DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES
HOUSE OF COMMONS

FOURTH SESSION—SEVENTEENTH PARLIAMENT

23-24 GEORGE V, 1933

VOLUME V, 1933

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRD DAY OF MAY, 1933, TO THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF MAY, 1933, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CXCVIII FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1933

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME



OTTAWA
J. O. PATENAUDE, ACTING KING'S PRINTER
1933

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wednesday, May 3, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table of the house an order in council passed pursuant to the relief legislation.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER

Mr. GORDON: I also beg leave to move:

That three hundred copies in the French language of the report of the commissioner of unemployment relief, 1933, be printed, and that standing order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

UNLOADING OF GRAIN, PORT OF QUEBEC

Mr. LAVERGNE:

1. Has the contract for the unloading of grain at the port of Quebec been renewed for the present season of navigation?
2. If so (a) were tenders called; (b) to whom was the contract awarded?
3. If not, why?

Mr. DURANLEAU:

The following information has been furnished by the harbour commissioners of Quebec:—

1. Yes.

2. (a) No. (b) Messrs. Albert G. Baker, Limited.

3. Messrs. Albert G. Baker, Limited, had the contract for the season of navigation of 1932. It was felt that no advantage would be gained by calling for tenders this year as their services were satisfactory in all respects in 1932.

INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS

Mr. ROBERGE:

What amount of money has the government collected by way of income tax during 1932 from individuals, companies, corporations or others who pay a tax on an income ranging from $500,000 to $1,000,000?

Mr. RYCKMAN:

$20,764,572.05.

GOLD PURCHASES

Mr. COOTE:

Since October 1, 1931, what amount of gold has been purchased by the government and what is the total amount of premiums paid for such gold?

Mr. RHODES:

Gold purchased from October 1, 1931, to March 31, 1933:

Ozs. Fine	Value	Premium Paid
4,228,136 739/1000	$87,403,340.14	$12,236,962.81

LIVINGSTONE CHANNEL—USE OF AMERICAN WORKMEN

Mr. HEENAN:

1. Has permission been given the contractor engaged in deepening the Livingstone channel in the Detroit river to bring workers into Canada from the United States?

2. If so, how many stationary and hoisting engineers have thus been granted entry?

Mr. GORDON:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF, MONTREAL

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, resolutions and other documents exchanged between J. G. H. Duperron, president of the Delorimier Independent Labour Club, of Montreal, and the Prime Minister of Canada and the Minister of Marine, respecting the manner in which direct relief is distributed in the city of Montreal, and protests against taxes imposed by the Rhodes budget on sugar and other foodstuffs.

BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS, RESTRICTED AREA

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents, in the possession of the Department of Agriculture, respecting the establishment of a restricted area for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis embracing the agricultural districts of Chicoutimi, Roberval, Charlevoix and Saguenay, from January 1, 1930, to date.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT REGULATIONS

Mr. NEILL:

For a copy of all documents, correspondence, letters, petitions and telegrams passing since September 1, 1932, between any member of the government, or official thereof, and any other government, persons, or associations in connection with the request for the change in the regulations of the Meat and Canned Foods Act which was embodied in P.C. 206 passed on February 3, 1933, whether before or after the passage of the said order in council.

NEW GOVERNMENT BUILDING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government if there is any truth in the report which appeared in the paper yesterday to the effect that the government was to begin construction of a $5,000,000 block on Wellington street, such construction to be financed by the issue of notes?

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Any information of that sort will be made known to the house in due course, as no action can be taken without consent of the house.

COAL INQUIRY

REPORT OF REGISTRAR ON IMPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF BRITISH ANTHRACITE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, some days ago I intimated to the house that I had received the report of the registrar appointed under the Combines Investigation Act with respect to his inquiry into the importation and distribution of British anthracite coal into Canada. I intimated at that time that as soon as I had an opportunity to review the report I would make a statement to the house. The inquiry was set in motion by reason of a complaint made by a member of the other chamber, and was not instituted, as is usually the case, by reason of a complaint having been made by the requisite number of consumers or others interested.

[Mr. Casgrain.]

At any rate, I instructed the registrar to make an investigation or an inquiry, as the act provides. That was done, and a great deal of evidence was taken in connection with the matter. As I indicated to the house a few days ago, the practice, and in my view a very proper one, has been not to make public the findings in inquiries under the act into business concerns. The reason of course must be obvious, namely, that if it is found after inquiry that the provisions of the act have not been invaded, then it would be highly improper that the business of anyone be made known to his competitors and others. On the other hand, if it is found that the business under inquiry falls foul of the provisions of the act and it is desirable to have a further review, that further review would of course be based upon the evidence secured by the registrar or commissioner as the case may be, and if the evidence were made public it might easily defeat the objective sought.

The importation and distribution of British anthracite coal in this country has been a subject of interest for a number of years. Efforts have been made in the past to introduce that fuel into Canada because of the fact that the supply of that sort of fuel was being obtained entirely from outside our boundaries. Until 1929 those efforts were not efficacious for reasons that probably are fairly well known to members of this chamber. Beginning with 1929 the importation of British coal was apparently made possible, and today the importation of that fuel is very considerable. No question arises as to contracts made or understandings arrived at between the importers of British anthracite and their other foreign competitors, so in that respect the inquiry made by the registrar is quite different from the usual inquiry made into matters arising under the act. The question that does arise is whether or not in the formation of the organization that is distributing the British anthracite in Canada those engaged have complied with the terms of the act. Many questions of law are involved. The registrar's report indicates that the importers' net profit for the four years, 1929 to 1932 inclusive, ranged from 39 cents a ton to 64 cents a ton. The registrar also finds that there has not been a contraction of that profit in the same ratio as retailers' profits and matters of that character. He has concluded, however, that the arrangements

perfected by the importers of British anthracite coal do not in his view conform to what is contemplated by the Combines Investigation Act. Therefore, there being, as I have indicated, questions of law involved that are difficult of determination, I have decided that I will refer the matter to the appropriate authorities in the province or provinces affected, to take whatever action they think desirable in the light of the registrar's report, the evidence, and the exhibits upon which it is founded; and further review of the matter by this chamber probably will not be necessary.

Mr. RALSTON: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. minister if the registrar's report contains any statement with regard to the advisability in the public interest of making the report public? As I remember it—I have not the act before me, but I have sent for it—the act requires that publicity be given to the report unless the registrar expressly states that it is not in the public interest that the report be published.

Mr. GORDON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's recollection is not correct with respect to what the act contemplates. Section 27, which deals with reports of this character, says that the registrar at the conclusion of every investigation which he conducts shall make a report in writing which he shall sign and without delay transmit to the minister. Then, dealing with the report of a commissioner, who is an entirely different officer under the act, subsection 2 says:

> Every commissioner who conducts an investigation shall at the conclusion thereof make a report in writing which he shall sign and transmit to the registrar, together with the evidence taken at the investigation, certified by the commissioner, and any documents and papers remaining in the custody of the commissioner; and the registrar shall without delay transmit the report to the minister.

Then with respect to publicity, section 28 says:

> Any report of a commissioner, other than an interim report, shall within fifteen days after its receipt by the minister be made public, unless the commissioner is of the opinion that the public interest would be better served by withholding publication . . .

That deals entirely with a report by a commissioner, and not an inquiry by the registrar.

Mr. RALSTON: The registrar was not sitting as a commissioner?

Mr. GORDON: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask what the decision of the department has been in regard to an application for an inquiry in reference to the combine in the city of Winnipeg?

Mr. GORDON: I assume that the hon. member has reference to an alleged combine in connection with the coal industry in Winnipeg. The distribution of coal in Winnipeg has been under review by the officials of the department. An interim report has been received. I expect to have the matter investigated further.

Mr. RALSTON: In that connection may I ask a further question? While it is true that the imperative section of the act with regard to publicity refers to a commissioner, I understand there is nothing in the act which prohibits the minister from making public the report of the registrar; in fact there is no suggestion that it shall not be made public. Will the minister lay the report on the table of the house?

Mr. GORDON: The hon. member is quite right in saying that the act is silent with respect to making public a report of the registrar. As I have already indicated, having regard to the fact that I am transmitting the report of the registrar and the evidence and exhibits upon which it is founded to the provincial authorities affected, in order that they may take such action as they deem advisable, in my view it would not be desirable to make the report or the evidence public.

Mr. YOUNG: Why not?

Mr. GORDON: Because it might defeat any action which the attorney general of the province to whom the report is submitted might take.

Mr. YOUNG: In what way?

Mr. GORDON: If there should be a prosecution the evidence would be in the hands of anyone who might be subjected to that prosecution. That has not been the practice in the past, and I think the practice that has been followed is sound.

Mr. SPENCER: May I ask to what provinces the report will be submitted?

Mr. GORDON: The only provinces affected would be Quebec and Ontario, and Ontario would be affected much less than Quebec.

CANADA-GERMANY TRADE AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. SAMUEL FACTOR (Toronto West Centre): I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) if the trade agreement between Canada and Germany, which I understand expired last month, has been renewed by the government and, if so, when it was renewed and for what term.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The understanding with Germany—it is not a trade agreement—was extended about a month ago, and some statement in that connection was made in the house. I think it has been extended for a period of six months.

RACE TRACK EMPLOYEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ECCLES J. GOTT (South Essex): Mr. Speaker, according to press reports of yesterday the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Gordon) is expected to modify the restrictions against United States citizens entering Canada to work on Canadian Racing Association tracks as pari-mutuel operators. I should like to ask the minister what is the intention of the government with regard to the employment in Canada of United States citizens in this connection, in view of the fact that Canadian citizens are barred from employment on the tracks in the United States.

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Acting Minister of Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the question of the interchange of labour between Canada and the United States, as I think every hon. member knows, has come up with respect to many industries and activities. It is difficult to adopt any course that will not at times give rise to irritation or cause some people to feel that the division is not fair as between the two countries. With respect to the employment of people on race tracks—and I may tell hon. members that I am not at all acquainted with race tracks and their operation—I had this question before me last year and again this year. I am not prepared to subscribe to what my hon. friend says with regard to the exclusion of Canadians from United States tracks, though I would not care to deny that there has been some restriction in that regard. There are many more tracks in the United States than there are in Canada, and Canadians are employed on United States tracks. The number of United States citizens employed on Canadian tracks the year before last was about one hundred. Last year that number was greatly reduced, and this year a further reduction has been made, so that there will not be more than fifteen such officials employed.

Hon. members must realize that the operation of a race track is a highly specialized business, and one cannot become acquainted with all its complexities in the course of a few weeks. For instance, a steward is a very special man, and so also is a starter; these men are trained for their work. An assistant starter does dangerous work at times, I am told, and it has been suggested to me also that sometimes the finisher finds himself in a very precarious situation. I can assure my hon. friend, however, that the whole subject has been given very careful review, having regard to the possibility of employing Canadian labour and also having regard to the fact that huge sums of money have been invested in race tracks in this country. I do not think it would be advisable for the government to adopt such a course as would be likely to render impossible the carrying on of the sport, so called. Yesterday I did take some action; it was indicated to me that a special man was necessary, and I allowed that man to enter on condition that the race track employ at once four unemployed Canadians who would be taught how to do the work. We must take action such as this at times, and as each case arises the responsibility is mine to see that the best course is followed, having regard to the interests of everyone concerned and particularly the interests of those unemployed in Canada who are capable of carrying on the work.

TARIFF BOARD—APPLICATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. G. SANDERSON (South Perth): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) in regard to the new tariff board. Could the minister tell the house what applications for hearings have been received from Canadian and British firms? If the minister has not the information before him perhaps he would give me an answer to-morrow.

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Obviously I will have to ask that my hon. friend's question stand as a notice, and I will give an answer to-morrow.

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is desirable that we should have interim supply. Therefore I would ask the unanimous consent of the house for the

purpose of voting one-twelfth of the estimates. I accordingly move, Mr. Speaker, that you do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of supply.

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask the minister whether, when this amount is voted, he will make a second motion for the house to resolve itself into committee of ways and means.

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the opposition): I imagine that the minister's motion is made for the purpose of obtaining what is necessary for the payment of the civil servants on the 15th of the month?

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I might avail myself of this opportunity to say so, this motion rather brings up the question of whether this house will not conclude its business by that time. I may say quite frankly that so far as the opposition is concerned we have no desire to protract the session. If we could come to an agreement with regard to the business for the remainder of the session I think it might not be necessary for my hon. friend to ask for this interim supply. I just make this suggestion as an indication of the attitude of the opposition provided we can reach an agreement as to the business for the balance of the session.

Mr. RHODES: Even in that event, Mr. Speaker, there would be some inconvenience because under the new control and audit act we are practically without funds for purposes which require funds from day to day. In view of what has been said by my right hon. friend, however, and in anticipation of any possible announcement that may be made I think perhaps the motion may be withheld until to-morrow. Therefore I would withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) if there has been any change in the intention of the government to proceed with the redistribution bill this session. I ask the question because there seems to be some uncertainty with regard to the matter.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I think perhaps I can answer that question with more authority to-morrow, but so far as I know at present there is no change.

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE DATE OF PROROGATION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I have no intention of asking the government to discuss a matter which they may or may not be ready to take up at the moment; if however the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) intends to take up interim supply to-morrow perhaps I might ask the Prime Minister if, between now and to-morrow, he would not consider whether it might not be possible to arrange matters so that by sitting mornings or giving up Wednesday night adjournments, or something of the sort, we may have an approximate time fixed for prorogation.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): We have what I suppose is a most disputatious measure to consider in connection with redistribution. The discussion of redistribution might take some time, from the indications I have heard. I have not had an opportunity to investigate the matter fully, but I have been told that may be so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: I thank the hon. gentleman from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe); he says it is so. Therefore it follows that there may be a lengthy discussion on the question of redistribution. Apart from that I know now of no measure that will take any considerable time of the house. There is a short measure which I indicated I might introduce but which I have not yet discussed fully with my colleagues. It is probable that we shall ask the house to approve of a trade agreement between now and prorogation, and that is the reason I have not made any statement, because I cannot do so to-day with any degree of certainty. I shall endeavour, however, between now and to-morrow to get as full information as possible on all these matters and communicate it to the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend refers to a trade agreement. Is it the one with France he has in mind?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

WAYS AND MEANS

CONDITION OF SETTLERS IN ROUYN DISTRICT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Mr. JEAN-FRANCOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): The other day I was unfortunately compelled to submit to the house complaints made by certain settlers and, commenting upon

this, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gordon) said that these complaints had come from people other than those who had been settled by the federal government. To-day I have received complaints again, and every one of the settlers concerned has been assisted by the federal government as well as by the provincial authorities and the municipality. This matter is of the utmost importance and I would direct the attention of the house and of the country to the condition of these poor people who are now in dire distress. Depending on them are babies and young children who have no milk.

The Minister of Labour, the day after I brought this matter up, read the following telegram which he said he had received from Mr. J. E. Laforce, who acts for the Canadian National Railways on the committee with respect to this work:

Relative statement the Gazette this morning. No families back to land were placed Rouyn or immediate surroundings. No back to land families province Quebec in distress provided they have shown willingness to work.

J. E. Laforce.

The day before the minister read that telegram to the house I had read a telegram received from Mr. Marcel Essiambre. I will now read the letter I received from this man. I regret very much that I have not an English translation at hand, but I may say that the letter has been sworn to before a commissioner of the superior court. It speaks for itself:

(Translation)

I, Marcel Essiambre, previously residing in Montreal, married and father of nine children, residing at Rivière-Solitaire since October 6 of last year—

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Where is Rivière-Solitaire situated? In what district?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): In the county of Pontiac, twenty miles from Rouyn.

—do hereby swear on the Holy Bible and make the following statement:

On October 6 last, I left Montreal to establish myself at Rivière-Solitaire, as a settler. On October 26, my wife and my nine children joined me there. I had to pay $15 for the transfer of my household effects from Ville-Marie to Rivière-Solitaire. Instead of delivering them on my lot, the driver spread them over a distance of about 12 miles. In connection with this transfer I lost for at least $100 worth of my household effects, namely, two large boxes containing new clothes which we had purchased before leaving and which were to last, at least, over two years; I also lost a mattress. No one ever reimbursed us for this serious loss. My lot is situated at a distance of half a mile from the highway. The road leading to it was cleared, that is the trees were cut, but the road bed is soft. Therefore, it is impossible to reach my lot with a summer vehicle; however, it can be reached with a "log-sled" (a kind of a sled made of logs which is dragged along the ground). Since our arrival here, we have, so to speak, no mail service, that is, any one coming from Rouyn brings us our mail. Last Sunday, Mr. Leroux, the parish priest notified us in his sermon that, in the future, those who wanted their mail, would have to get it themselves at Rouyn, as he did not intend to bring it any more.

I have not been able, for more than fifteen days, to obtain goods from the store of Mr. Bellehumeur, at Rivière-Solitaire. My account amounts to $421.53, the balance completing the $500, I am told (Mr. Joseph Morin, who is one of the agents of colonization here, so informs me) is held to cover the travelling expenses to this place, of my family and myself, also to cover the freight rate on my household effects. Yet, previous to my departure from Montreal, I was informed at the C. P. Ry. offices, Windsor station, that our train fare and freight for household effects would be free of charge. I am charged seven fares at $10 each, or $70. The only food we have had in the house, since fifteen days, for my wife, children and myself, is flour. To-day, I arrived at Rouyn on foot, after having walked 32 miles, in order to obtain some work. As we had not eaten anything, I had to beg for my food. My friend and myself, have enough for another meal before returning, on foot, to Rivière-Solitaire, as no work can be had at Rouyn.

I now appeal to Mr. Jean-François Pouliot, M.P., and ask him to draw the attention of the House of Commons to the sad plight of my family and myself and to request the government to supply us with food.

I know a number of families who are also starving; the following are the names of a few of them, all residents of Rivière-Solitaire.

Names of families: 1. Octave Larocque; 2. Amable Larocque; 3. Joseph Levasseur; 4. William Laviolette; 5. Jérémie Trépanier. There are many others who have no food whatsoever.

I would request the government to send an inspector here, you will then be able to judge whether I have given false evidence. Many of us are in a weak state and unless the government acts immediately, there will be deaths to register.

I sign,
Marcel Essiambre,
Rivière-Solitaire, Témiskaming,
(Signed) Marcel Essiambre.

Sworn before me, this 25th day of April, 1933.

(Signed) Nelson Pinder,
(Justice of the Peace for the district of Pontiac).

Note.—I have an infant 8 months old to whom milk is refused.

(Signed) Marcel Essiambre.

I forwarded this letter to the hon. Minister of Labour enclosing also mine which is as follows:

Ottawa, April 28, 1933.

Honourable W. A. Gordon,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.
Dear Mr. Gordon:

Referring to your statement of yesterday (Hansard, p. 4644) on the condition of settlers

in Rouyn and other parts of Quebec, Mr. Laforce has wired me that "no families back to the land were placed Rouyn or immediate surroundings."

Mr. Marcel Essiambre's telegram which I have read on April 26th (Hansard, p. 4615-6) was sent from Rouyn and it mentioned that a letter was to follow.

I have received that letter only yesterday and I forward you a copy of it.

You will see by that letter that Mr. Essiambre or Essiandre is one of the settlers at La Rivière Solitaire, and that man walked the whole way, about twenty miles, from La Rivière Solitaire to get some work in Rouyn wherefrom he sent his telegram.

I did not mention in the house that Mr. Essiambre was living at Rouyn, but it appeared by the telegram itself wherefrom it was sent.

Mr. Laforce, who, as you said, "acts for the Canadian National Railways on the committee with respect to this work" has added: "No back to land families province Quebec in distress provided they have shown willingness to work."

You will note that Mr. Essiambre's letter has been sworn before a justice of the peace. The only thing he asks, and it seems very fair, is the visit of an inspector. He writes: "You will then see if I perjure myself."

Therefore the sworn statement made by that man is most serious and deserves every consideration.

Mr. Essiambre says that he is the father of an eight months' child and who is refused milk. Can you expect from such a child "the willingness to work" mentioned by Mr. Laforce?

You have stated that only two settlers had been assisted by your government in my constituency and that you believed that the other settlers there had been placed by the province of Quebec; but the above mentioned wire came from Rouyn and the sender was a settler from La Rivière Solitaire.

Therefore, will you kindly let me know at once if your government had anything to do with the settlement of La Rivière Solitaire? This is my first question.

My second question is: What are the settlements to which your government has made any contribution in the province of Quebec?

My third question is as follows: If your government had anything to do by contribution or otherwise with the settlement at La Rivière Solitaire, will you kindly see to it at once that an inspector from your department is sent there to interview Mr. Essiambre and the people mentioned in his letter, in order to have a true, complete and impartial report on the matter which seems to be very serious.

In fact, this morning I have received another wire from J. D. Valiquette, dated Rouyn, but I presume that that gentleman is one of the settlers of La Rivière Solitaire. You will note that he says that his children are very weak.

I am anxious to receive his letter and I will send a copy to you as soon as I get it.

I regret not to have the time to translate some of the documents which I send you but it is easier for you to have it done at once by your staff.

My only appeal is to your sense of justice and to your good heart. This is why I expect a fair answer with great eagerness.

I wrote another letter to the hon. gentleman on May 1 but as yet I have received no answer. I desire to take this opportunity to thank the newspapers which have published the letter written by Mr. Essiambre. I refer particularly to the newspapers La Presse, La Patrie, Le Devoir and Le Droit which have brought these facts to the notice of the public. They must be known to everyone. Only this morning I received another letter, also sworn to by the same gentleman, which reads:

Sworn Statement

I, Marcel Essiambre, a settler of Rivière-Solitaire, hereby swear on the Holy Bible and make the following statement: I arrived this evening from Rivière-Solitaire, together with my nephew Frédéric Larocque, after having walked 32 miles. As we had no money and had not eaten any food, we had to make up our mind to beg for food. After having explained to a Rouyn citizen that we were poor settlers having come from Montreal and settled at Rivière-Solitaire, and that we had not eaten any dinner that day, he gave us our supper, and a bed for the night. He showed me in the newspaper "La Presse" what the minister, W. A. Gordon, had said regarding the statement I had made in my telegram; the newspaper contained the following: That my name did not appear on the files of the department, that in the back to the land scheme under the Dominion government, no settler was located in Rouyn or surroundings. I deem it my duty to furnish to the one who defends our cause in the House of Commons, Mr. J. F. Pouliot, the facts such as sworn to, in order to make known the truth and prevent those charged of resorting to lies justifying their actions. I left Montreal on October 6 last, and after reaching Rivière-Solitaire, I settled on lot 7, range 8, township of Desandrouin; my family left Montreal on October 26 to join me and ever since then we have been residing on my lot, located at a distance of 32 miles from Rouyn. To-day I am looking for work because I am certain that if I remain on my lot we shall all starve to death. I have no hesitation in advising my relations and friends who reside in Montreal not to come and settle at Rivière-Solitaire, it is a real snare and the best place to starve to death. All our surroundings here consist in deceit and hypocrisy. We are shamefully robbed of the few dollars granted to us by the city of Montreal and the Dominion government. The provincial government does not seem to have paid its quota, because the drivers who transferred our household effects have not, according to them, been paid.

I cannot vouch for these facts; I simply quote the sworn statement such as it is:

Food and other articles were sold to us at twice their value. Our letters are unsealed, taken out and lost, while the goods sent to us through the mail are stolen. We have no mail service, we must depend on every one. If the minister, Mr. Gordon, wishes to be better informed, let him send some one to hold an inquiry (some serious person) and he will discover quite a number of poor settlers who had their goods stolen, their letters opened or stolen. For months past our member, Mr. Bélec, has been promising us that mail service—

Mr. Essiambre makes certain comments about the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Belec) and out of deference to the latter I shall not read them.

If federal inspectors have held inquiries, I do not hesitate to state, under oath, that they did not fulfil their duty, they made false statements and did not endeavour to discover the truth.

First, our member, Mr. Charles Bélec, in the grand speech he recently delivered, was bold enough to state publicly that we had a well equipped hospital; I wish to state, under oath—

Mr. Essiambre uses language which I shall not repeat, however, he absolutely contradicts the statement of the hon. member for Pontiac.

—we have no hospital or even a doctor. Although I am but a poor settler, I shall take the liberty of telling our member, Mr. Charles Bélec—

Neither shall I quote the words Mr. Essiambre uses.

—that he should defend in the house his constituents so that we would not be forced to ask an outside member to request on our behalf charity for our families and ourselves.

Sworn before me, May the second, the year of our Lord, nineteen hundred and thirty-three, at Rouyn, witness,

(Signed) Nelson Pinder,
Commissioner of the Superior Court
of the province of Quebec,
Abitibi district.

I sign,
(Signed) Marcel Essiambre.

I took the trouble to communicate with the Post Office department to verify the statement of Mr. Essiambre, in connection with the mail service; the following is the letter received, dated May 1, last, from Mr. Maurice Grondin, private secretary to the hon. Postmaster General.

Mr. Jean-François Pouliot, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Pouliot:

I am instructed by the hon. Mr. Sauvé, to acknowledge receipt of your letter addressed to him on March 28 last, in connection with the mail service at Rivière-Solitaire-Rouyn. There is not yet any post office located at Rivière-Solitaire. A request for one has already been made, however, the necessary arrangements have not, so far, been completed.

As the list of addresses published by the Post Office Department is arranged by each local post office, this will explain why no list of addresses has yet been made. As to the transport of mail, tenders were asked for a semi-weekly service between Rivière-Solitaire and Arntfield. The contract has not yet been awarded.

I remain, sir,
Yours sincerely,
(Signed) Maurice Grondin,
Private Secretary.

I think it shameful, sir, that the 2,800 people who reside at Rivière-Solitaire, since October last, have not yet any mail service. Is it to prevent these poor people from broadcasting their legitimate complaints against the way they are treated by the governments and municipalities? If that is the reason there is not only Mr. Essiambre who has to complain. I also received such a complaint from Mr. Joseph-Donat Valiquette in a telegram dated at Rouyn, however, this gentleman resides at at Mont-Bayard, in the neighbourhood of Rivière-Solitaire. This telegram was also sent "C.O.D." on April 27, last.

Mr. Jean-François Pouliot, M.P.
Ottawa, Ont.

My family and myself nothing to eat. Ask you to rise in house and request the government to send food. My children are in a weak state. Writing to-day.

(Signed) J. D. Valiquette.

Sworn Statement

I, Joseph-Donat Valiquette, previously residing in Montreal, father of four children, settled at Rivière-Solitaire, Témiskaming, on October of last year, do hereby swear on the Holy Bible and make the following statement:

I left Montreal on October 6 last to settle at Rivière-Solitaire, under the system which grants $600 to a settler. After reaching Riviére-Solitaire, I decided to take my lot at Mont-Bayard, which is the next parish, situated 12 miles from Rivière-Solitaire.

My account, I am told, amounts to $499. Now, the store of Coté, Limited, refuses to give me food for my family and myself. When I left home this morning, all my wife had in the house was half a kettle of beans and bread. We have been living for the last fifteen days on nothing else but boiled beans, without grease or pork.

Our boots are all worn out. We still have flour and beans to last us about three or four days.

I appeal to Mr. Jean-Francois Pouliot, M.P., to rise in the house and request the government to send us food in order that we may not starve to death.

The following are the names of a few families who, like myself, are starving. These families reside at Mont-Bayard: Messrs. Gravel, Gagnon, and many others whose names I cannot recall, at present.

Sworn before me, this 26th April, 1933, at Rouyn, Quebec.

(Signed) Nelson Pinder,
Commissioner of the Superior Court
for the province of Quebec,
Abitibi district.

I sign,
Joseph-Donat Valiquette,
Mont-Bayard, Témiskaming, Que.
(Signed) J. D. Valiquette.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, I always try to be lenient towards those who ask questions

when I am making a speech, but the other day when I was saying that it was a crime to let the children of our race die of hunger, some hon. members opposite dared to shout "Hurrah." There may be some excuse for their not understanding fully what I was saying but they should not make fun of these distressing cases. It is not a pleasure to me to bring up these matters before the house; I do it because I feel it to be my duty to defend these families who have been placed in the middle of a wilderness, cut off from everyone. I feel that my action is not only in accordance with the rules of this house but in accordance with the rules of humanity. I feel sure that no man or woman in this country wants to see a human being go hungry. These men do not ask for money; all they ask is that a fair investigation be made of their cases. They do not want this investigation to be held by those who are paid according to the number of settlers they place on the land; they want it to be held by someone who is fair, impartial and independent. They want someone who will tell the truth to the Minister of Labour in Ottawa and the Minister of Colonization in Quebec. That is all I ask of the minister here and all I have been asking of the Minister of Colonization in Quebec. The latter writes me under date of the first of this month that he intends sending a man there to make an investigation. I ask the government—and I urge upon them the necessity of doing this—to send there a man who is competent, independent, fair, who will interview those people who are starving in the wilderness and report as to their condition. Then we shall find out whether Mr. Laforce is telling the truth when he says that no one is dying of hunger in Quebec. I want the minister to understand what I say. Mr. Laforce says that no one who is willing to work has been in distress. Can you expect a starving man to show unwillingness to work?

Mr. CANTLEY: Better go home and put your head to soak.

Mr. POULIOT: I am sorry, but I shall put the hon. member for Pictou in the same class as those who shouted "Hurrah" the other day. I pity him. A man of his age, who must have a heart in his body, should not say anything like that when I am speaking of human misery. If the hon. member for Pictou were bringing to the attention of the house the sad case of those who are suffering in his constituency, he may be sure I should not jeer at him, but I would sympathize fully with him, and I promise, when he speaks in the house I shall pay attention to him. If he has a stone instead of a heart in his body, I shall leave him alone and I shall not mention him again in my speech as I would not honour him by paying any more attention to his gibes.

I have made an appeal to the sense of justice and good heart of the minister. I am asking him something that is fair and reasonable, something that any man who has a heart in his body would do at once. I urge him to see to it immediately that an inspector is sent there to find out whether those men who sent sworn letters about their miseries and grievances, are telling the truth or not. The minister must take with a grain of salt those reports that are sent to him or to the provincial government stating that everything is well in those newly settled districts. That is all I have to say, and I say it in all earnestness and sincerity, hoping at least that the minister will believe I am not playing petty politics; that all I wish to do is to open his eyes and tell him that those who have already made reports to him have not told the truth.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (North Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, on account of the fact that the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) has brought up this matter, I wish to say that the policy of the government in connection with the back to the land movement has placed a number of families in my constituency. I believe during the coming summer the number who will be placed by the government in conjunction with the provincial government will be nearly 400 families, so that on account of these facts the house will allow me to say a few words on this important question.

I am absolutely in favour of the movement because I believe out of it will come a great deal of good as ultimately it will help to bring about a balancing of population between urban and rural centres. I said, I believe five weeks ago, that the government should have a better follow-up system, but taking the movement as a whole, I think it is good and that some benefit has been accomplished. Of course it is always easy to single out certain individual cases and on them build up an argument before parliament, but, as I say, the movement as a whole will be of benefit. For one thing, it makes the governments, both federal and provincial, realize the serious situation that exists in our rural sections. I believe I mentioned a few weeks ago to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gordon) the case of a man named James McLean, a very fine type of Canadian, at Frederickhouse, who has taken up a lot under that scheme, but who finds it almost impossible to make both ends meet.

In a letter which I read to the house he mentioned that he was allowed only $1.40 a head. He has eight children, so that with his wife and himself, there are ten of a family who have to live on $14 a month. Every hon. member will realize that it is absolutely impossible to keep body and soul together on such an amount. I could cite two or three others cases, but I do not believe it would be in order to do so at this time. Again I repeat: No family and certainly not a single man should be allowed to settle on the land after the end of June. No matter how well administered the scheme may be, no one should be allowed to go on the land in the fall or winter. In the last two years we have allowed many people to settle in the northern sections in the fall or late in the summer and it is impossible for those fine people to make a success. On that score, however, I believe the government is well seized of the situation.

There is another case which I want the government to understand. A number of those new farmers who have been taken away from their previous occupations and thrown into a new one are finding it impossible, even under the $600 scheme, to finance the buying of seed grain so as to put in a crop on the land which they cleared last year. I believe the government out of either the equalization fund or in some other way should find it possible to get some of the surplus grain which has been accumulating in the west for a few years and which must deteriorate, and distribute it in the northern section of Ontario. I have in mind hundreds of cases of farmers and settlers who find it impossible to put any seed into the ground for the simple reason that they have not the money to do so. I believe $500,000 would be quite sufficient to meet the requirements of those people. I have under my hand a newspaper dispatch in which I read that the provincial government is sending Hon. Doctor Robb to make an inquiry into the situation, and really this is praiseworthy because a minister of the Ontario government will find out for himself the actual situation and will see that some help must be given. The provincial government go further; they say that they are going to give to some of the settlers who at present are on relief, from ten to twenty bushels of seed grain. This is a move in the right direction. I believe the federal government in this back to the land scheme should enlarge its policy by allowing a sum of $500,000 to be voted by parliament so that not a single settler placed on the land under this scheme will suffer from lack of seed during the present season. As regards the view that they should be self-supporting, we all know that on new holdings or farms, it is impossible for these people for a number of years to make the thing go with the crop that they find there. Unless they have some seed grain placed in the soil this season, they will be in a worse position next fall than they are at the present time.

There is another matter which I believe will come under this heading, and which has a great deal to do with public health, particularly in the unorganized sections of our country, especially northern Ontario and northern Quebec. We know the doctors in the organized localities are looking after the population not only in the districts in which they live but also in the unorganized sections. I have in my hand a regulation issued by the provincial government last fall whereby it has curtailed the amount that is to be paid to the doctors for their services, extending to every section in which they are giving medical attention. I said in the house early this session, and I repeat that this regulation is actually prejudicial to the health of the individual. It is very harmful to the rural sections and every member will readily understand that a sum of $100, where each doctor has to look after a population of at least 6,000 people, is ridiculous. I believe it is in order to read the regulation so that the house may be fully seized with the situation. It reads:

> Regulations as to medical services and medical supplies. This statement is issued in order to clarify in the minds of the municipalities and the doctors the proper interpretation of the phrase "medical services and medical supplies" which appears in the order in council dated the 19th of September, 1932.
>
> At the outset, it must be clearly understood that the government is not forcing any policy upon the municipalities with regard to this matter. Each municipality has the right to decide for itself whether it wishes to undertake any medical services in connection with direct relief, and also as to the nature and plan of such medical assistance.
>
> 2. As set out in the Public Health Act (section 51, clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4) municipalities are directly responsible for the medical attendance and medical supplies of their indigent population.

This new regulation might well apply to other sections of the province of Ontario. The Minister of Labour is familiar with the northern part of that province, and must realize fully that it cannot apply to the section of the country from which I come. In that part of the province there are only a few organized rural districts. Most of them are in the colonization stage, and there are no municipal bodies to take care of them. A doctor from Timmins giving services in one of the surrounding rural districts would find

it absolutely impossible to collect fees for any such services rendered. The same would apply to the district surrounding the town of Cochrane. That applies as forcibly to other sections, such as those surrounding Kapuskasing and Hearst. Then, regulation No. 3 is as follows:

Any municipality wishing to undertake the furnishing of medical services and medical supplies and desiring to secure government assistance in connection with such work under the order in council above referred to must comply with the following requirements:

(a) All medical treatment to indigent patients in their homes or in doctors' offices is included, also maternity services at homes, as well as after treatment, in major emergency operations outside of hospitals; the doctors furnishing the necessary medical supplies.

(b) For such services as outlined in the previous subsection the doctor may be allowed one-half the established prevailing fee for such service in the community.

(c) Surgical and medical treatment in hospitals or other institutions for treatment of disease and surgical operations outside of hospitals are not included.

(d) Before the medical services and supplies are given an order in writing for same must be obtained from the relief officer, except in very emergent cases where the relief officer can give such an order after some part of the services required has been performed.

(e) Accounts for medical services and supples must be rendered by the doctor in an itemized statement, and each account must show the details of the prevailing charges in the locality for such services upon which the one-half claim is based. Such account must be rendered to the relief officer and forwarded by him to this department with the monthly statement.

(f) In rural municipalities a maximum mileage fee of twenty-five cents per mile, one way, may be allowed.

(g) An amount in excess of $100 in a doctor's account for any one month will not be allowed.

(h) It will be observed that "medical services and medical supplies" is one of the items of direct relief that must be included in the forty per cent as set out in the order in council.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, is of absolutely no use to our section of the country. If my information is correct, in the city of Ottawa medical men giving their services under the relief act are allowed a minimum of $400 per month. I suppose they attend an average of 2,000 people. In our section, however, in the unorganized districts the doctors have to look after the health of at least 6,000 people. Travelling conditions are poor in a good many cases, he would have to go fifty miles each way, making a round trip of one hundred miles, for which he is allowed twenty-five cents a mile one way. While that may be fair enough in the summer months when automobiles can be used, in the winter months the amount allowed by the government is not sufficient. We know that doctors in the newer sections have a more difficult task than those in the more populated areas. I do not know of any doctor in my section of the country who through lack of money has refused to give service. Let us visualize what would happen for instance, in a maternity case: The doctor is called, but on account of the fact that the government is not willing to pay fifty per cent of the fee, he refuses to attend. Supposing that on account of such refusal death follows; who would be responsible, or who would receive the blame? It would be the doctor. I put this fair question to the house: Is a doctor more obliged to give public service than any other citizen? Must he make more sacrifice for the public than any other citizen? A hundred dollars a month to attend to 6,000 people, and to supply them with proper medicaments, is wholly inadequate. To be fair I must say that in some cases the provincial government has given more; still the payment is inadequate. We have the spectacle of that splendid profession being compelled to make a sacrifice which is not asked from any other section of the population. I know of a case where a doctor in the town of Kaspuskasing received a call from an adjoining locality. In that instance the poor settler did not have money enough to pay for the phone call, and the doctor had to pay the reversed charge of $1.40. The doctor never hesitated, but went to attend the patient. He took his car, knowing that he would never receive a single cent for the services he was going to give. Surely a government could not object to helping pay a fee in an instance such as that. The minister may urge that this is a matter with which the provincial legislature should deal. I maintain however, as I said previously, that since we are voting money for relief, out of the federal treasury something should be done by the federal authorities, and it should take a lead in such matters.

To make my point clearer, and so that the house may be fully seized of the seriousness of the situation, I am going to read a letter from one of the doctors which is typical of several letters I have received from doctors in my section of the country. As I said a while ago, we all know that professional men, whether they be doctors or lawyers, never expect to get the full amount of their fees. This applies more forcibly to doctors, because in addition to giving their personal attention they have to supply the necessary

remedies for treatment. The letter before me, dated February 2, 1933, is addressed to Mr. J. A. Ellis, of the Ontario Unemployment Relief Department, and is as follows:

Two weeks ago your representative, Mr. Tackaberry, at the Northern Development office, sent me a copy of regulations as to medical services and medical supplies, dated December 29, 1932, asking me for comments on same by return post. Hurriedly, I gave him my impressions.

The flu epidemic has not given me time to go further into the subject. To-day, however, financial conditions urge me to come to you for information.

I was this morning asked by a man on relief to go ten miles to attend to his wife sick in bed for the last six days. This man walked in ten miles and back ten miles, which is not unusual here. I called the relief department for the $5 livery pay in the case. Receiving no satisfactory answer I at first refused the husband. Eventually I went, driving twenty miles with team and driver, and opened an abscess in the mouth.

The problem that presents itself is "How deep shall I sink before I stop." My expenses are so very heavy and the present returns so insignificant that I have had to borrow. My limit at the bank has been reached. I can no further risk the welfare of my family and go deeper into debt without assuring myself of the reimbursement of my expenses, and money to keep my wife and seven children going.

Like everybody else, doctors are willing to make sacrifices, but in return expect a living. On account of the population under our care, the amount of work done, and the hardships encountered in this climate, covering the distances over roads, full of impediments, the inevitable expenses are such that the amount of money allowed in the south is altogether inadequate here; and just lately the flu epidemic has intensified that condition.

Whereas I concur with subsections a, b, d and e, of regulation No. 3, I must point out that subsections c, f and g, are not at all suitable to the district. Doctors with mixed practices of medicine and surgery can, as a rule, fairly well forego their surgical fees, but when patients are so far apart that doctors cannot possibly make the round, or where homes are so unsanitary that patients cannot be left there —(settlers' homes are all of pioneer age here, log shacks, all of them, many tumbling down, previously discarded homes even being at times used)—and must of all necessity be brought to hospital for care.

The hospital here takes the place of the home down below, and we should be paid for such services. Unlike the southern hospitals there are no house surgeons here to assume responsibility of patients and our attention is constant. As corroboration to my assertions I might tell you a maternity case of mine died in her home lately because no doctor could reach her. The coroner had to investigate.

Personally I care for about 6,000 of a population in a radius of 50 miles. During this flu epidemic my professional expenses (drugs and supplies, auto or livery, office rent and care, tax, insurance and inevitable expenditure, train, travelling bills) vary between $500 and $600 a month.

[Mr. Bradette.]

To one who does not know our circumstances I will say "not one drop of medicine or one article of medical supply has been handed out that should not have been." In most cases I should have given more.

Unfortunately I have reached my limit financially and physically. (I have been practising my profession twenty-four years). It is not to be forgotten that three or four doctors in Cochrane do incomparably more work than southern doctors, and, if I may say so, undergo hardships unknown in the south.

I am now asking for information and fair treatment, commensurate with the relief work done. I only want my expenses, on relief work, and fair compensation.

I would not wish my letter to be construed as a threat, but in all justice I cannot work all day in one municipality and all night in another one, spend $20 a day to receive $3.33.

Keep in mind that there is one doctor in a city to every 600 or 800 people in a small radius, whereas I attend seven or eight times that number in a radius twenty-five times as large.

This letter is written explanatory to our conditions, and imbued I believe with good intentions. I should be pleased to give any information one might wish, any time.

I have gone to homes where five, eight or ten had la grippe, and three or four such houses in succession, fifty miles from my office. I have had to furnish those poor but honest people with requirements deemed necessary to effect a cure in as short a time as possible. There is no drug store in any of the twenty communities I have to attend to. It is absolutely out of the question to give such patients medicine for two or three days, it must be for eight, ten or fifteen days as the case may be, and for the number that are affected.

Men have skied or hiked eighteen miles each way to my office. Mothers have pulled babies six or eight miles behind them to my office and other mothers have walked ten miles to my office. One mother, chilled, drove eighteen miles at 15 degrees below zero with a sick infant in her arms to my office. That is only a few, and they must be looked after, and looked after with humanity, and I cannot support the cost alone, or any more.

I have given thirty-two ounces of cough medicine to a family of ten, fifty miles away, and as much tonic; that was not enough, it only lasted four days, and rightly so. The cost may seem high, but it is both expensive and sad in the community to see a few cases developing tuberculosis or a young father dying. I have seen both in this present epidemic. It is very heart-rending at times, but most of those people on relief do not deserve to, must not be left unattended, especially now.

Whatever it may seem to cost, I don't get it. I would welcome a relief agent from Toronto to go my round and investigate.

My yearly income tax reports to Ottawa show my expenses, professional only, at from $5,000 to $6,000 a year. They are the same now.

Quite correctly you have assumed 25 cents a fair remuneration for mileage. This is commensurate with conditions where a car can be used. Herein you will find affixed a cartoon of the country physician. Now that has happened often to me, but for displacements it is worse yet, as we have to hire a team of horses

and driver whom we must pay 50 cents a mile one way (and it is very fair). You cannot allow us less than we actually pay.

There was a bad apostle among the twelve, and there must be an odd doctor who will forget himself sometimes, but our cases here are bona fide. Our neighbouring doctors are by rail 70 miles west, 92 miles east, 125 miles south (Timmins 60 miles southeast) and the north pole limit north. We cater to the municipalities of Cochrane, Glackmeyer, Fauquier, Moonbeam, besides the unorganized districts which comprise Frederick House, Hunta, Driftwood, Holland, Devonshire, Abitibi, Brower, Norembega, Genier, Clute, Gardiner, and a few others.

To fix an amount equitably for doctors' services one must take into consideration the situation as it arises in the district. There are no industries, no manufactures, no regular pay here, but what comes from the community. Nine-tenths of the settlers are on relief, and the other one-tenth has no money. This is a railway junction but the railway has its own doctor who is paid per capita.

I depend for living on the work I do, which is 95 per cent relief, requested by the relief officer, with the clear understanding of a 50 per cent usual fee.

If the minister wishes the name of the doctor I shall be glad to give it; I believe he knows him personally. I think that the health of our fine pioneer population is at present jeopardized, and that we cannot expect further sacrifice by the medical profession in the new sections of our country.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the attention that the house has given me. In closing I want to correct a statement which I believe has been prejudicial to our section of the country, made by a controller of the city of Ottawa a few days ago. I understand that controller visited some sections of northern Ontario and Quebec to see the progress made in the back to the land movement, and he came back here and made statements which I think are not fair to northern Ontario. In the first place, if he wanted to make a thorough investigation he should have gone to the north country when the snow was not on the ground, so that he could see the quality of the soil and the facilities we have to clear land. But he went there when the ground was covered with two or three feet of snow and then came back and said that no citizen of Ottawa should be sent to that country. I protest against that statement which cannot go unanswered. It is true that at present many of them are on relief, but I believe that with a proper policy of direction and assistance on the part of the federal and provincial authorities they will again know days of prosperity and comfort. As a representative of the new sections of Ontario I deny the statement made by the Ottawa controller, which was given much publicity, in the press of this city at any rate, because I state again that there is a future for agriculture in our northern country.

Before resuming my seat I voice the fervent wish that the federal and provincial governments will have a better follow-up system in connection with their back to the land operations. I am going to study the situation through that country all summer; I am going to spend most of my time among these new settlers to find out on the ground their requirements. I know that the great majority of those who have gone there have gone with the same spirit that animated our pioneer fathers. But again I repeat that the government will have to do more for those fine people than they have done in the past. I hope the matter will be given attention so that there may be no failure in the policy so well inaugurated two years ago, being certain that its success will prove most beneficial to the whole of Canada.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Morand in the chair.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 10 of the resolution, schedule III, articles exempt.

10. That schedule III to the said act, as enacted by chapter fifty-four of the statutes of 1932, be repealed and the following substituted as schedule III:—

Schedule III

Bread, not to include rolls, buns or similar goods, whether sweetened or not; flour, not including self-raising flour; animals living; live poultry; meats and poultry, fresh; meats salted or smoked; milk, including buttermilk; condensed milk, evaporated milk and powdered milk; cream; butter; cheese; lard, when produced in Canada; eggs; vegetables, fruits grains and seeds in their natural state; shorts; bran and middlings when for use as cattle, hog, poultry or other stock feed; alfalfa meal; oil cake, oil cake meal; grains mixed or crushed for cattle or poultry feed; hay; straw; hops, when produced in Canada; nursery stock; vegetable plants; other farm produce sold by the individual farmer of his own production; bees; honey; sugar; maple syrup; salt, when manufactured or produced in Canada; ice; fish and products thereof; ores of metals of all kinds; fuel other than in liquid form; gold and silver in ingots, blocks, bars, drops, sheets or plates unmanufactured; British and Canadian coin and foreign gold coin; logs and round unmanufactured timber; split fence posts; fence posts, railroad ties, pulpwood, tan bark, and other articles the product of the forest, when produced and sold by the individual settler or farmer; newspapers and quarterly, monthly, bi-monthly and semi-monthly magazines and weekly literary papers unbound; materials for use only in the construction, equipment and repair of ships; ships licensed to engage in the

Canadian coasting trade; radium; electricity; gas manufactured from coal, calcium carbide or oil for illuminating or heating purposes; artificial limbs, and parts thereof; artificial eyes; donations of clothing and books for charitable purposes; settlers' effects; war veterans' badges; memorials or monuments erected in memory of soldiers who fell in the great war; articles for the use of the governor general; articles imported for the personal or official use of the British High Commissioner, ministers of foreign countries, consuls general who are natives or citizens of the country they represent and who are not engaged in any other business or profession; bibles, missals, prayer books, psalm and hymn books, religious tracts, and Sunday school lesson pictures; manila fibre for use only in the manufacture of rope not exceeding one and one-half inches in circumference for the fisheries; boats bona fide purchased by individual fishermen for their own personal use in the fisheries; articles and materials used in the manufacture of boats bona fide built for individual fishermen for their own personal use in the fisheries; sinkers and floats including trawl kegs, when for use exclusively in the fisheries, not including these articles for sportsmen's purposes; fibre for use only in the manufacture of binder twine; fertilizers; dried beet pulp; manuscript; raw furs; wool not further prepared than washed; drain tiles for agricultural purposes; printed text-books authorized by the department of education of any province in Canada and phonograph records so authorized for instruction in the English and French language, and materials used exclusively in the manufacture or production thereof; insulin; calf, cattle, hog, fox or poultry feed; preparations or chemicals sold for disinfecting, dipping or spraying and so used in agriculture or horticulture, and materials for use exclusively in manufacture or production of such preparations; cream separators and parts thereof; cars and other similar appliances for use exclusively at a mine or a quarry for mining or quarrying; articles and materials to be used exclusively in the manufacture of cars and other similar appliances for use exclusively at a mine or a quarry for mining or quarrying; articles and materials to be used exclusively in the manufacture of cream separators and parts thereof; usual coverings to be used exclusively for covering goods not subject to the consumption or sales tax; materials to be used exclusively in the manufacture of usual coverings to be used for covering goods not subject to the consumption or sales tax.

Woollen rolls or wool yarn milled for a producer of wool from such wool supplied by him for his own use; cotton duck and cotton sail twine to be used only in the manufacture of equipment for ships or vessels; official stationery imported by His Majesty's trade commissioners in Canada from His Majesty's stationery office in England; crushed stone, produced or manufactured by any municipality exclusively for use in building or maintaining its roads or sidewalks, and not for sale, and sand, gravel, rubble and field stone; lasts for boots and shoes including rubber footwear and patterns and dies for boots and shoes including rubber footwear; apples, dried, desiccated or evaporated; articles and materials for the sole use of any bona fide public hospital certified to be such by the Department of National Health, when purchased in good faith for use exclusively by the said hospital and not for resale; preparations for use exclusively as gopher poison; bakers' cake and pies when produced by any one manufacturer or producer to the value of not more than three thousand dollars in any one calendar year.

[The Chairman.]

Goods Enumerated in Customs Tariff Items

40. Salt for use of the sea or gulf fisheries;

173. Books, embossed, and grooved cards for the blind; and books for the instruction of the deaf and dumb and blind; maps and charts for the use of schools for the blind;

175. Books not printed or reprinted in Canada, which are included and used as text-books in the curriculum of any university, college or school in Canada; books specially imported for the bona fide use of incorporated mechanics' institutes, public libraries, libraries of universities, colleges and schools, or for the library of any incorporated medical, law, literary, scientific, or art association or society, and being the property of the organized authorities of such library, and not in any case the property of individuals—the whole under regulations prescribed by the minister—provided that importers of books who have sold the same for the purpose mentioned in this item shall, upon proof of sale and delivery for such purpose, be entitled to a refund of any duty paid thereon;

209b. Nicotine sulphate;

281. Fire brick, containing not less than ninety per cent of silica; magnesite fire brick or chrome fire brick; other fire brick valued at not less than one hundred dollars per one thousand, rectangular shaped, the dimensions of each not to exceed one hundred and twenty-five cubic inches, for use exclusively in the construction or repair of a furnace, kiln or other equipment of a manufacturing establishment;

281a. Fire brick, n.o.p., for use exclusively in the construction or repair of a furnace, kiln or other equipment of a manufacturing establishment.

352a. Bells, when imported for use in churches only;

364. Diamond dust or bort and black diamonds, for borers;

406. Coil chain, coil chain links, including repair links, and chain shackles, of iron or steel;

409a. Milking machines and attachments therefor; centrifugal machines for testing butterfat, milk or cream; complete parts for all the foregoing;

409b. Cultivators, harrows, seed-drills, horse-rakes, horse-hoes, scufflers, manure spreaders, garden seeders, weeders, and complete parts of all the foregoing;

409c. Ploughs; farm, field, lawn or garden rollers; soil packers; complete parts of all the foregoing;

409d. Mowing machines, harvesters, either self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, harvesters in combination with threshing machine separators including the motive power incorporated therein, and complete parts of all the foregoing;

409e. (i) Spraying and dusting machines and attachments therefor; including hand sprayers; apparatus specially designed for sterilizing bulbs; pressure testing apparatus for determining maturity of fruit; pruning hooks; pruning shears, animal dehorning instruments; and complete parts of all the foregoing;

(ii) Fruit and vegetable grading, washing and wiping machines and complete parts therefor;

409f. Hay loaders, hay tedders, potato planters, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, ensilage cutters, grain crushers and grain or hay grinders for farm purposes only, post hole diggers, snaths, stumping machines and all other agricultural implements or agricultural machinery, n.o.p., and complete parts of all the foregoing;

409g. Incubators for hatching eggs, brooders for rearing young fowl, and complete parts of all the foregoing;

409i. Scythes, sickles, or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, pronged forks, rakes, n.o.p.;

Complete parts for goods enumerated in tariff item 409i;

409j. Fanning mills; peaviners; corn husking machines; threshing machine separators, including wind stackers; baggers, weighers and self-feeders therefor; complete parts of all the foregoing;

409k. Windmills and complete parts thereof, not including shafting;

409n. Portable engines with boilers, in combination, for farm purposes; horse powers and traction engines for farm purposes n.o.p.; and complete parts of all the foregoing;

410b. Machinery and apparatus for use exclusively in washing or dry cleaning coal at coal mines or coke plants; machinery and apparatus for use exclusively in producing coke and gas; machinery and apparatus for use exclusively in the distillation or recovery of products from coal tar or gas; and complete parts of all the foregoing, not to include motive power, tanks for gas, nor pipes and valves 10¾ inches or less in diameter;

411. Machinery for use in sawing lumber, up to but not including the operation of planing, and complete parts thereof, not to include motive power, when for use exclusively in sawmills (for the purpose of this item motive power is defined as equipment for driving the machinery of the sawmill);

411a. Machinery, logging cars, cranes, blocks and tackle, wire rope, but not including wire rope to be used for guy ropes or in braking logs going down grade, and complete parts of all the foregoing, for use exclusively in the operation of logging, such operation to include the removal of the log from stump to skidway, log dump or common or other carrier.

411b. Cylinder stave saws, wheel type stave jointers, crozing and champhering machinery, when for use exclusively in making staves;

439c. Farm wagons, farm sleds, logging wagons, logging sleds, and complete parts thereof;

440k. Engines and complete parts thereof, to be used exclusively in the propulsion of boats or in hoisting nets and lines used in such boats bona fide owned by individual fishermen for their own use in the fisheries, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

442. Articles which enter into the cost of manufacture of the goods enumerated in tariff items 409a, 409b, 409c, 409d, 409e, 409f, 409g, 409j, 409o, and 439c, when imported by manufacturers for use exclusively in the manufacture in their own factories of the goods enumerated in tariff items 409a, 409b, 409c, 409d, 409e, 409f, 409g, 409j, 409o, and 439c, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

442a. Notwithstanding the provisions of tariff item 442, materials or commodities as hereunder defined or described, when imported by manufacturers for use exclusively in the manufacture, in their own factories, of the goods enumerated in tariff items 409a, 409b, 409c, 409d, 409e, 409f, 409g, 409j, 409o, and 439c, under regulations prescribed by the minister:—

(1) Pig iron;

(2) Bars or rods, of iron or steel, hot rolled;

460. Materials to be used in Canada for the construction of bridges and tunnels crossing the boundary between the United States and Canada, when similar materials are admitted free under similar circumstances into the United States, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

464. Steel dies, of a class or kind not made in Canada, valued at not less than one thousand dollars each, for use exclusively in stamping metal sheets or metal plates: Provided that such dies shall be exported from Canada under customs supervision within three months from the date of import entry;

476. Surgical and dental instruments of any material; surgical needles; X-ray apparatus; surgical operating tables for use in hospitals; microscopes valued at not less than $50 each by retail; and complete parts of all the foregoing.

476a. Glassware and other scientific apparatus for laboratory work in public hospitals; apparatus for sterilizing purposes, including bedpan washers and sterilizers but not including washing or laundry machines; all for the use of any public hospital, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

480. Crutches or specially constructed staffs for cripples;

538. Binder twine or twine for harvest binders;

663b. Articles which enter into the cost of the manufacture of fertilizers, when imported for use exclusively in the manufacture of fertilizers;

666. Nitro-glycerine, giant powder, nitro and other explosives;

667. Blasting and mining powder;

682. Fish hooks, for deep-sea or lake fishing, not smaller in size than number 2·0; bank, cod, pollock and mackerel fish lines; and mackerel, herring, salmon, seal, seine, mullet, net and trawl twine in hanks or coil, barked or not—in variety of sizes and threads—including gilling thread in balls, and head ropes for fishing nets; marline, and net morsels of cotton, hemp or flax; and fishing nets or seines, and manilla rope, not exceeding one and one-half inches in circumference, when used exclusively for the fisheries, not to include hooks, lines, nets or ropes commonly used for sportsmen's purposes;

692. Coins, cabinets of; collections of medals and collections of postage stamps; medals of gold, silver or copper, and other metallic articles actually bestowed as trophies or prizes and received and accepted as honorary distinctions, and cups or other metallic prizes (not usual merchantable commodities), won in bona fide competitions;

695a. Paintings in oil or water colours, and pastels, valued at not less than twenty dollars each; paintings and sculptures by artists domiciled in Canada but residing temporarily abroad for purposes of study, under regulations by the minister;

696. Philosophical and scientific apparatus, utensils, instruments, and preparations, includ-

ing boxes and bottles containing the same; maps, photographic reproductions, casts as models, etchings, lithographic prints or charts; mechanical equipment of a class or kind not made in Canada. All articles in this item, when specially imported in good faith for the use and by the order of any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious philosophical, educational, scientific or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use and by order of any public hospital, college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in Canada, and not for sale, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

700. Animals and articles brought into Canada temporarily and for a period not exceeding three months, for the purpose of exhibition or of competition for prizes offered by any agricultural or other association: Provided a bond shall be first given in accordance with regulations prescribed by the minister, with the condition that the full duty to which such animals or articles would otherwise be liable shall be paid in case of their sale in Canada, or if not reexported within the time specified in such bond;

701. Menageries, horses, cattle, carriage and harness of, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

702. Carriages for travellers, and carriages laden with merchandise, not to include circus troupes or hawkers, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

703. Travellers' baggage, under regulations prescribed by the minister;

704. Apparel, wearing and other personal and household effects, not merchandise, of British subjects dying abroad, but domiciled in Canada; books, pictures, family plate or furniture, personal effects and heirlooms left by bequest;

Articles and materials to be used exclusively in the manufacture of goods enumerated in customs tariff items: 281, 281a, 391a, 406a, 406b, 409a, 409b, 409c, 409d, 409e, 409f, 409g, 409i, 409j, 409k, 409n, 410b, 411, 411a, 411b, 439c, 440k, 442, 442a, 476, 476a, 480, 538, 663, 663a, 663b, 666, 667, 696.

Materials, not to include plant equipment, consumed in process of manufacture or production, which enter directly into the cost of goods enumerated in customs tariff items: 281, 281a, 391a, 406a, 406b, 409a, 409b, 409c, 409d, 409e, 409f, 409g, 409i, 409j, 409k, 409n, 410b, 411, 411a, 411b, 439c, 440k, 442a, 476, 476a, 480, 538, 663, 663a, 666, 667, 696.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, before we proceed I want to take this earliest opportunity to refer to a difference of opinion between the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) and myself when the committee was in session yesterday, with respect to the total amount involved in the taxes imposed under the recent budget. Upon inquiry I find that my hon. friend was correct, and that I was in error. Perhaps I may be permitted to use language which is familiar to my hon. friend, "by way of confession and avoidance," that I was compelled suddenly to resort to my recollection, without the opportunity to refer to the actual figures. It serves only to illustrate the fact that on a spring evening after many weeks of arduous work during the session it does not do to trust to one's memory for figures. I feel that I owe it to my hon. friend as well as to myself that I should make this correction, and also for the purposes of accuracy of the record.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend will find in the record that when I corrected him last night I gave him credit for not attempting in any way to mislead the committee.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, clause 10, which includes a very long schedule of articles, refers to items which are exempt from the sales tax. The sales tax at the present time on certain articles is fixed at 6 per cent. Last year, if I remember correctly, in addition to the items enumerated on pages 12 and 13 of this resolution, another commodity that is commonly used in the household was not subject to sales tax, an article which is used by nearly every one in greater or less degree, and I am going to appeal to the Minister of Finance to have it included in this schedule of exemptions. Yesterday the minister gave certain reasons as to why it was necessary to impose a special tax of 2 cents per pound on sugar; in fact he has been giving those reasons for the last two or three days. I am not going to argue with the minister with regard to that tax, because I would be out of order and also because of the fact that last night the house passed on division that section of the proposals. But in view of the fact that a tax of 2 cents per pound is being collected from the people of this country, who have consumed sugar in much larger quantities in recent years, I appeal to the minister to exempt molasses from the tax. I remember that in my younger days molasses was used to a much greater extent than is the case at present, and I am very much afraid that as a result of this 2 cent tax on sugar the ordinary people in this country will have to use molasses to a greater extent once more. Even with the increased consumption of sugar molasses remained a household necessity. In going over my constituency and meeting the boys and girls of three, four, five and six years of age, especially between ten and eleven o'clock in the morning and four and five o'clock in the afternoon I find that nearly every child has a piece of bread covered with molasses. This makes a very palatable meal and promotes the health of the children.

Mr. MULLINS: Molasses and sulphur.

Mr. DUFF: In addition molasses is used largely by the fishermen and lumbermen together with beans and other articles of food.

I do not object particularly to the tax on sugar, but I suggest to the minister that in view of the fact that this tax will result in a greater use of molasses he should include molasses in schedule III, where it has been in previous years. This is the first time in a number of years that molasses has been subject to this tax, and I strongly urge upon the minister that after having imposed a tax of 2 cents on sugar he should not also tax the molasses which many people will be compelled to use in future.

Mr. RHODES: I have every sympathy with the viewpoint held by my hon. friend from Antigonish-Guysborough, but speaking solely from the point of view of revenue I may say that he weakens rather than strengthens his argument when he intimates that if there were no tax placed upon molasses the consumption would be increased, with the consumption of sugar becoming less. My hon. friend will recall that the object of the tax was to raise revenue, and it was felt that since sugar was taxed molasses should properly bear at least a small tax, not comparable in any degree with the tax applied to sugar. The sales tax, as applied to molasses, based as it is upon the wholesale price, would mean an additional cost of only 2½ cents per gallon, and I fancy that a gallon of molasses would last that young lad whom my hon. friend saw on the street with a slice of bread spread with molasses, for at least a year. Even at that, however, if it were possible to devise a regulation which would permit the use of molasses by the poorer families without payment of a tax, small though the tax might be, I should be entirely agreeable to that being done. Unfortunately, however, molasses is capable of being used and is used in manufacturing processes and in many ways other than for household table use, and there is no method of division by which we could make the tax apply in the one case and not in the other. I may tell my hon. friend that I have recognized for some time that the tax would be open to the objections voiced by the hon. gentleman, but having regard to the circumstances I have briefly outlined I do not see how it is possible, in justice to those who have to pay such a heavy tax on sugar, to afford an exemption in the case of molasses.

Mr. DUFF: I quite see the point raised by the minister, and if he were exempting from the operation of the sales tax every article of common consumption used in the country that argument would be good. It seems to me, however, that when he exempts a great many other articles, some of which do not seem so important as molasses, his argument is not so strong. Not satisfied with putting a tax on sugar, which is one sweet, he is also putting a tax on molasses. I suggest to the minister that if he must raise revenue by putting a 6 per cent sales tax on molasses surely that tax should apply also to phonograph records, prayer books, hymn books and a number of other articles included in the schedule. Surely molasses is much more important to the people of this country than even hymn books or prayer books. We can go to church and listen to someone else pray and sing. I have sat behind people in church who did not know one note from another; it would have been a great deal better if they had not opened their mouths, and the same thing applies sometimes in this chamber. So I think the minister's argument would be sound if the 6 per cent sales tax applied generally, but it does not. If the minister puts a sales tax on molasses while he leaves phonograph records, prayer books and other items free of that tax his argument does not hold water. I think he should give some consideration to my plea. I am not speaking simply to take up time; I know from my own experience that hundreds of thousands of gallons of molasses are used every year by the poorer people in this country, and I think the minister would be doing God's service if he added molasses to the list of exemptions.

Mr. RHODES: If molasses were used only for household consumption I would not hesitate a moment, but I would point out to my hon. friend that the bulk of the molasses used is not consumed in that manner. It is used very largely in manufacturing processes, and a common illustration is the manufacture of denatured alcohol for use in the radiators of automobiles as anti-freeze. If we could devise some method by means of which the tax might be imposed in the one case and not imposed in the other I should be very happy, but I believe that is not possible from an administrative point of view. Of course, it can be used in the manufacture of certain forms of confection like sweets and that sort of thing, and it would so greatly increase the disproportion in cost as between molasses and sugar as to defeat the purpose of the sugar tax. I will take into further consideration the representations made by my hon. friend, although, as I have already said, we did give the matter the most careful study in the first instance. However, if it is possible to reconsider it before the committee rises this will be

done, but I do not wish it to be understood that I give any undertaking in that respect. I do not think I can add anything to what I have already said except this. My hon. friend speaks about phonograph records; they are subject to the sales tax, the only exemption made being those used for educational purposes.

Mr. DUFF: The minister says he cannot exempt molasses because it is used for a great many purposes other than domestic consumption. But the same thing applies to flour; flour also is used in the manufacture of candy. Flour is exempt from the sales tax and if the minister is not going to exempt molasses for the reason he has given, then I suggest he should not exempt flour. I will leave the matter with him. I have made my plea as strongly as possible on behalf of the poor people of this country who are going to be called upon to pay 2 cents a pound on their sugar. They will have to use more molasses and I do think that they should be given some consideration. While I see the force of the minister's argument, that molasses is used for purposes other than domestic consumption, it seems to me that molasses when used by people for their tea or coffee should be exempt. I know that it is used in alcohol; I understand that you can make rum from molasses if you know how; and I do not object to the tax being imposed when the molasses is used for making candy. I agree that candy is a luxury in these times and is already taxed, but the ordinary householder is the person I am thinking of—the fishermen in the county of Richmond and in other parts of Canada as well as the lumbermen working for twenty dollars a month. They use molasses in their tea and I think that the officials of the department could devise some means whereby this very necessary commodity might be placed on the list of exemptions when used for certain purposes. In line 10 of schedule III reference is made to salt, which is exempt when manufactured or produced in Canada. We had some controversy over this last year, and perhaps the minister will say something about it. On page 13 reference is also made to salt—"Salt for use of the sea or gulf fisheries." That is exempt.

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: Why is it necessary to specify it in the other item? Why not simply say salt and leave out the words "when manufactured or produced in Canada?" The words "for use of the sea or gulf fisheries" should also be omitted. There is no necessity for the exemption to appear in both places when apparently the item is altogether free. As the minister knows, of course, I am in favour of abolishing the tax on salt.

Mr. RHODES: The explanation is that there are other forms of salt imported which are not used in the sea and gulf fisheries, and they are subject to the tax.

Mr. BRADETTE: The minister is right when he says that molasses is used in the manufacture of various articles, but he must bear in mind that it is graded. There is only one grade of molasses fit for human consumption, namely, the Barbados variety, which comes in in one hundred gallon puncheons or in other large containers—usually it comes in in one hundred gallon puncheons. The other grade of molasses is not fit for human food. It may be used in the manufacture of alcohol and other things and I think the department has power to distinguish between these grades and to tax accordingly. As my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) has said, molasses is used extensively in the mining and lumbering camps, and is a staple with most people in the province of Quebec. The minister will find that the per capita consumption of molasses is greater in that province than anywhere else in Canada. It ought to be a very simple matter for the department to ascertain just what is fit for human consumption and what is not, because there are only two grades known to the trade. Certainly I would make it as easy as possible for the people to obtain molasses used in the home.

Mr. NEILL: The minister says that he will consider this item, and I should be glad if at the same time he would give his attention to a minor aspect of it not touched upon by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough. I refer to cheap molasses used for cattle feed.

Mr. RHODES: That is exempt.

Mr. NEILL: Nowadays, when dairying is so much in the red, it is necessary to economize at every turn, and in British Columbia they have adopted a system of supplementing the more expensive feeds by the use of screenings, which must be made palatable by the addition of molasses. The lower grades of grain and hay, off colour, can also be made palatable in this way. The molasses used for this purpose is of a low grade that could not be used either in the manufacture of candy or for domestic purposes. I know that the minister has been approached by different dairy bodies, the dairymen's association of British Columbia, for one, and I would ask

him to consider very carefully their representations in this regard. There are two distinct grades, one of which I know is cheap. It could not be used for anything but cattle feed, and if the minister cannot give way in regard to molasses used for domestic purposes as a substitute for sugar, I am sure he could exempt this other grade of molasses without any loss to the treasury. Can he not see his way to exempt that grade?

Mr. RHODES: If my hon. friend will look at the sixteenth line on page thirteen he will find that calf, cattle, hog, fox and poultry feed are all exempt from the tax. Where the type of feed is not specified, the interpretation can be so broad, I am advised by the officials, as to include that low grade of molasses which is used for feed purposes. In fact, it is included.

Mr. NEILL: Even when brought in in bulk by itself, when not mixed?

Mr. RHODES: Yes. The administrative difficulty does not arise there as it does with molasses used for human consumption. It is therefore quite possible to classify it as tax-exempt under these provisions.

Mr. NEILL: Thank you.

Mr. REID: I notice the words "beet pulp." The Minister of National Revenue is present and I would direct his attention and also his colleague's to an important point in connection with this item. In the Fraser valley we have no beet sugar factory, but beets for sugar purposes are grown extensively and taken across the line for manufacture. The farmers are paid so much per ton for their beets plus the return of some of the beet pulp. That beet pulp is returned to them in part payment, but when it comes back the customs department imposes a duty of twenty per cent plus three per cent excise. On taking up this matter with the department I was informed that regulation 709 would apply. This regulation reads:

> Articles and other goods, the growth, produce or manufacture of Canada, returned to the exporter thereof after having been exported without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means;

When it was drawn to the attention of the department that the beet pulp being returned to Canada had not advanced in value or had not been improved in condition, the officials began immediately to scan the act in order to protect themselves, and so they found a clause under which they could impose the duty. This was clause 1 in regulation 709, which reads:

> All articles for which entry is claimed as returned goods must be returned within five years to the person by whom they were exported, and in the case of articles the produce or manufacture of Canada the property in such articles must have continued in the person by whom they were exported.

I might say that it is impossible for a farmer who has exported beets to state that the beet pulp being returned has been manufactured from the particular beets which he exported. When this regulation was put into effect I do not believe it was ever contemplated that the farmers should be taxed upon the beet pulp which was returned to them after being manufactured from beets which were exported. The committee which investigated the investigating of sugar from beets did not approve of the building of further factories at this time. If there was a factory in the Fraser valley it could well be said that the farmers could have their beets processed in this country, but they must send their beets across the line to be manufactured into sugar. I ask both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of National Revenue to consider seriously the allowing of free entry to beet pulp which has been manufactured from beets grown by Canadian farmers and exported from this country. The farmers receive this pulp as part payment for the beets which they export. This pulp now pays a twenty per cent duty plus a three per cent tax and there is some doubt whether or not the present sales tax will apply.

Mr. RHODES: The complaint of the hon. member for New Westminster has to do with customs administration and has no reference to the clause under consideration. Under the schedule now before us, dried beet pulp is specifically exempted from sales tax. I shall be happy to confer with my colleague the Minister of National Revenue upon the representations made by my hon. friend.

Mr. REID: There was no other item under which I could discuss this matter, and I took this opportunity as well as availing myself of the presence of the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. EULER: It is not my desire to revert again to the matter of the tax on sugar, but I note that while bread is still on the exempted list in connection with the sales tax, rolls, buns or similar goods produced by bakeries are not exempt. I suppose this classification would also include cakes. Why should these articles be subjected to a tax in

addition to that imposed on sugar? Cakes, buns and articles of the kind are used as food and a sales tax must be fairly difficult of collection. I should like to know just how much revenue is derived from the tax upon these articles. I think the minister should consider placing them upon the exempted list. I understand that representations have been made and I believe that these people have a good case to offer. Has the minister any intention of acceding to their request?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I have received requests similar to those referred to by the hon. member for North Waterloo, and I should like to know just what the government intends to do in this connection. Could the minister give us any idea as to how much money he expects to receive from the tax upon the articles mentioned?

Mr. RHODES: The subject raised by the hon. member for North Waterloo and referred to by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay is by no means an unimportant one. I think there have been more representations made in connection with this one matter than have been made in connection with any other dozen articles in the list. In the first place, I might tell my hon. friends that it is not a minor item so far as revenue is concerned. We receive about $600,000 per year, the great bulk of which is received from the large bakeries. Collection is free from difficulty and is made without friction. The difficulty which does arise is encountered in the case of the small bakeries. These men are in the same unfortunate position as many other small shop-keepers in the country. That is not only true to-day but it was true when times were more prosperous. The small baker who has to face the competition of new merchandising methods is the one who complains most bitterly against the sales tax on cakes and pies but it would be a manifestly unfair form of competition to exempt him to a greater extent than the heavy taxpayer. Last year the man whose business did not exceed $5,000 per year was exempted, and it was found that this exemption created a very unfair situation as regards those who were paying the tax. As business became restricted in the regular bakeries, many hands were laid off. Many of these men started up a business of their own and became keen competitors with the regular manufacturers who were heavy taxpayers and large employers of labour. This year the exemption has been lowered from $5,000 to $3,000 in an endeavour to prevent a good deal of this unfair competition. I refer to competition only from the point of view of revenue. Even though we were in a position to forego the receipt of a revenue of $600,000 per year, the matter would not stop there. In justice we could not exempt cakes and pies and impose a tax upon biscuits, cookies and other forms of confectionery. The tax upon these other articles brings in a revenue of $750,000. When we consider the sales tax as it is applied to cakes and pies, we are really dealing with a revenue—not in prospect but actually existing even under to-day's conditions—amounting to $1,350,000. That is a considerable item. I may say that I have had no deputation representative of those small bakers. I sympathize with them very keenly, but their difficulty is not the sales tax. It is one which is common to the small merchant and which has been increasing in recent years because of new methods of merchandising. Even if the sales tax were removed entirely, they would still do business subject to the same difficulties. I imagine we would find just as much flux and change in the case of small bakeshops under the old condition as we would under the new one where the sales tax obtains. If it were not for the need for revenue and for the large figures involved, this would be one of the first taxes I would wish to see removed, but in the circumstances and having regard to our necessity for revenue, I do not see how we can very well do away with it.

Mr. EULER: I do not desire to prolong the argument, but I should like again to impress upon the minister the very thing which he has admitted, that is that the situation as regards these small bakers is very difficult, even for those whose annual output is above $3,000. What makes the situation more difficult is the fact that the minister is imposing a very heavy tax on sugar which also enters into their costs. It is almost impossible for those people to add the additional cost to the value of their product. In that particular line of business there are standard prices and it is difficult in the case of buns, cakes and so on to charge the consuming public an increase in price commensurate with the increase in cost as a result of the tax on sugar and on their products. In view of the fact that the minister has imposed a tax on sugar, the fact that these people have particular difficulties now and the additional fact, which I think is of extreme importance, that these are articles of food and we should tax them as little as possible, I urge upon my hon. friend to consider doing something by way of relief for these people.

Mr. COOTE: There is a little difficulty in hearing some of the conversation carried on between the minister and the hon. member for North Waterloo, and perhaps for the benefit of hon. members who may have just come in, the minister might explain why rolls, buns and similar goods are not exempted from the sales tax. In the last line or two of schedule III, it reads:

Bakers' cake and pies when produced by any one manufacturer or producer to the value of not more than $3,000 in any one calendar year.

These are exempt. Do I understand from that that rolls, buns or similar goods if made by a producer where the value of such production does not exceed $3,000 in a year, would be subject to a tax, but pies and cake would not be?

Mr. RHODES: No; if produced by a baker whose annual production is under $3,000 a year, none of those commodities would be subject to tax.

Mr. COOTE: Not even the rolls or buns?

Mr. RHODES: No, because they are classed as cakes or pies.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I should like to inquire of the minister the reason for amending the section and enumerating the exempted list, while leaving out of consideration altogether, except that he has been good enough to furnish us with a list, the goods removed from the exempted list and now taxable. That is one question. The other is this: Are there any additions to the exempted list that prevailed last year? I apparently cannot get that information.

Mr. RHODES: Will my hon. friend look at the bottom of page 4 of the typewritten copy which I gave to the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth? Perhaps he has it before him.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I have it in my hand.

Mr. RHODES: He will see there:

Complete parts for goods enumerated in tariff item 409i.

That is scythes, sickles or reaping hooks, hay or straw knives, edging knives, hoes, pronged forks, rakes, n.o.p. These are added to the exempted list; they are not taxable.

460. Materials to be used in Canada for the construction of bridges and tunnels crossing the boundary between the United States and Canada, when similar materials are admitted free under similar circumstances into the United States, under regulations prescribed by the minister.

That provision is included by reason of international arrangement. Those are the only two which are added to the list.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There is a considerable reduction in the exempted list. By the courtesy of the minister we have been furnished with the list of goods now taxable. The complaint I wish to register is one similar to that which has been so prevalent against the sugar tax. I have not said a word against it, but I wish to register my complaint about taking from the exempted list so many articles of food. I shall not raise so much complaint about the steel, piping and all the rest of it, although I notice shovels and forks now come under the taxable list. My objection is chiefly in regard to food used by every householder in the country. I suppose the minister's answer will be that he must have revenue. I am not going to take time this afternoon to point out where he may obtain that, because that question has been dealt with by other hon. members on this side in connection with the discussion on the sugar tax. I wish merely to supplement, if I may, the suggestion made by the hon. member for North Waterloo that the minister might very well forego the bonusing of some thirteen articles which, if I remember correctly, the minister stated might involve a charge on the revenue of from $6,000,000 to $10,000,000. As one of those who do not believe in protection but who thoroughly believe in a tariff for revenue, I also am not in favour of bonusing. I know of no reason for granting that bonus other than for the purpose of furnishing some relief to those who are perhaps taxed so heavily, by way of tariffs, on their purchases. That, however, is by the way. What I am protesting against is this: In the list furnished by the minister, we find flour, oatmeal, rolled oats, corn meal and practically all breakfast foods if the packages are five pounds or over. As the question of molasses has been discussed, I shall not say anything about that. Then I find "fuel in liquid form." I presume that means fuel oil?

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That already bears a tax recently imposed in Ontario and this will be an additional tax.

Mr. RHODES: There is no tax in Ontario.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There must be something wrong, because I have been buying fuel oil and I have had to pay the tax. It was added to my last two bills for fuel oil in Ottawa.

Mr. RHODES: That was this tax.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, it is a tax by Ontario, supplemental, I imagine, to the tax on gasoline. However, I am not going to complain about that, because if we

wish to have the luxury of using fuel oil we must pay for it. But I must object to the tax on food. Sago and tapioca are two very important items. Then we turn to the list where one-half the tax is imposed, or only three per cent, on such articles as boots and shoes, including rubber footwear. These are taxes which I believe the minister might very well have left alone. Then, there are several other items of canned vegetables, such as "vegetables, prepared; beans, baked or otherwise prepared; corn and tomatoes." These are foods used by the ordinary citizen. Instead of being taxed at only half the rate, as formerly, they are placed under the full rate. The list so dealt with is formidable. I should like to know from the minister if he would be good enough to have the list of articles printed in order that we may have it before us for ready reference. I am very grateful to him for what he has already done, but in order that we may know exactly what commodities are removed from the free list, particularly articles of food, and placed under the sales tax regulations, we should have the information before us. Again I protest vigorously against the tax on foodstuffs.

Mr. RHODES: The merit which may be attached to the principle underlying the stabilization fund, is one matter. I believe a discussion of that principle at this moment would not be advantageous. I mention the matter only in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Edmonton. Whether it be good or bad, such funds as may be necessary in consequence of its establishment are not taken out of revenue. They come out of unemployment relief funds. Although it may not be an important point, for the purpose of accuracy I believe I am justified in making the statement.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I believe I have not understood the minister.

Mr. RHODES: Any money which is expended under the stabilization fund comes out of the unemployment relief vote, and not out of current revenue. Then, with reference to the list of commodities which have been taken out of the free list, the fact is that with a few unimportant exceptions most of the commodities were taxed up to and including the year 1926. Speaking from the standpoint of revenue, conditions to-day are far more necessitous than they were at that time. I make this reference to show that in this form of taxation we are not breaking new ground. Further, I could give a list of rather important commodities which were taxed in 1926, but which even under the necessitous conditions of to-day are not being taxed under the present proposals.

The request that a list be printed is in my judgment most reasonable, and I shall endeavour to see that some convenient form is arranged which will enable hon. gentlemen to have possession of the facts.

Mr. RALSTON: With the consent of the committee would it not serve the purpose if that information were inserted at this time in Hansard, without reading it. It would become part of the minister's budget speech.

Mr. RHODES: Is the hon. member referring to the list I have in my hand?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. RHODES: If the committee is prepared to give unanimous consent, I shall give the file to Hansard. As a matter of strict procedure, however, I believe it is not competent for the committee to do so.

Mr. RALSTON: It may be put in as part of the budget.

Mr. RHODES: However, if the committee would give unanimous consent I am content that the list should be printed in Hansard. Perhaps this would be a good time to do so, because Wednesday is a short day, and we would not be unduly encumbering the record.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

1933 BUDGET

Résumé of Changes in Sales and Excise Taxes

The following goods, formerly exempt from tax, now taxable at the full rate in force:

Self-raising flour, oatmeal, rolled oats, cornmeal and rolled wheat, when in packages exceeding five pounds each in weight; buckwheat meal and pea meal; pearl barley; split peas; barley meal; pot barley; rice, cleaned; macaroni and vermicelli; bran and middlings when sold for human consumption in packages exceeding five pounds each in weight;

Molasses; corn syrup; sugar cane syrup;

Fuel in liquid form;

Calcium carbide;

Carbolic or heavy oil, to be used only in creosotoing logs and round unmanufactured timber;

Materials, not to include plant equipment, consumed in process of manufacture or production, which enter directly into the cost of goods subject to the consumption or sales tax, manufactured or produced by a licensed manufacturer or producer;

Articles and materials, not to include permanent equipment, which enter into the cost of manufacture or production of goods manufactured or produced by a licensed manufacturer or producer;

Wrought, seamless or lap-welded iron or steel tubing, less than four inches in diameter,

threaded and coupled, or not, when used only in oil wells, and materials used in the manufacture of such tubing;

Machinery and apparatus used only in the pumping of crude oil out of wells, and articles and materials used in the manufacture of such machinery or apparatus;

Goods enumerated in customs tariff items:

64. Sago and tapioca;

*219a. Non-alcoholic preparations or chemicals for disinfecting, dipping or spraying, n.o.p.;

*219c. Non-alcoholic preparations or chemicals, such as are used for disinfecting, dipping or spraying, when in packages not exceeding three pounds each, in weight;

Dry preparations used for the same purposes as goods enumerated in items 219a and 219c;

391a. Castings, of iron or steel: being ingot moulds for use in the production of steel;

409o. Equipment for generating electric power for farm purposes only, viz: engine, gas tank, generator, storage battery and switchboard; and complete parts of all the foregoing;

410c. Machinery and apparatus and complete parts thereof for use exclusively in producing unrefined oil from shales, not to include motive power, of a class or kind not made in Canada;

410d. Well-drilling machinery and apparatus, and complete parts thereof, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and seamless iron or steel tubing over eight inches in diameter, for use exclusively in drilling for water, natural gas or oil, and in prospecting for minerals, but not to include motive power; including goods enumerated in this item of a class or kind made in Canada;

410e. Well-drilling machinery and apparatus and complete parts thereof, and rope twenty-one hundred feet and over in length, capable of drilling wells of two thousand feet and over in depth, of four inches and over in diameter, and of raising and lowering casing over four inches in diameter for such wells, for use exclusively in drilling for water, natural gas and oil, and in prospecting for minerals, not to include motive power;

410f. Machinery and appliances of iron or steel, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and elevators, and machinery of floating dredges, for use exclusively in alluvial gold mining;

410g. Articles for use exclusively in the metallurgy or smelting of iron, viz.: machinery and apparatus for sintering or nodulizing iron ore, concentrated or not, or flue dust; machinery and apparatus for use exclusively in the construction, equipment and repairs of blast furnaces for smelting iron ore, such machinery and apparatus to include hot blast stoves and burners, blast piping and valves connecting the blowing engines with the furnace, scale cars, charging and hoisting apparatus, blast furnace gas piping, cleaners and washers; and integral parts of all the foregoing, but not to include wrought iron pipe or valves 10½ inches and under in diameter, nor structural iron work;

410k. Machinery and apparatus, of a class or kind not made in Canada, for use exclusively in handling ore and other materials to be charged into the blast furnace, from the dock, car or stock pile, at the smelting works;

410l. Ore crushers, rock crushers, stamp mills grinding mills, rock drills, percussion coal cutters, coal augers, rotary coal drills, n.o.p., and complete parts of all the foregoing, for use exclusively in mining, metallurgical or quarrying operations;

410m. Diamond drills and core drills, not including motive power, and electrically operated rotary coal drills, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and integral parts of the foregoing, for use exclusively in mining operations;

410n. Diamond drills and core drills, not including motive power, and electrically operated rotary coal drills, n.o.p., and integral parts of the foregoing, for use exclusively in mining operations;

410o. Coal cutting machines, n.o.p.; coal heading machines; electric or magnetic machines for concentrating or separating iron ores; automatic scales for use with conveyors; and integral parts of all the foregoing, for use exclusively in mining or metallurgical operations;

410p. Sundry articles of metal as follows, for use exclusively in mining and metallurgical operations, viz.: furnaces for the smelting of ores; converting apparatus for metallurgical processes in metals; machinery for the extraction of precious metals by the chlorination or cyanide processes, not to include pumps, vacuum pumps or compressors; blast furnace blowing engines for the production of pig iron; and integral parts of all the foregoing;

410q. Pumps and vacuum pumps, and complete parts thereof, for use exclusively in the extraction of precious metals by the chlorination or cyanide processes;

410s. Amalgam safes; automatic ore samplers; automatic feeders; retorts; mercury pumps; pyrometers; bullion furnaces, amalgam cleaners; and integral parts of all the foregoing, for use exclusively in mining or metallurgical operations;

410z Machinery and apparatus, n.o.p., and complete parts thereof, for the recovery of solid or liquid particles from flue or other waste gases at metallurgical or industrial plants, not to include motive power, tanks for gas, nor pipes and valves 10½ inches or less in diameter;

431. Shovels and spades, of iron or steel, n.o.p.;

431a. Axes;

439d. Freight wagons, drays, sleighs, n.o.p., and complete parts thereof;

1017. Lap-welded tubing of iron or steel, not less than four inches in diameter, threaded and coupled or not, when used in casing water, oil and natural gas wells, or for the transmission of natural gas under high pressure from gas wells to points of distribution;

UNENUMERATED

Iron or steel pipe, not butt or lap-welded, and wirebound wooden pipe, not less than thirty inches in internal diameter, for use in alluvial gold mining; including articles and materials used exclusively or consumed in the manufacture of the said pipe.

Articles and materials to be used exclusively in the manufacture of goods enumerated in customs tariff items:

219a, 219c.—Dry preparations used for the same purposes as goods enumerated in items 219a and 219c, 391a, 409o, 410d, including goods enumerated in this item of a class or kind made in Canada; 410e, 410f, 410g, 410k, 410l,

* See under "Unenumerated" next column for changed item.

410m, 410n, 410o, 410p, 410q, 410s, 410z, 431, 431a, 439d, tubing enumerated in customs tariff item 1017.

Materials, not to include plant equipment, consumed in process of manufacture or production, which enter directly into the cost of goods enumerated in customs tariff items:

391a. 409o, 410d, including goods enumerated in this item of a class or kind made in Canada, 410e, 410f, 410g, 410k, 410l, 410m, 410n, 410o, 410p, 410q, 410s, 410z, 431, 431a, 439d, tubing enumerated in customs tariff item 1017.

The following goods, formerly taxable at the half rate, now taxable at the full rate in force:

Schedule IV

Boots and shoes, including rubber footwear;
Creosoted railroad ties;
Printing paper for use exclusively in producing newspapers and quarterly, monthly, bimonthly and semi-monthly magazines, weekly literary papers unbound, bibles, missals, prayer books, psalm and hymn books, religious tracts and Sunday School lesson pictures;
Moist mince meat;
Yeast.

The goods enumerated in customs tariff items as follows, when produced or manufactured in Canada:

89. Vegetables, prepared, in air-tight cans or other airtight containers;
(a) Beans, baked or otherwise prepared;
(b) Corn and tomatoes;
(c) Peas;
(d) N.O.P.
90. Vegetables, prepared or preserved;
(d) Pastes, hash and all similar products, composed of vegetables and meat or fish, or both, n.o.p.;
105. Fruit pulp, with sugar or not, n.o.p., and fruits, crushed or frozen;
105d. Jellies, jams, marmalades, preserves, fruit butters and condensed mince meats;
106. Fruits, prepared, in air-tight cans or other air-tight containers;
(a) Apricots, peaches and pears;
(b) Pineapples;
(c) N.O.P.

The following goods, formerly taxable at the full rate, now exempt from sales tax:

Complete parts for goods enumerated in tariff item 409i;

460. Materials to be used in Canada for the construction of bridges and tunnels crossing the boundary between United States and Canada, when similar materials are admitted free under similar circumstances into the United States, under regulations prescribed by the minister.

The following goods were formerly exempt under customs tariff items 219a and 219c and dry preparations used for the same purposes; the exemption is altered to read as follows:

Preparations or chemicals sold for disinfecting, dipping or spraying and so used in agriculture or horticulture and materials for use exclusively in manufacture or production of such preparations.

The following goods were formerly exempt under tariff items 410m and 410n, now specifically exempt:

364. Diamond dust or bort and black diamonds, for borers.

[Mr. Rhodes.]

The exemption for bakers has been reduced from five thousand dollars ($5,000) per annum to three thousand dollars ($3,000) per annum.

Special Excise Tax

The following goods are added to the list of exemptions from the special excise tax on importations:

Schedule V

Bibles;
Fertilizers;
Goods enumerated in customs tariff items 173, 364 and 460.

Mr. COOTE: What is contained in the list?

Mr. RHODES: It contains a résumé of the changes made in the sales tax, with respect to the budget.

Mr. NEILL: The minister mentioned something about the stabilization fund. It seems to me desirable that there should be some opportunity to discuss this matter. As the payments are going to be made out of relief moneys, it appears to me that unless the minister is kind enough to provide an opportunity, we will not have one.

Mr. RHODES: After we have concluded our several items in committee, and just before reporting, I should be perfectly content if by unanimous consent there should be a discussion in committee of the stabilization fund. In response to a word the right hon. leader of the opposition had with me to-day I made the suggestion that we might move the house into committee on Monday or Tuesday, thereby affording an opportunity. However, I agree with the view taken by the right hon. gentleman that perhaps we could have a better discussion in committee, when we would not be confined to a single speech. If that arrangement suits other hon. members I am content that such procedure should be followed.

Mr. NEILL: Thank you.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I wish to revert to the matter which has been raised by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). As hon. members may recall, the sales tax was discussed last year. If I remember correctly, the movement was initiated from a complaint made by the biscuit makers, who had been taxed three per cent. The cake and pie makers were not taxed. For that reason the biscuit makers felt they had suffered an injustice. A complaint was made, and as a result the whole matter came under consideration. To the chagrin of the biscuit makers, instead of the tax remaining at three

per cent it was raised to six per cent. They are to-day feeling the pinch, the same as other manufacturers.

The minister has said that the greater part of the tax is paid by the larger manufacturers. Since Friday I have been approached by representatives from the three largest baking concerns in Toronto. They state that although they have paid the tax and have not made any objection that, as a matter of fact, it has not come out of earnings but, as one put it, has come out of capital account. As the other one said, "It is simply adding to our deficits, so that it is not coming out of earnings at all." While not objecting, the firms are paying the tax, and as a result a very large amount of money has been received by the treasury. They complain, however, that for their type of industry the tax is altogether too high. I believe they are correct. It is only necessary for us to follow the annual statements made by large bakery concerns in recent weeks or months to learn that in the majority of cases dividends have been passed not only on common stocks, but on preferred stocks and in some cases on debentures. That will show the condition of the baking industry. These men say that a tax of six per cent on the finished product is altogether too high, and the industry cannot stand it. I asked what their remedy would be, and I find it is the same as that put forward by smaller bakeries to which the Minister of Finance referred, that is that the tax should be placed upon the ingredients that are now taxable and not upon the finished product.

Now the industry to-day is not in good condition. These bakers tell me, not only the large ones but the small ones, that their greatest competition is that of the housewife who is doing her own baking. That is competition that they cannot possibly meet, it is a matter of necessity with these people, and that is where the great competition is. These small bakers are complaining that they are being forced into bankruptcy right and left. The larger bakers are finding difficulty. All that has been done this year by way of remedy as far as I can see—and it is not a remedy; I do not say that in any disrespect to the minister—is to add to the number who now pay the tax. Heretofore it was confined to those having a turnover of more than $5,000 a year; now that figure is reduced to $3,000. Those who under the new legislation enjoy exemption from the six per cent tax on ingredients are those who have a turnover of less than $3,000 a year; and two other classes concerned in the baking industry, namely the hotels who do their own baking of cakes and pastry, and the restaurants doing the same thing. They pay not on the finished product but simply on the taxable ingredients. The large bakers say they suffer from that competition and that it is an injustice to them. I have made strong representations to the minister, as strong as I could. I feel yet that he might give the question further consideration and grant to these bakers what they ask. They suggest that the government put the tax on the ingredients, that is ingredients now taxed, and if the government want to add to that list, say powdered milk or frozen eggs that enter into the manufacture of these products, they say the government would not only get all the revenue chargeable but would get it without cost and without irritation. At the present time the collection of this tax is causing a great deal of irritation among the baking fraternity. It seems unfair that that class should be unnecessarily irritated over a tax that they cannot possibly pay, because it is not coming out of revenue, it is coming out of capital or, as one individual said, it is adding to our deficit yearly. In the city of Toronto many of these smaller bakers are finding it impossible to pay this tax, large amounts of arrears have accumulated against them, and the department have found it necessary to give them some leeway. I have no doubt the minister knows it, at any rate it is true that they are accepting small weekly or monthly payments as the revenue of the concerns makes it possible to pay. In many cases even these instalments are not being paid. I know that one of the large concerns in Toronto is not paying the tax to-day because it cannot, yet it is threatened with action or penalty under the act. That is, action is taken in the exchequer court, judgment is filed against the firm and the sheriff put in if necessary. But I must give this credit to the Minister of National Revenue, that he has not pursued that course to the limit. He is extending leniency as I have just suggested, taking weekly or monthly payments.

I think the proper method would be to place that tax upon the ingredients. The department would get every cent of it because it would be collected at the source, everyone would pay, the housewife would pay, the bootlegger in the trade would pay, and it would not be necessary to have so many agents of the department out trying to collect the tax. I appeal to the minister to make a concession to these men. On Saturday they came to me in all earnestness and wanted to know

whether the minister would give them a further appointment that they might discuss it with him again. I said I did not think it would be much use, that the representations had been made. But if the minister thinks his mind might be changed in that regard I would like him to give these men an opportunity to make the representation, because they feel that it is a great burden that they cannot possibly carry.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, I try to exercise the virtue of patience. I have had three if not four deputations, taking a considerable time, presenting the views of the bakers of cakes and pies, and I can assure my hon. friend from Toronto-High Park (Mr. Anderson)—who has been most persistent in this matter; he has followed it up almost daily in the interests of those whom he seeks to serve,—that I can see no useful purpose in repeating ad nauseam representations which have already been made time and time again, especially by these very gentlemen in question. Of course if necessary and if time permits I will do the best I can to allow them to rake over the same straw they have raked over on previous occasions.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Can they not pass it on to the consumer?

Mr. RHODES: I do not know that there is much that I can add to what was previously said in response to the query put to me in the first instance I think by my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), except to say this, and I say it with all respect to my hon. friend from Toronto-High Park and to the bakers, that when they say, put the tax upon the ingredients, they are just begging the question. The ingredients, now taxable, that go into cakes and pies are currants, raisins, peel, baking powder, flavourings, jams and yeast at the half rate. They represent a trivial fraction of the revenue which is involved in the sales tax. Of course if they say, tax all the ingredients, it means that they would like to put the sales tax on flour, salt, sugar, lard, eggs, milk, etc. We can fancy how popular that would be with the people. So I say to my hon. friend with all respect, and without desiring to say anything to which exception can be taken, that the suggestion to tax the ingredients in lieu of sales tax on these articles is simply begging the question.

I am advised by the Department of National Revenue that some of these small bakers are in arrears. But the sheriff has not been put in; they are being given reasonable latitude to enable them to pay their tax. I repeat briefly what I said a moment ago, that if this sales tax were removed to-morrow the small baker, as the small shopkeeper, would have the same difficulties they have now in conducting business in competition with the chain stores and the big establishments that have arisen in recent years. Their difficulties do not arise out of the sales tax.

Then my hon. friend says with respect to some of the larger manufacturers, who are paying their sales tax, many of them without complaint, that it is either a case of adding to their deficit or taking it from their capital. I may say that that is one of the regrettable features of taxation in many cases to-day. We are imposing income tax this year, as we have other years, not upon the income which the man receives in 1933, but the income which he had in 1932, and has spent. That income tax is being taken from people who to-day have not one cent of income. In one instance I was advised by letter that a man had to borrow the money by mortgaging his house. He may or may not have told the truth, but I know there are some extreme cases. I may say to my hon. friend that I have myself had the experience of paying income tax in one year on an income that had vanished, and I was obliged to go to the bank to borrow the money to enable me to pay the tax. But that experience is not new or unusual. If we could devise a form of taxation which could be applied by means of some instrument which we could place upon a man's head and by means of which we could tell exactly how much taxation he could pay, that might be an ideal method, but we cannot do that; we have to lay down taxation principles along some general lines, and the best designed form of taxation will cause hardship in individual cases; there is no question of that.

Then my hon. friend said he hoped we would reconsider this matter. I would give him the same reply I gave the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough, who made a plea with regard to the sales tax on molasses. Without giving any undertaking I am quite content that the matter should be thought over further, but the committee will bear in mind that it involves no less than $1,350,000 of revenue, based upon the business of last year, which is a very considerable item.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Before the minister sits down may I ask him how it happens that these gentlemen are so generous that they make it a charge against their business? They have the privilege that is exercised by everyone else of passing it on to the consumer. Surely the competition of the

housewife does not prevent them from doing that. I am rather glad to see an instance of this kind; it is the first that has come to my notice.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): In reply to that very suggestion may I say that the bakers tried that. The Consolidated Bakery Company tried it, but it only lasted a week; it could not be done.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): For what reason?

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): I would ask the minister what was the reason for exempting the hotels and restaurants, who pay only on the ingredients. Why are they exempted? We have many large hotels such as the Chateau Laurier and the Royal York who do their own baking, and the bakers want to know why they should be exempted when the men who do nothing but baking are taxed.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The bakers want a monopoly of the business.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): No, they want to be on the same basis as the hotels and restaurants.

Mr. RHODES: I can hardly give a complete answer to my hon. friend at the moment, but I think the answer in a general way is comparatively simple. The hotel is not in competition with the baker; it cooks for its patrons. That is a recognized matter of hotel practice. I do not know that any other answer is necessary; they are not merchandizing cakes and pies, as are the bakers. You might as well say that we should walk into a house where the housewife is baking and apply the sales tax to the cake or pie in the oven.

Mr. ANDERSON (High Park): She is paying on the ingredients.

Mr. RHODES: And so is the hotel. That is a mere bagatelle.

Mr. COOTE: I have been much impressed with the statements of the Minister of Finance and I think we all should have a good deal of sympathy with him because of the deputations which he must receive in protest against these taxes. But the minister has brought it on himself.

Mr. RHODES: I am not complaining.

Mr. COOTE: I heartily agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for West Edmonton; I protest against the sugar tax and against the inclusion of all these articles under the sales tax. I want to point out to the minister what I think is a fact, that if he devoted his time and thought to the question of raising price levels in this country he could balance the budget without these drastic increases in taxation. I know some hon. members do not agree with that idea, but may I point again to the fact that Australia, which two years ago was in a worse position than Canada, balanced her budget largely through the rise in price levels. In Canada the commodity price level has dropped from 80 to 63 in the last two years, but in Australia it has remained at 80, and as a result the government of Australia is collecting more revenue, in proportion, than the government of Canada is collecting.

If the Minister of Finance will look back at the budget of 1928 he will find that the money collected that year would completely balance the budget this year, including the Canadian National deficit, the expenditures on unemployment relief and the advances to the provinces. If we could get back to anything like the 1928 price level the Canadian National deficit would not be so great, because there would be more traffic and the receipts would be greater and the expenditures for unemployment relief would not be so large, because the greater amount of money in circulation would provide more employment. I seriously recommend this suggestion to the Minister of Finance, and I hope that during the coming year he will give his attention to the problem of raising price levels. He can do it by means of a different money policy, and then we will be able to get rid of many of these taxes of which I am sure he does not approve.

One of the great difficulties in connection with a tax like that on sugar, as an illustration—and I hope I may be pardoned for referring to it because twice while it was under consideration I tried to make some remarks but did not have an opportunity to do so—is that the tax is proposed by men who do not realize what it may mean to the average family. I am sure the Minister of Finance and some of his officials do not realize that, because it is such a small item in their expenditure. To many thousands of families in Canada, however, it simply means that they will not be able to buy all the sugar they really need. Last year many families gathered wild fruit and put it down without sugar, hoping that when they came to use it they would be able to buy sugar. With the money they have at their disposal now they can buy only perhaps sixty per cent of the sugar they could have bought if this tax had not been imposed. I know this seems a small matter to many hon. members, and they get

impatient when others protest, but I want to repeat that to thousands of families it means that they will not be able to purchase all the sugar they really should have. I say again that one trouble is that these taxes are imposed by men who do not realize what will be the effect on many consumers throughout Canada. I think it is absolute folly to impose a tax on buns, on self-rising flour and similar articles. Let us raise the general price level in Canada by 25 per cent; then we will be able to wipe out all the extra taxes imposed this year and the budget will be in much better shape than it is at present. I do not want to labour the point, but I think the minister would be far better employed if he devoted his time and attention to that question instead of bothering with such trivial matters as a tax on buns, self-rising flour, cakes and pies, cigarette papers and so on.

Before I sit down I should like to ask the minister a question in regard to the limitation of this tax to those producing goods to the value of more than $3,000 in a year. In deciding that question of production will the $3,000 include bread, in the case of big bakeries, or will that amount include only cakes, buns, pies and so on?

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend said that if we had the 1928 price levels we would not require these new taxes, and that we would have a surplus. I hope he will think me neither facetious nor disrespectful if I say to him that the reply made on one celebrated occasion is, I think, strictly in point; I refer to that of the Irishman, who said that if he had the lakes of Killarney in Hades he could sell them for a shilling a glass. It is idle to say, "If we had the price levels of 1928." That is obvious, and if my hon. friend is serious when he suggests to me that I had better address myself to the raising of price levels, I thank him deeply for the compliment because, if I could do that, I should be worthy of a place in history along with Atlas. I say that in the kindliest spirit and without the slightest intention of making a remark to which the hon. gentleman could take exception. I submit, however, that the reply is absolutely in keeping with the nature of the suggestion. I must take exception not only to what my hon. friend has said but to his attitude in saying it. He says that the men who make up these taxes do not realize what taxes mean. I do not know whether he thinks that we dwell in a world apart. I had the idea that I occupied a common Canadian citizenship along with other members of the house.

[Mr. Coote.]

Mr. COOTE: Will the minister permit me to correct him? I was referring to the thousands of families who have to pay the tax.

Mr. RHODES: I will not yield to my hon. friend from Macleod in asserting my sympathy with the people. I say to him that my human sympathies, my desire to be of service to the people of Canada, my knowledge of conditions in Canada and of the homes and lives of the people are just as complete as his own.

Mr. COOTE: I never suggested anything to the contrary regarding the minister's attitude to the public; not at all.

Mr. RHODES: That is the reply I feel bound to make to the hon. gentleman's suggestion that he has a superior knowledge of conditions in the country, that we are looking at those conditions from a different plane from himself. Let me say to him that I know the homes of the people of this country, the common people. I sprang from them myself and I do not like the imputation from the hon. gentleman that these taxes are harshly imposed by those who have neither a knowledge of conditions nor any care about them. I do not mind telling my hon. friend that during the time I have been a public servant, and one with some experience, I have had to do many distasteful things, and nothing has been personally so distasteful to me as to be associated with many forms of taxation which we are called upon to impose at the present time. But I regard my personal feelings as something that must be submerged into what I conceive, either rightly or wrongly, to be that which is for the common good of the country. In imposing these taxes, harsh though they may be, I have in mind the welfare of those for whom the hon. member for Macleod professes to speak. I have in mind their welfare just as much as that of any individual anywhere in the whole farflung breadth of Canada.

My hon. friend asked a question as to whether the deadline of $3,000 with respect to bakers was applicable to their whole business, including bread, or only to bakers' cakes and pies. The computation is based entirely on that portion of their business which consists of cakes and pies.

Mr. COOTE: I did not intend for a moment to suggest that the minister had no concern about the hardship which taxation would impose upon the people. I do not want the committee to misunderstand what I had in mind. I was suggesting that men who are sitting in Ottawa, engrossed in this very diffi-

cult task of trying to balance the budget, were not in my opinion as closely in touch with certain classes in the country who are finding it hard to carry on as those of us who have to return to our constituencies and there see exactly the problems which the people have to face for six or eight months of the year. I did not wish to insinuate that the minister did not care as much about the welfare of the people as I do, or is not just as much a humanitarian as I am. Certainly I do not want to create that impression. I must say however that the minister was not quite fair to me when he suggested that it was as difficult to raise price levels in this country as to transplant the lakes of Killarney to the region he spoke about. I cited Australia, and again I would point out that the price level there has stood approximately at eighty during the last two years, while in that period it has fallen in Canada from eighty to sixty-three. If the minister does not wish to reply to that point, it is quite all right; but I do not think he should suggest that it is impossible now to do anything about raising price levels in this country. And I think he will agree that if price levels were raised the receipts of the government through ordinary channels of taxation would also increase.

Mr. RALSTON: The thing we object to, and the thing I feel sure the minister finds most distasteful, is the fact which has been mentioned by one or two members of the committee, that two large classes of commodities are now being removed from the list of exemptions from the sales tax, namely, implements of production—at least a large number of implements of production—and the necessaries of life. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that many, perhaps quite a number, of these articles were taxable up to 1926—I have not had an opportunity to compare the records. He mentioned that date, I presume, as the date when they were taken off.

Mr. RHODES: That is right.

Mr. RALSTON: I would remind him, if I remember rightly, that they were also taxable in 1921. In other words, I think they were put on when the original Special War Revenue Act was passed, or very soon after the war. They were on in 1921 and in 1926 they were removed from the taxable class, and we had hoped that we should not find it necessary once more to tax these two particular classes of goods. In the list of implements of production I find spraying materials, materials used for disinfecting, electrical power machinery for farm uses, mining machinery, shovels and spades, and as regards the necessaries of life there appear in the list oatmeal, rolled oats, cornmeal, barley, split peas, rice, molasses, sago and tapioca, canned vegetables and fruit, boots, shoes and rubbers. We are sorry to see these things again taxable. Assuming that my hon. friend finds it necessary to impose further taxation—let us leave aside for the moment the reasons—may I ask whether he has considered the possibility of leaving goods of this description non-taxable and increasing if necessary taxation in connection with goods that might be regarded either as luxuries or as less necessary than these.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend has misunderstood the reference to the sales tax on spraying materials. The situation remains precisely the same as it was prior to this budget, except that we have taken out those processed and fancy commodities which in many instances sell at prices out of all proportion to the ingredients used—disinfectants for spraying, such as household insecticides, and that sort of thing; the range is comparatively small. But spraying materials used in agriculture are not subject to the tax at all. My hon. friend will find on careful analysis that, with the exception of some items, the items which we tax to-day are those which were taxed in 1926.

Mr. RALSTON: And 1921 too.

Mr. RHODES: Quite so. I mention 1926 for no special purpose except that it was the last year during which the tax was imposed.

Mr. RALSTON: And the year it was taken off.

Mr. RHODES: Yes; I mentioned it for no political reason. I was not suggesting any political significance. I just desired to indicate that as recently as that this tax had been imposed. Earlier in the afternoon I stated that the necessities of the treasury are greater to-day than they were at that time. Even as we have the list in the schedule to-day we still do not tax the number of commodities which were taxed under the sales tax as it was applicable from 1921 to 1926 inclusive. I might say to the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth that I was rather surprised to find that canned fish was subject to the sales tax during that period. It is exempted under the present proposal.

Mr. RALSTON: I think it was under the original act.

Mr. RHODES: Parts of farm tools, such as reaping hooks, rakes, et cetera, were subject to the sales tax at that time while they are not to-day. Split fence posts are also in the same category. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni will be surprised to know that sinkers and floats, including trawlkegs for use in the fisheries were subject to sales tax at that time; they are not to-day. Phonograph records for educational purposes and fox feed were also subject to the sales tax at that time; they are not to-day.

Mr. RALSTON: Gopher poison.

Mr. RHODES: Yes, the ingredients for use exclusively in the manufacture of gopher poison. Apples, dried, desiccated and evaporated; hospital supplies and materials; these were all subject to the sales tax during that period while they are exempted to-day. Despite all the necessities of the case, these articles remain exempted in the list which is now submitted. I mention this only to impress upon hon. friends the necessity of considering this matter from all angles and to ask them to bear in mind the list of articles to which I have just referred. The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay has just returned to the chamber and I am reminded of a question he asked and which I inadvertently failed to answer. I know his absence was necessary because he happens to be the chief whip of the opposition. The articles which we have included in the list to be subject to the sales tax and which have been exempt since 1926 will, according to the best estimate which can be made by the officials of the Department of National Revenue, yield $13,000,000 per year in revenue even under existing conditions.

Paragraph agreed to on division.

11. That schedule IV to the said act, as enacted by chapter fifty-four of the statutes of 1932 enumerating articles exempt for fifty per cent of the sales tax, be repealed and the following substituted as schedule IV:—

Schedule IV

All articles manufactured or produced by the labour of the blind in institutions in Canada established for their care or under the control or direction of such institutions.

Paragraph agreed to.

12. That schedule V to the said act, as enacted by section sixteen and referred to in section twelve of chapter fifty-four of the statutes of 1932, be repealed and the following substituted as schedule V:—

Schedule V

Articles on which other excise taxes are imposed on importation by part XI of this act; raw leaf tobacco when imported by licensed tobacco or cigar manufacturers; material for the manufacture of binder twine for export, when imported by the manufacturers thereof; British and Canadian coin and foreign gold coin, bullion and unmanufactured gold; fish and other products of the fisheries of Newfoundland; fish caught by fishermen in vessels registered in Canada or owned by any person domiciled in Canada, and the products thereof carried from the fisheries in such vessels; donations of clothing for charitable purposes; bibles; fertilizers; animals for the improvement of stock; boards, planks and deals of fir, spruce, pine, hemlock or larch, in the rough or not further manufactured than planed or dressed on one side, when imported from a country which admits free of duty similar lumber imported from Canada; goods enumerated in customs tariff items 173, 364, 460, 700, 702, 703, 704, 705, 705a, 706, 707, 708 and 709.

Paragraph agreed to.

13. That any enactment founded on paragraphs five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven and twelve of this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the twenty-second day of March, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three, and to have applied to all goods imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that date, and to have applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that date.

Paragraph agreed to.

14. That any enactment founded on paragraphs two, three and four of this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of May, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-three.

Paragraph agreed to.

Resolution reported.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT AMENDMENT

Resolved,—That it is expedient to amend the Income War Tax Act and to provide:—

1. That the exemption granted to a married person or a widow or widower with a dependent child be reduced to $2,000 and the exemption for all other persons be reduced to $1,000;

2. That the exemption heretofore afforded to householders as defined shall be abolished;

3. That the exemption for a dependent child or grandchild be $400;

4. That the exemption for a dependent parent, grandparent, brother or sister be the actual amount expended by a taxpayer up to a maximum exemption of $400 for each such dependent person;

5. That the exemption of $2,000 heretofore afforded to corporations and joint stock companies be abolished;

6. That the graduated rates of tax applicable to persons other than corporations and joint stock companies shall be the rates set forth in the following schedule;

7. That the rate of tax applicable to corporations shall be twelve and one-half per centum;

8. That where a corporation elects to file a consolidated return, the corporate rate of tax shall be thirteen and one-half per centum;

9. That the additional rate of tax heretofore provided in respect of incomes in excess of $5,000 shall not apply to corporations;

10. That all bearer coupons, coupon certicates or dividend warrants issued by Canadian debtors in respect of which any interest or dividends are payable and all similar bearer coupons and dividend cheques issued by British or foreign debtors which are cashed by residents of Canada must have attached thereto a duly completed ownership certificate on the form prescribed;

11. That a tax of five per centum shall be imposed at the source on all dividends or interest paid or credited by Canadian debtors to non-residents of Canada;

12. That a tax of five per centum shall be imposed at the source on all dividends or interest payable by Canadian debtors and cashed by Canadian residents at a premium over par of Canadian funds;

13. That rents and royalties which are payable by Canadian debtors to non-residents of Canada shall have deducted at the source a tax of twelve and one-half per centum subject to adjustment on assessment of the income tax return filed by the non-resident;

14. That provision be made to clarify and to render more certain and effective section 13 of the said act;

15. That provision be made for the limitation of certain allowances and expenses charged by companies in respect to amounts paid to relatives of shareholders, bonuses to officers and fees to directors;

16. That interest on indebtedness and taxes on productive property shall be rateably apportioned between income from sources exempt and those not exempt from income tax, provided that in no case shall such interest or taxes be apportioned against a taxpayer's income from his chief occupation or business;

17. That any enactment founded on paragraphs one to nine, both inclusive, and paragraphs fifteen and sixteen, shall be deemed to have come into force at the commencement of the 1932 taxation period and to be applicable thereto and to fiscal periods ending therein, and to all subsequent periods;

18. That any enactment founded on the provisions of paragraphs ten, eleven and twelve of this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of April, 1933, and shall be applicable to all payments made or received on or after such date and to any coupons, coupon certificates or dividend warrants which are redeemable on or after the said 1st April, 1933;

19. That any enactment founded on the provisions of paragraph thirteen of this resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the 22nd day of March, 1933, and shall be applicable to all payments made on and after the said date.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to paragraphs 5 and 7 of this resolution. Ordinarily I do not attempt to defend corporations but I would like to point out to the minister, as I have done already in private, what I regard to be as an injustice in the present enactment. Under the present proposals the $2,000 exemption which applied previously to corporations has been abolished. Last session the family corporation was abolished and this year the rate of taxation on private corporations has been increased to twelve and one half per cent. I am making no complaint of the principle of income tax or as to the tax as it applies to corporations, because, as I said last night, I appreciate fully the difficulty faced by the minister in raising revenue. When the minister answers me, as I believe he will, I am quite sure he will give as a reason for doing what I am complaining about the fact that he needs the money. I admit that that is a strong argument but I submit to him and to the committee that in the raising of money by way of taxation whether it be by income or any other sort of tax, some regard should be given to the principle that there should be no discrimination as between persons of the same class. The minister has wiped out the exemption of $2,000 for corporations. I have no complaint to make of that action so far as large corporations are concerned, but I want to point out that in the case of small companies which are in effect the property of one man or of one family, the present legislation practically doubles the income tax. I should like to give the committee a few figures. A corporation which makes a profit of $5,000—I think every hon. member will agree that that is not very much—will pay an income tax of $713.75 under the present proposal. I think my calculation is correct. A private person operating a similar business and making a similar profit will pay an income tax of $126. I claim that the difference is entirely too great. The man who chooses to operate his business as a corporation must pay over $700 in income tax on a profit of $5,000, whereas his competitor who is operating his business as a private concern will pay an income tax of only $126 on the same amount of profit. It seems to me that such a difference is entirely inequitable and unfair. The only result of this legislation will be that the small corporations will give up their charters and revert to ordinary partnerships or single proprietorships. If a man finds it convenient to operate his little business as a joint stock company, there is no reason why the tax should be so great. Where the annual profit is $10,000, the corporation pays a tax of $1,667.38, whereas the private concern pays a tax of only $546. I could continue my calculations but I do not propose to do so. I make no plea for the large corporation but it seems to me that my argument is sound as far as the small corporations making a profit of as low as $5,000 are concerned. The one is paying between five and six times as much income tax as the other.

I would also like to point this out to the minister: by reason of wiping out this exemp-

tion and reducing the rate, in the case of the small corporation that is making only $5,000 a year, you are under the present proposal practically doubling his tax as compared with that the man would have paid on $5,000 last year. I am not objecting to an income tax; let those pay who can. What I am objecting to is the difference and discrimination existing as between these various businesses, and against the one that is run as a little corporation for its own purposes, its own convenience, and it is entitled to run it in that way; the law provides for that. I do not see why there should be such a tremendous increase in the income tax of a man carrying on business in that way.

Mr. RHODES: May I at once thank my hon. friend for his courtesy in discussing this matter with me personally the other day in my office and for leaving with me the figures, some of which he has just mentioned. He takes the case of a man who has an income of $5,000 and who, if he were taxable as an individual, assuming he was a married man with an exemption of $2,000, would pay an income tax of $120. The figure that my hon. friend submitted was, I think, $126.

Mr. EULER: I added the surtax.

Mr. RHODES: The tax is $120. If the same man were an incorporated company with an income of $5,000, according to the figure as submitted by my hon. friend the tax would be $713.75. That is correct, but my hon. friend has overlooked the fact that the man with the income of $5,000, when he pays his income tax, receives his exemption. If he becomes incorporated, as in the instance prepared by my hon. friend, he has no provision in that to pay his own salary; he has worked for nothing.

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. RHODES: Then my hon. friend is not comparing comparable things. He has given the case of an income of $5,000 obtained by an individual and that of an income of $5,000 obtained by an individual who has become an incorporated company. In the one case he is giving the instance of a married man with an exemption of $2,000 and in the other that of a company which has a straight income of $5,000—

Mr. EULER: No.

Mr. RHODES: —but in that case the man has to pay himself a reasonable salary as manager of the business which he owns himself. If he does that, he will find that he is in precisely the same position as the individual with the married man's exemption. That is the fact. But let me point this out to my hon. friend, and I take no exception to his remarks: he is making a plea confined to a restricted number of individuals. He is taking the case of a man who becomes an incorporated company. The number of instances of that character would be negligible, but even if it were not, the situation would be met by the man receiving a reasonable salary and the income tax officials advise me that a reasonable, fair salary would, in those circumstances, be allowed. Otherwise, why incorporate? While my hon. friend, and quite properly, is making his plea with respect to this restricted class of companies, he must bear in mind that at the same time we are dealing with thousands of companies who, by reason of the exemption of $2,000 being removed, will pay an additional income tax and this means a substantial sum in revenue. Even if the injustice, which I do not admit, were apparent in the case instanced by my hon. friend, he must look at the picture in the large and realize that we are dealing with all companies in Canada; that they are all treated alike, that the $2,000 exemption is obliterated in every case, and lastly, and what is very important from my point of view at least as Minister of Finance, this involves a considerable increase in the revenue derivable under the income tax.

Mr. EULER: I cannot let the minister get by with the statement that the matter of salary—and perhaps his officials have so said, and I make that remark without any offence—must be considered. The matter of salary does not appreciably affect the picture that I have drawn. In the figure I gave, there was $5,000 profit in each case and I took it for granted that in each case the business had paid a salary. Supposing the salary is $3,000 a year; all you need to do in each of those cases is to add to the man's income for taxation purposes that $3,000 and the picture will not be appreciably changed at all. You cannot get away from the fact that that $5,000 for the little joint stock company is immediately subjected to a tax of 12½ per cent, or $625, which is far greater than that borne by the single proprietor. I am not making a plea for the big corporation because, the larger the profits, the less is the discrimination. I am speaking only on behalf of the smaller one and I deliberately took the figure of $5,000, as a modest figure, to show what a tremendous discrimination there was. I would ask the minister to have it figured out. The matter of a reasonable salary in both cases, say $3,000 if you like, will not greatly alter the tremendous discrimination that exists in the two instances.

The minister has made a point of the fact that he is quite consistent; that you must look at the larger picture; that this applies to big corporations. That is quite true; I am in favour of that. He also says that this means a considerable sum of money in revenue. That is very good; he needs it. But I would like to point out to him the very thing he did in a sales tax item under discussion not so long ago when he made an exemption in favour of the small baker. Even last year the small producer of cakes, pies and so on was exempted. I think in this case he will find his own argument turned against him. This year he gives an exemption to the baker who does a business of under $3,000 a year, saying that he is passing the tax on to the higher one. Should he not make the same concession to the little fellow who happens to be conducting his business as a joint stock company? As I say and as I am sure his officials will tell him, when he takes the big corporations with large profits, if there are any to-day that have large profits, he will find this difference very largely disappears or at least is not nearly as great, but it is very formidable and trying to the small chap who is endeavouring to run his little business as a joint stock company for quite legitimate reasons and not with the purpose of making tremendous profits. I would like the committee to bear that figure in mind—and I am allowing for salary paid in both cases—that the tax to the man who is running his business as a joint stock company and who earns $5,000 profit, is over $700, while to the man who is running his business as a single proprietor, the tax is $120. The difference is entirely too great; it is unfair, inequitable, and I think some change should be made to afford some relief.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 4, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. A. U. G. BURY (East Edmonton) presented the third report of the select standing committee on standing orders and moved concurrence in the second report of the committee.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): This motion involves concurrence in the report of a committee, which permits certain bills to be considered at this stage of the session. I merely rise to say that the government cannot give any approval to this course of action being pursued with respect to at least one of the bills which might involve rather lengthy discussion. We will not oppose adoption of the motion, but there is no assurance that the legislation can possibly be considered at this session.

Motion stands.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—WAGES

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table of the house the return asked for by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) in regard to wage scales and agreements between the Canadian National Railways and their employees. I wish to state that I am laying on the table of the house everything that the railways agree might be given. It is not a complete return of the information as called for, but it contains everything that could be presented in justice to the public interest.

RADIO BROADCASTING

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table of the house certain amendments to the radio regulations from Nos. 20 to 30 inclusive.

BRIGHT FAN

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): I have also to lay upon the table certain information received with respect to the insurance which was effected on the ss. Bright Fan. A few days ago the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) asked for this information. Upon the previous occasion I stated from memory that I had received the information from the insurance company. I shall have to rectify that by stating that the information was received by the owners of the ship.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 84, to amend the Judges Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. DUPRE: The object of the amendment is to add a subsection to section 28 of the Judges Act, which is chapter 105 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927. The purpose of the change is to provide that any judge of a superior court of any province or the Yukon territory who continues or is continued in office after attaining the age of 75 shall suffer a reduction in salary to an amount equal to that which he would receive by way of retiring allowance, if he were retired at 75, less any sum which he may receive from the provincial government by way of additional remuneration. The new salary rate will commence when the judge attained or attains the age of seventy-five years, or on the first day of July, 1933, whichever is later. In the case of a judge who would not be entitled to a retiring allowance if retired at the age of seventy-five, the operation of the act will be postponed until he is eligible for a retiring allowance.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RADIO ANNOUNCERS—QUEBEC

Mr. JEAN:

1. Who are the official or temporary announcers of the federal radio commission in the province of Quebec?
2. What is their nationality?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member is dropping this question?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I gave the hon. gentleman certain explanations and he is willing to have the question dropped.

Question dropped.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

ADVANCES TO BANKS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What were the annual advances to the chartered banks and savings banks under the Finance Act from August 22, 1914, to March 30, 1933?
2. What was the rate of interest charged?
3. What was the aggregate amount of interest received by the government on these advances?
4. What were the total advances during the aforesaid period to each bank unit?

[Mr. Dupré.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—ADVERTISING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston City): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion) based on a long letter which I have received. The question is this: Have the Canadian National Railways sold to a private company a franchise to erect and maintain illuminated and other outdoor advertising signs on the Canadian National right of way across Canada?

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was good enough to tell me he was going to ask this question, and I think one or two other hon. members of the house are interested as well, notably the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), who said he was going to ask a question along this line.

In brief the facts are that the management and directors of the Canadian National Railways have entered into an agreement with a Montreal company—I think McArthur-Irwin is the name—not to erect signs across the entire right of way, as the hon. member suggests, but to place advertising signs on their bridges, under proper conditions. I am informed by the management and by the directors that this should bring in a reasonably good income which has not been enjoyed by any railway in Canada previously. I may add quite frankly that I entirely agree that this is a wise step to take, particularly in view of present financial conditions.

Mr. C. B. HOWARD (Sherbrooke): May I ask the minister if he is aware of the fact that last year the province of Quebec passed legislation forbidding the placing of advertising signs along either side of the highway even on private property?

Mr. MANION: I was not aware of that fact, but I do not know what bearing it would have on this matter. I understand that the agreement relates only to bridges, and of course that advertising would have to be within the laws of the various provinces. I am informed that the agreement amply protects the railway company in every possible way, so there is no danger of any conflict with provincial laws.

Mr. MARCIL: Is that an exclusive contract, or is it open to other companies as well?

Mr. MANION: I understand that it is an exclusive contract. I do not think it could be anything else, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HOWARD: I think the minister missed the point I was trying to make. He is practically permitting the Canadian National Railways to do something that other companies cannot do with regard to the highways.

Mr. MANION: We are not permitting the Canadian National to do anything; the Canadian National itself has entered into the contract, and I assume this company, like any other corporation, will have to remain within the laws of the provinces. The contract was drawn up by the lawyers of the Canadian National, and I assume they took into account whatever laws might affect this advertising.

TARIFF BOARD—APPLICATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Yesterday the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson) directed a question to me; he wished to know what applications for hearings had been received by the tariff board from Canadian and British firms. Upon inquiry I find that my predecessor, the late Mr. Robb, took the position with respect to similar requests when the former tariff board was in existence that to give this information in the ordinary course was not in the public interest. That practice obtained during the existence of the former board. I must say that I think that position was quite sound, and it is the intention of the present administration to follow the same practice, so that any information which is desired will come from time to time as and when the hearings take place before the board.

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): As I recollect it, Mr. Speaker, the former practice was to advertise these hearings so that all interested could be heard if they so desired.

Mr. RHODES: The same practice will obtain with respect to the new board, as I understand it, but my hon. friend must realize that the board is only starting its work.

Mr. F. G. SANDERSON (South Perth): I might remind the minister that when he answered my question yesterday he said he would let the house have the information today.

Mr. RHODES: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; here is what I said:

> Obviously I will have to ask that my hon. friend's question stand as a notice, and I will give an answer to-morrow.

53719—289½

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER AS TO LEGISLATION TO BE BROUGHT DOWN

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I promised yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I would advise the house as to whether or not it was the intention of the government to proceed with the redistribution bill. It is proposed to proceed with that bill at once. The other bills on the order paper will be proceeded with also, with the possible exception of the bill dealing with admiralty courts, which may not be proceeded with this session in view of the fact that the shipping bill is not being pressed. The arrangement made in 1926, 1929 and 1930 with respect to shipping contemplated uniform bills throughout the British Empire. It was felt that when the statute of Westminster was passed and admiralty courts acts were adopted by the various dominions we would have a fair measure of uniformity having regard to the different conditions existing in the various dominions, but the shipping acts themselves, modelled on the Merchant Shipping Act, would be similar for reasons that I fancy I need not state in this house.

That was the view taken at the Imperial conference in 1926, and again in 1929 and 1930. Inasmuch as there has been no legislation of that character passed as yet by the other dominions the matter is further under consideration; the shipping bill is not being proceeded with and a further opportunity will be given to study the various provisions of our act and other acts that may be drafted by the other dominions in order that we may carry out the understanding agreed upon at the imperial conferences and the drafting committee conference in 1929. The Admiralty Court Act, therefore, following on that, will not be passed. The other bills on the order paper will be proceeded with whenever the opportunity offers. There is one other matter, namely, a short bill to grant the governor in council power to extend the duration of the New Zealand treaty beyond the 24th day of May of this year, when it expires. There is the French trade agreement, if an agreement is submitted to the house to be dealt with, and there is an amendment to the Excise Act which cannot be submitted until after the budget provisions have been entirely adopted, because they contain administrative machinery dealing with legislation that has been and will be considered by the house with respect to the budget. At the moment, after conferring with my colleagues, I do not think there is any other legislation except an amendment to

the Tariff Board Act—a short amendment—which will not give my hon. friend from Weyburn (Mr. Young) any work. There is the Coastal Shipping Act, which is now in the Senate and which will be brought down to this chamber, and there is also an amendment to the Insurance Act, in connection with certain investments, which by accident was left out of the bill last year. That Senator Beaubien has in the Senate and it will be submitted to this chamber in due course. I think there are some other private bills in the Senate, but apart from what I have mentioned there is no new legislation contemplated. The Soldier Settlement bill is on the order paper. The redistribution schedules will be completed as early as possible, and if unfortunately agreement cannot be arrived at in the committee, the committee will report the bill to the house and we shall have to endeavour to arrive at some conclusions with respect to legislation.

I may say that I have placed on the order paper for Monday next a notice suggesting that the house meet on Tuesday at eleven o'clock, but that is entirely in the hands of the house; whatever the house may desire in that regard, we shall be glad to accommodate our views thereto. It is also contemplated that the house shall sit on Wednesday evening next.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is it the intention to bring in some amendments to the Shipping Act with respect to coastal trade?

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I mentioned. That bill is now in the Senate.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does the Prime Minister intend to proceed with Bill No. 26, to amend the Exchequer Court Act? The reason I ask that question is that the Minister of Justice, before leaving, had intimated to me that it was not the intention to proceed with that bill.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): The Minister of Justice gave me to understand that he had indicated that it was not thought desirable to proceed with the Admiralty Court bill. I spoke to my colleague to-day and asked him to call the bill for committee for the purpose of hearing what observations the former Minister of Justice had to make on the matter, and we would then determine what action should be taken. If the Minister of Justice indicated that we would not proceed with it, we will certainly carry out the undertaking he gave.

COAL INQUIRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. G. SANDERSON (South Perth): I have a question to ask the Minister of Labour with regard to the report of the registrar appointed under the Combines Investigation Act with respect to the inquiry into importation and distribution of British anthracite coal. Yesterday the minister made some remark touching this question, and according to Hansard he said that the report was not to be made public; yet I find in yesterday's press, in the Toronto Globe of yesterday—

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member proceed with his question?

Mr. SANDERSON: I am about to state it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not read from newspapers.

Mr. SANDERSON: I have not read anything, but in the Toronto Globe, in great headlines, it is reported that importers—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SANDERSON: —are using the duty to overcharge users of British fuel, and then it mentions an hon. member of the other house, the salary he has been getting—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: To ask a question it is not necessary to retail to the house what appears in newspapers.

Mr. SANDERSON: I must frame my question, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to you, sir, I submit that if you will give me a moment I will put the question. My question is this: If the press of Canada can get part of the details of the registrar's report, is not that report to be had by members of parliament? If it is to be semi-public we might as well make it public. I would ask the Minister of Labour whether the members of this house have a right to see the report.

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): I do not think I can usefully add anything to what I said yesterday. I understand that there were comments in the press with respect to what was thought to be in the registrar's

report. The press very frequently hazards opinions about what is contained in documents, about what governments intend to do, as well as about the intentions of individuals. I am not stating whether what appears in the press is in the report or not. Certainly I am not going to attempt to control or direct what the press may or may not say, but I feel confident that the practice and procedure outlined yesterday is the one that has been adhered to in the past. I believe it to be a sound practice, and with respect to this report it will be followed. I am dispatching the report, the evidence and the exhibits to the proper attorneys general for attention.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Unless we grant interim supply, Mr. Speaker, hardship will result to a certain number of civil servants and more particularly to those returned soldiers who are in receipt of hospital treatment. I would therefore ask the unanimous consent of the house for the passage of a supply bill granting one-twelfth of supply. I move that you do now leave the chair for the house to go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Mr. RHODES moved:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $16,220,422.36, being one-twelfth of the amount to be voted as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1934, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending the 31st March, 1934.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. RHODES moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Mr. RHODES moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1934, the sum of $16,220,422.36 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Rhodes thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 83, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1934.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL-CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BILL

The house resumed from Friday, April 28, consideration in committee of Bill No. 37, respecting the Canadian National Railways and to provide for cooperation with the Canadian Pacific Railway system and for other purposes—Mr. Manion—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

On section 6, subsection 1.—Vacancies.

The CHAIRMAN: There was an amendment moved by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power).

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: To strike out all the words after the word "occurring" in the fourteenth line.

Mr. MANION: The amendment would wipe out the panel idea.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think we are all for that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is the amendment acceptable to the minister?

Mr. BENNETT: Is it desirable that future appointments should be in the hands of the political party which happens to be in power at the moment?

Mr. EULER: Certainly.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why should not the same theory be applied to the first appointments?

Mr. BENNETT: It has been the custom to commence these institutions or commissions by appointments made by the government of the day. That involves the government being censured for the appointments which may be made and criticisms may be offered so as to destroy public confidence in the body. If we desire to assure ourselves that political considerations will be eliminated, the panel system offers the only method. Should a vacancy occur it is contemplated that the remaining trustees along with the chairman of the Board of Rail-

way Commissioners and the president of the exchequer court shall prepare a list from which the appointments would be made. It seems to me that that is as far as you can hope to get if there is an earnest desire to eliminate purely political factors. I think the view of those who are responsible was that if we could we would remove temptation which might arise from the desire of those who felt they had claims upon the government to have such claims recognized by appointment to such a position as this. It is true that the government has a majority but if a substantial body of this committee is of the opinion that the panel system as indicated in this bill is not desirable, we are not concerned about it. However, I want to put it fairly to the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I submit that my right hon. friend has used a phrase which hardly describes the situation accurately. He asks whether it is desirable to have future appointments made by a political party. I submit that what he should have asked was whether it was desired to have future appointments made by the government of the day. It is the government and not political parties that makes appointments and the government of the day is the one body to which the people have a right to look for appointments. What the complexion of the government of the day may be rests entirely with the people of the country and it seems to me that their voices should be heeded in these matters. I must say that I think it is a very unfair reflection for the Prime Minister to make when he assumes that when any political party comes into office its members are not going to be actuated by motives quite as high as those which have actuated the government of which he himself is the head. I said the other day quite frankly that we all agreed with the Prime Minister in his view that it was difficult enough to obtain for those high positions men who were equal to the task and that if such persons were secured any government, it seemed to me, would be only too pleased to retain them in office; there would not be any desire to change them. I think that is quite true. I say to my right hon. friend that I believe we might well agree that all governments will be actuated by motives equally honourable, that the obligation upon one government should be just the same as upon another, and that full responsibility should go with office in the matter either of retaining those who may in part be administering the nation's affairs or in replacing them. The government cannot free itself from that responsibility, and the only way in which it can properly be held responsible is by leaving it free to act as it thinks best.

As regards this panel, I do not think it amounts to anything; it is a mere sham, a mere pretence and for that reason it is worse than nothing. No one will believe that appointments are being made as a result of a non-political panel when those who are filling the offices that are named as those of the persons to select the panel, have all been appointees of one political party. Apart from that altogether, I submit that the president of the exchequer court, however able he may be, does not begin to have the same knowledge of the persons best equipped for the position of trustee of railway, that members of a government have. I do not see why a government should give to some group, inferior to itself, the responsibility of making what perhaps would be the most important of all the appointments to be made. I would ask that, so far as possible, the fundamental principle of ministerial responsibility be observed in these appointments.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman realizes that by his observations in the last part of his speech he contradicted the first part of it and he used exact words in contradiction. He said that appointees were the appointees of the government; then he said that the two, who would have to be half of the four, are appointees of one political party. Which does he mean? The first or the last? If he means the first, then he separates the government from a political party. If he means the last, he and I are wholly in agreement. He said that he thought I was reflecting upon the honourable capacity of governments to make selections. I was pointing out that governments selected those who generally supported their political party. The words he used were that the two would be appointees of one political party and that they would select as additions to the board men who were in accord with their party. It was in order to prevent that, if possible, that this provision was inserted. It is in order to provide that by the joint selection of four men a panel might be prepared that would not necessarily be merely the selections of one political party. It is always well to discuss practical matters in a practical way. I could cite as an outstanding illustration of what I mean the commission that constructed the National Transcontinental. It was a political commission.

Mr. MALCOLM: Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, that is what I am trying to point out, and the results that followed are reviewed in the Gutelius report. I am only pointing out that there is no desire to avoid ministerial or governmental responsibility, but if there is a wish on the part of the house that we should have a panel of names that commended themselves to four persons, from which panel the government might make a selection—and the house may reconstitute the method of selection in any way it pleases—to escape the evils that have followed from purely political appointments, we should adopt the course I suggest. Who will say that this country has not had too long an experience of the political type of appointees that built the National Transcontinental? No man, free from political bias, who will just look at the facts, the classifications that were approved and the costs involved, will say that that is not so? It follows in the necessary sequence of things that would be so. It was to avoid such a situation that this suggestion was made. If this committee this afternoon is of opinion that an effort should not be made to divorce from politics, if possible, the class from which selection should be made, by limiting it to persons approved by a body consisting of the two trustees, for instance, who would remain, and the gentlemen named, well and good. Certainly neither I nor the government desire to press it upon the committee or the house. We only wish to carry out the purpose which was in the mind of the commission when they made their report in which they said that members of parliament should not be eligible, and which aim was to divorce the administration of the system from politics, and to say that the government must assume responsibility for all the acts of the board is to beg the question, because the hope was and is that a body will be created that will discharge all the functions of a board of directors free from control or restraint so far as governments are concerned and conduct the business of an enterprise that means so much to this country as though it were a private undertaking, with the benefits that would accrue from the exercise of the best business judgment they have in dealing with the problems before them. That is the reason the provision was inserted in the bill with regard to members of parliament, senators, etcetera. It has not been unusual in all parliaments to provide by legislation for the exclusion of certain classes from appointments to certain offices. It may not be generally known, but there was once in Great Britain a statute that all lawyers were excluded from the House of Commons. It may be interesting to some hon. members to know that it was discovered in a very short time that parliament could not get along without lawyers. I mention that merely as an illustration. There have been other restrictions of a similar character.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The ignoramus parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly the name by which it was known. Although the government has a majority with which to carry out its will with respect to this matter, we shall keep faith with the principle on which we brought this bill into the house, and if it is the wish of the opposition that the panel provision be eliminated, we shall not waste time in trying to force it through.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to the Prime Minister that his argument, if it carries any weight at all, is equally applicable to the first appointments; I do not think that can be denied. I think he should be chivalrous enough to concede to his political opponents a desire to be just as fair in making these great appointments as would be the members of any other government. He has cited former commissions, I am not going to take up the time of the committee in saying what might be said on all sides of the question, but there have been commissions appointed by his political opponents that commended themselves even to my right hon. friend, for example, the board of grain commissioners who were appointed by the late Liberal administration. Hon. gentlemen opposite have retained them in office because they found that they were acting impartially and fairly. Without question one of the strongest influences to compel those likewise situated so to do would be the thought that they would wish to commend themselves to the successors of the government that might at the moment be in office as well as to the government in office.

I mentioned the other day the International Joint Commission. There again hon. gentlemen opposite had made appointments that might be regarded as very strong from the point of view of political partisanship, if you wish to term it such. One of the gentlemen appointed had been Conservative premier of his province, but he received that appointment to the commission and he was retained in that office during all the time the Liberal administration was in power. Another member of that commission who was retained

throughout by the Liberal administration had been a Conservative member of this House of Commons.

The same thing is true of judges. Over and over again it had been said that judges when they assume office on the bench give up their partisan politics, although they may not altogether change their personal feelings.

Reference has been made this afternoon to what was termed an ignoramus parliament. I do not see why we should constitute ourselves an ignoramus parliament at the instance of the commissioners who have made this recommendation. I do not like any commission appointed by a government to say that the government of the day is not capable of honourable action with respect to the discharge of public affairs. That is my strongest objection, to this provision proposed, I do submit that the government ought not to try to have it both ways. Either make this panel, if it amounts to anything and signifies anything, applicable at once to immediate appointments, or if it is not of so much significance, allow to all subequent ministries with respect to the filling of vacancies the same authority and responsibility that the ministry is taking to itself at the moment.

Mr. EULER: As I have said before, if this provision of a panel for the selection of trustees ensured to any reasonable extent that politics would be eliminated in the appointment of these trustees, I would be disposed to favour it, but the objection I made previously to that clause as it stands was this, that while it does provide for a panel of eight for the filling of subsequent vacancies, the original appointments are made by the government itself, and so I think these two provisions are entirely inconsistent with each other. If the government would so alter the bill that the selections of the original trustee board would also be made from a properly constituted panel, I for one would be inclined to favour it. I know that that conflicts perhaps with the opinion of my leader in that there is not government responsibility there, but there would still be left a reasonable measure of government responsibility because after all from the panel of eight the appointments must be made by the government itself, and to that extent at least there is government responsibility. But I admit that I would go some little distance even at the sacrifice of what might be called government responsibility if thereby we could ensure that there would be very little of political influence or political patronage in the selection of that board of trustees, but I do submit that the two provisions, the first appointments by the government and future appointments from a panel, are entirely inconsistent with each other. If the government so desired to have it, and I am not accusing them of that, the first board might be an entirely political board if the government makes the first selections, and I submit that now is the time if ever that the management of the Canadian National Railways should be as free from political influence as it is possible to have it, because the railway is in the most critical period of its history. So I would say if it is not possible to amend the clause so that we may have non-political appointments from the beginning, I would just as soon have that provision wiped out altogether and let the government take the responsibility. But if the government can provide for a non-political panel right from the outset I would be inclined to support that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In view of the concluding remarks of the Prime Minister and in view of the arguments which have been advanced by the right hon. leader of the opposition, I should like to say that I think there is a very substantial body of public opinion on this side of the house as well as on the other side which, having regard to the doctrine of ministerial responsibility and the manner in which the first trustees are to be appointed, is of the view that the panel system should not be included in this bill. I have no doubt in the world that the government will be held responsible for the success or lack of success of the principles underlying this bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite will see to that if the legislation fails, and hon. gentlemen on this side of the house, if it succeeds, will claim any merit there is in it. That being the case, and human nature being what it is, I strongly suggest to the Minister of Railways that if he has evidence that there is a substantial body of opinion in this house that the panel system should be eliminated, it be eliminated forthwith.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In support of what my hon. friend from North Waterloo has said, may I say that if these trustees are going to have such an important office as has been represented, and I believe they are, I do not agree that the government should select the appointees from among the men who according to the Prime Minister would offer their services as having been good supporters of the party in power. I think that for an office of this kind conscription rather than voluntary service would be the best system. The government should go after the best men available for the office, and how can that be done by means of a panel system? How can the

Exchequer court judge or the president of the railway commission properly go and ask men to accept the office who according to their own view would be the best qualified to administer the Canadian National Railways? How could they go after those fellows and ask them whether they would accept the office or not? They would have to form a panel of the persons who would be best qualified according to their views, but how would they know whether those persons would accept the office? My own experience is that for an office of this kind the minister who is responsible and his colleagues are seeking out the man who would accept, and I think that is the best way. Even in the appointment of the board of trustees we should maintain ministerial responsibility, and not entrust the task of forming a panel to those gentlemen who will merely put names down without knowing if the men will be available for the office or not.

Mr. MALCOLM: I should like to say that I appreciate very much the attitude of the Prime Minister in dealing with clause 7, in leaving the question of a panel or ministerial responsibility to the judgment of the house. I thoroughly agree with the remarks made by my hon. friend from North Waterloo, but I should like to submit to the members of the committee that there are worse kinds of patronage than political patronage. Very often there exists a good deal of executive patronage within organizations, which is harder to deal with than political patronage. If an executive is appointed with any feeling of entire independence of the government of the day, I do not think that such a relationship is desirable. I believe that whoever is appointed, if appointed by the government in power, will be the very best selection that can be made from the material available. I believe with my leader that parliament has made some of the best selections for commissions that could possibly be made, as is evidenced by the lack of criticism of many selections. Nor do I think that in a matter as important as the administration of the national railway any government of the future will select a man who is not competent and capable of administering this great trust.

My object in rising, however, was to point out to hon. members of the house what was pointed out by the senior member of the house, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) only a few days ago, and to which I referred the other evening. There is no reason why we should run Canada like a soviet. There is no reason why we should put the most important department of administration in this nation under men over whom this house would have no control.

If we are going to administer the affairs of Canada according to British parliamentary practice, we are certainly going to have parliamentary control over the administration of government. Someone said only recently that in a very few years we could turn Canada into a soviet, just by appointing a chief commissar, and that there were already commissars for every department of government. I believe the people of Canada will trust this government; I believe they will trust succeeding governments to make as good selections as can be made. If a panel were to be appointed to select names for submission to the government I can see no reason whatever for the existing commissioners having any say in recommending their favoured friends. The remaining commissioners will no doubt make friends. If future appointments were to be made by a panel, I think the chairman of the railway commission and a judge of the exchequer court could make recommendations to the government. I do not see, however, how even they would have any better opportunity of knowing the men available than would the Prime Minister and his Minister of Railways.

I do submit that the hon. member for Quebec East brought out the very point to which the Prime Minister referred only a few days ago, namely, that the men who are wanted will have to be sought after. It will not be the men who are applying for the job that the Prime Minister will want. No doubt to-day he and his Minister of Railways are canvassing the situation to see what men are available who would meet the necessary requirements. I do not believe anything is to be gained by parliament or the government giving up its responsibility for a great national asset and appointing men who do not owe their appointments to parliament, which after all represents the owners of the road, and who do not owe their appointments to the administration in power, which after all must be responsible to the people for expenditures of money on the railroad.

I believe the government will be following the wishes of the country if they maintain British parliamentary institutions, and make appointments by governor in council of the men who are to be appointed in the first place, and the men who are to succeed when the original appointments expire.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Mr. Chairman, I wish to be brief and to avoid covering the ground which has been previously covered by hon. members from this side of the house. When speaking on the introduction of the bill I remember the Prime Min-

ister made the statement that the appointments would be made much in the same manner as the appointment of judges. Undoubtedly Canada has been particularly fortunate in the appointment of judges. Naturally, when these men receive their appointments they bear the political complexion of the party in office.

Mr. BENNETT: Not always.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Perhaps not always, but there are very few exceptions. Despite that fact however, I believe I may say without fear of successful contradiction that most of them, indeed all of them, have fulfilled their duties to the entire satisfaction of the litigants appearing before them, and to the public generally. However, I look upon these appointments from a different standpoint altogether. Judges are appointed to interpret the law and to settle disputes. In this instance, the men appointed will have to spend a very large amount of money. They will have to be business men, in the real sense of the word. No doubt what the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has said is quite true. Personally, while I would not trust the judgment of the Prime Minister in all matters, in the selection of these gentlemen I should prefer his judgment linked with that of the Minister of Railways to that of a panel, as is set out by the provision in the legislation.

Moreover, if three gentlemen are to be selected who are going to spend and have control over as much money as the government of Canada spends annually, and if the enterprise is likely to remain in that position, then surely the government of Canada through the governor in council should retain control over appointments. I cannot see that any good purpose would be served by delegating to any body, no matter how worthy a body it might be, the naming of the men from whom selections are to be made. There must be governmental responsibility, if this railway system is to remain, as we now term it, a national railway. So long as it is the railway of the people of Canada the government of the day must take responsibility for it. If they do not, my fear is that we will have the privilege of voting the necessary funds for the carrying on of the railway, but will have no control whatever over its management.

For those reasons I want to voice my opposition to the suggested method of selection. I should very much prefer to leave such selection in the hands of the governor in council. May I say that I heartily agree with and concur in the provision for the reduction of the board to three members, Further, I do not believe that so-called political patronage has had very much effect upon the operation and administration of the railways. True, there is some justification for the statement made so frequently to the effect that municipalities and different parts of the country exercise some influence upon the railways. With two competing railway lines in existence, that influence will be exercised again. However, I do not believe that is the reason that the national railways have suffered. As a matter of fact I am not prepared to admit that the national system has suffered much more than the privately owned system now running in opposition. I do sincerely trust that the government will agree to have control remain where it has been, namely in the hands of the governor in council.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the Prime Minister has been good enough to ask for the opinions of hon. members in regard to this important matter, I shall state my opinion very briefly. The proposal to create a panel does not appeal to me at all, inasmuch as the two remaining trustees will have probably the greater say as to whose names shall be submitted as part of the panel. I am fully in accord with those hon. members who have suggested this afternoon that parliamentary control should continue. I am quite willing to trust any government which may be in power to find the proper men to put into these positions, when vacancies occur. One of the objections I have already voiced to the bill has been the taking away from parliament of practically the whole control over the national railways. So long as we have our present parliamentary institutions, with members of parliament responsible to their electors, parliament should exercise control. I believe the house would do well to ask the Prime Minister to accede to the request which has been made, namely that the governor in council should be responsible for all appointments made to the board of trustees, either in the first instance or to fill vacancies.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, I shall not speak until the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott) has spoken.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If the minister is about to say that the government has decided to have the appointment of the original trustees and of those who are appointed to fill vacancies made in the same way, then it is not necessary for me to urge what I have stated on a former occasion. Having the power to appoint

the three trustees, I believe the government should have power to fill the vacancies. If on the other hand the three are appointed from a panel, which I believe restricts the class from which they can be drawn, then in my view further appointments should be made in the same way.

Mr. MANION: In view of the opinions expressed from all sections of the house the government has decided to accept the suggestion of doing away with the panel. Unfortunately the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Quebec South does not fill the bill because, no doubt unintentionally, he moved that the whole clause after the word "occurring" be stricken out. Since the hon. member is not here to withdraw the amendment I shall have to ask the committee to vote it down, and then I will have an amendment moved simply striking out the words after the word "occurring" to the end of the sub-clause.

The CHAIRMAN: That is the way the amendment reads now, to strike out all the remaining words in the section.

Mr. MANION: Yes, but that means all of section 6.

Amendment (Mr. Power) negatived.

Mr. MANION: Then I have this amendment.

Mr. BENNETT: I move that all the words after the word "occurring" in subsection 1 of section 6 be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 7—Removal from office or reduction of salary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This section reads:

> No trustee shall be removed from office, nor suffer any reduction in salary, during the term for which he is appointed, unless for assigned cause and on address of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada.

We have just decided, I think unanimously, that in the matter of the appointment of trustees the doctrine of ministerial responsibility should be observed and maintained. I would submit that all that can be said in favour of maintaining that doctrine with respect to appointments ought to apply equally with respect to the continuance in office of trustees and with respect to their salaries. I think this clause ought to be struck out altogether on that ground, without mentioning other reasons that might be equally strong, if not stronger.

Mr. MANION: We held this section in abeyance, and it has been fully discussed by the government. We are of the opinion that this clause should stand as it is at present. I think the best arguments that can be advanced in favour of this provision were advanced when the section was first under consideration. They were to this effect, that if one or all of the trustees proved unworthy or unfit to fill these positions there is no doubt that the other chamber, whatever might be its composition, would be glad to help get rid of them. On the other hand if it should so happen that any government—and I do not refer particularly to the government of my right hon. friend opposite—for any unfair or unwise reason should desire to get rid of trustees who had been doing excellent work, it would be only right that the other chamber should refuse to permit that action to be taken. I do not submit this argument in criticism of any party or any group; I simply say that if such a situation should occur we ought to have that safeguard. I believe the House of Commons can feel sure that if these trustees, or any of them, should be unfit to carry on or should in some way betray their trust, both chambers of this parliament would be glad to act in unison to get rid of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What the minister has just said is the equivalent of saying that one branch of parliament should be supreme as against the ministry itself, which itself is responsible to parliament as a whole and through parliament to the people; moreover the particular branch of parliament which the minister mentions is the branch which has not the immediate responsibility to the people that the elected chamber has. I do not see why it should be necessary for any minister of the crown to reflect upon a government as such, and that is what is being done in this paragraph and even in the words used by the minister this afternoon.

Mr. MANION: I did not reflect on any government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister's words were an implication, if not a reflection; he referred to any government that might be in office and that might want to do something that was not right and proper. Since when did one administration become the keeper of the conscience of its successor? I submit that so long as we have responsible government we must assume that the government which is placed in office by the people will be actuated by fair and honourable motives, and we must give that government a free hand.

I do not think it is right or fair for one government to try to bind its successors in any way, and that is what hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to do not only in this but in other measures they have put through. The government has a hard enough job in times such as these, and in fact at all times; they should be given the freest hand possible to deal with public affairs. They are always responsible to parliament and through parliament to the people. Any ministry that would take a course such as that just now suggested by my hon. friend and do what was obviously unfair in the dismissal of a trustee of the Canadian National Railways would find itself defeated at every by-election, and ultimately thrown out of office for such unjustifiable action.

Here we have at stake the whole basis on which parliamentary government rests under British institutions. It is not merely a question of how parliament may view a given matter at a particular moment; there is involved the whole question of the election of representatives to parliament and the basis upon which they are elected, namely, to carry out the will of the people. That is tested in by-elections and at general elections, and it is the one thing after all that is the controlling factor in a government's actions. It is but fair and right, and in keeping with our parliamentary institutions, to ask that a clause which would restrict any ministry in the exercise of its responsibility, I do not care what the ministry's political complexion may be, should not find a place in our statutes. I believe this section should be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Vancouver Centre has presented an amendment to strike out section 7.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Speaking to that amendment, Mr. Chairman, and following the remarks of my right hon. friend, let me say—

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion this amendment is out of order. The committee must vote for or against the section, so this amendment which would strike out the section is negative, and I declare it out of order.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Then speaking to the section itself, Mr. Chairman, let me say that if we emasculate this bill much further we might as well withdraw it, because it will serve no purpose at all. As I see it the report of the commission and the bill founded upon that report constitute one final effort to rescue the railway system from the bedevilment of politics. It matters not what anyone says in relation to that; go back over the whole history and you will find that politics, parliamentary politics if you like, are responsible for the situation in which we now find ourselves. Whether you can get a board of trustees that to some degree will lift this system out of that situation I grant at once to be a question, but if you are to have trustees you must get the best possible men in this country. The chairman of this board will have the biggest job ever assigned to any Canadian in Canada, and the right hon. gentleman opposite suggests that we should go out looking for that man and say to him, "We want you to take this job. Divest yourself of every other responsibility and interest you may have, but remember that you will remain there subject to dismissal in case there is a change in government." It seems to me that is the position. Can we possibly expect to get the type of man we want under those conditions? I conceive it to be impossible.

I am not going to labour that point, Mr. Chairman. My right hon. friend referred to governmental responsibility and the right of one government to tie the hands of another. What is the procedure in regard to appointments to the railway commission? Every single member of that board is appointed for a definite term of ten years. Already we have reduced the terms of appointment under this bill to five, four and three years, which to my mind simply weakens it to that extent. What is the practice in regard to judges, if you like? We might as well say that a judge appointed by one government is to be subject to the will of any other government that may follow. We have many evidences, if we wanted to go back over the past and introduce the political aspect, to show exactly what has resulted from the removal of men—and that in the case of the national railways itself—and the appointment of other men for political reasons. I say therefore that if this bill is to be further emasculated we should withdraw it altogether and wipe out the farce.

Mr. MARCIL: The hon. gentleman is dreaming of a time to come when there will be no politics either in this house or in the Senate. Unfortunately, under the system we now have, the people cannot attend this meeting here but they send their delegates, and they hold us responsible whenever we go back to them; they demand an accounting on our part. The Senate is a very honourable body but it is not under that obligation; its members do not have to go back to constituents. They are merely a court of appeal as it were, and that was the reason for their appointment in the first instance, to protect the rights of minorities in the provinces. That role has not

been filled but it exists nevertheless. In this case I am glad to know that both leaders have recognized the principle of ministerial responsibility. We cannot get away from that, and if the hon. member wants to escape it he will have to retire from the political field, because when he goes back to his constituency he will be accountable for everything that has taken place during his term in parliament.

The idea of sharing responsibility between the cabinet and the Senate with respect to the removal of any of these appointees is inviting discord from the inception. Suppose you have a cabinet of one political complexion and a Senate of another. That idea is all right when the appointment is made by parliament; the appointee can be removed only on a joint address of both houses. In this case however the appointments are not being made by parliament but by the governor in council, and the people will hold the governor in council responsible for what occurs. If the new policy is a success the government will boast of it and will receive the credit; if it is not a success they will be condemned by the people. Why therefore should you have the governor in council make the appointments and then compel that body to go to the Senate for approval in the removal of anyone? I do not think it is workable; moreover, it is contrary to the principles of responsible government. In the light of such experience as I have gained here in the period of a third of a century, I think that the more we depart from the old-established rule of responsible government the deeper the mess we shall fall into. The people must rule and the House of Commons are their representatives. The Senate exists for certain purposes, to revise hasty legislation and to make certain amendments which the government of the day, in view of public opinion, cannot make but which may be necessary in the face of conditions that may be inimical to the interests of the country. But the responsibility rests with this house, and when the hon. member for East Algoma goes back to his constituents he will be held responsible not only for this act but for everything that has been done in this house; he will be responsible for the report of the Duff commission if he approves of its conclusions. I can only say therefore that I am opposed to this clause in principle as it stands. I want the whole responsibility left with the committee of this house called the governor general in council.

Mr. McGIBBON: It seems to me there are only two methods of procedure before the house; one is for the government to take full responsibility in conducting the railways, having the Minister of Railways in the House of Commons responsible to the house and the people; the second method is to remove the railways as far as possible away from politics and political influence. It does seem to me that we are halting between these two methods. I do not think that anyone who has had the privilege of attending the special committee on railways and shipping can conscientiously say that in the past politics has been divorced from the management of the national railways. I am not going to discuss here the results, for they are only too apparent to-day to the taxpayers of Canada, and in my opinion will be in the lifetime of every member sitting in this house at this moment. In that I may be wrong; I hope I am. Rightly or wrongly, however, with the background and history we have had since 1923, when the national railways were consolidated, the Duff commission has taken the view that politics in the past has been evident in the management of the railways. Read the report and it will so inform you as plainly as the English language can state it. As a remedy—and it is time we were finding a remedy—the commission submitted certain recommendations which are reflected in this bill.

I say frankly, as one representing the people of this country, that of these two policies I prefer the first. Under normal conditions I should have preferred to have the minister and the government take full responsibility, but I do not believe that the people of Canada want that; I do not believe that any government could carry it out at the present time. Consequently we are left with but one alternative, namely, for the government to remove the railways as far as possible from parliamentary and governmental influence; and while I prefer the first method, I am not sure that the government were wise in withdrawing the amendment they did a few minutes ago, because that would certainly put the management a little further away from parliament than it is now.

If there is anyone here who thinks that the national railways do not present the greatest problem the country has to deal with, he is an optimist. I for one believe that the taxpayers of the country will be called upon for years to come to put their hands very deeply into their pockets to pay the deficits of the road. All I want to remind the house of at the moment is this, that only in one year did they come anywhere near meeting the interest obligations to the public, and it would take $20,000,000 more to-day of an operating surplus than they had in 1928 to meet the situation. Does anyone think that business will

come back as quickly as that, with traffic on the railways falling, as it is to-day, out of sight almost every hour? Does anyone think that the railways will pay their obligations to the public? Well, I do not, and I say to the government that if I were in their place I would, on the authority of the Duff commission, unload this responsibility and get it as far away from me as I could. They have authority for that. They appointed a commission comprising the best men they could get, and that is their report. The report was well received by the public of Canada as hon. members know. I did not think very much of it, but that is neither here nor there; but having decided on a policy of divorcing the management of the railways from politics and from parliament, if I were Minister of Railways I would certainly get it as far away as I could, because I should hate to shoulder the responsibility.

Mr. EULER: Would my hon. friend, then, have supported the first appointment of trustees by the government?

Mr. McGIBBON: I gave a reason which I think is justifiable. Having appointed a commission of the most eminent men available, men eminent in railway matters, in finance, and in law, having given freely of their time and having made a report to this house, I think it would be an insult to that commission if we did not adopt their recommendation. I do not pretend to hold my judgment as being superior to theirs but probably I am not as conceited as some hon. members of the house.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. McGIBBON: We have a tremendous problem upon our hands and in my opinion this problem will be increased in the future by the fact that mail, express and package parcels will be carried largely by air. The busses and trucks are taking business away from the railways. They serve the thickly populated parts of the country, they stop anywhere for passengers or freight while the situation of the railways is just the reverse. I cannot see a very bright future for the railways in this or any other country. If parliament could solve this problem it would be doing one of the best turns possible to the people of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who has just taken his seat based his argument upon the advisability of carrying out the recommendations made by the Duff commission. He stated that as the government appointed this commission, they ought to carry out its recommendations. May I say that the Duff commission never made the recommendation which is included in this clause. The clause reads:

> No trustee shall be removed from office, nor suffer any reduction in salary, during the term for which he is appointed, unless for assigned cause and on address of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada.

The words "on address of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada" have been added by the ministry.

Mr. McGIBBON: Surely those words were a fair deduction from the recommendation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the Duff commission had thought that it was right and proper that the ministry should be restricted by the addition of words of that kind, those words would have been included in the recommendations of the report. May I give an additional reason as to why they would have done so. Another commission, the Drayton-Acworth commission, investigated the question of railways and it made a recommendation that in the particulars here mentioned it should be impossible for a subsequent ministry to undo anything that a previous ministry had done. That appeared in the majority report of the commissioners. The minority report of one of the commissioners who dissented is very significant. When the Drayton-Acworth commission sought to bind succeeding ministries much in the way that this clause seeks to bind them, one of its members took exception. I shall read his words which were as follows:

> I am unable to join my colleagues in their recommendations. They propose that practically all of the railways in Canada, except the Canadian Pacific and the American lines shall be turned over to a corporation to be managed by a board of trustees appointed by the government. They insist that this board is to be permanent and self-perpetuating. I do not know by what means one parliament can bind its successors to a given policy, especially in so simple a matter as changing the organization of a government board. My friends seek to avoid government ownership and operation, in fact condemn it as inadvisable, but propose a plan which contains so many elements of danger in the direction which is sought to be avoided that I am unable to join them.

In other words, the commissioners, as set forth by one of their number, were seeking to make government ownership and operation impossible, and one of their recommendations was that the board of trustees should be self-perpetuating and after appointment not be removable by a ministry at a later date. May I point out that the governments of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden and of the Hon. Mr. Meighen had the report of this commission

before them but neither government were prepared to take action in accordance with their recommendations. The Duff commission had the report of the Drayton-Acworth commission before its members but they were not prepared to recommend to the government and through the government to parliament the adoption of any such provision as this. The fact that in the circumstances the Duff commission refrained from making such a recommendation is the strongest argument that could be advanced as to why this parliament should not insert in this bill any provision of the kind. I am going to move that all the words after the word "cause" in the thirty-fourth line be struck out. Should this amendment carry, the section would then read:

No trustee shall be removed from office, nor suffer any reduction in salary, during the term for which he is appointed, unless for assigned cause.

The words I am proposing to strike out are:

—and on address of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada.

May I give a further reason why these words should be struck out? By the passage of previous clauses, this committee has decided that the governor in council shall make appointments and shall fix salaries. It has given to the governor in council the power to increase salaries; if the governor in council is to be given the power to increase salaries why should it be denied the power to reduce salaries? Why should the reduction of salaries as well as the removal from office be made subject to the will of the Senate as well as that of the House of Commons? It seems to me that there are two fundamental constitutional principles being sacrificed by the clause in the form in which it appears. The first is the one already referred to of the responsibility of a ministry, in other words the principle of responsible government; the government taking full responsibility for its actions and not being subordinated to the will of a non-elected house of parliament. The second and a very important fundamental principle is the control by the Commons of all matters of expenditure. By this clause the House of Commons is impliedly parting with its right of control over expenditures and the taxation incidental thereto; they are being made subject to the will of the Senate. It may be that the amount involved is small but the principle is very great. This principle, probably more than ony other, has occasioned long and acrimonious debate in the British parliament during recent years. The same statement, in fact, applies to most parliaments. For this as well as for the other reasons mentioned, I do not think that this clause should be accepted in its present form.

I fail to see just why it should be necessary to reflect in this indirect way upon any ministry that may be in office. I think that in the future, members of governments will be as honourable in their actions as their predecessors, whether those actions relate to appointments or to dismissals. Speaking the other day in connection with these appointments, I said that if at any time a Liberal administration should be returned to power and I had anything to do with it, my last desire would be to remove any trustees appointed by the present government provided they were performing their duties impartially, fairly and well. If they were not doing that, it seems to me that the ministry of the day ought not to be restricted in its attitude towards them. The ministry will have to carry the responsibility of their actions whether it wishes to do so or not.

May I say a further word about this getting rid of government control? It seems to me that here another fundamental principle is involved. Either these roads must be considered as government controlled as well as government owned roads or they should be passed over altogether into private hands. If the ministry is of the view that parliament is not the proper body to control the national railways, then let them bring in a measure which will ask parliament to transfer the roads to private control. The ministry claim that the president and board of directors under the late administration and as they exist at the present time were possessed of too great a power, but it now proposes to go a step further and give still greater power to the three trustees. The complaint has been made that the board of directors have had too free a hand, that certain expenditures would not have been made if they had been subject to greater control by the ministry, but now the ministry proposes to go even further and take away all control on the part of the ministry. These three men are to be given the power to do as they please with respect to the largest expenditure that the country will be concerned in. Reference has been made this afternoon to human nature and, knowing human nature as we do, I cannot but believe that any gentlemen who may be given appointments as trustees will be all the better in administering these national railways for realizing that they are subject to the control of whatever ministry the people may be responsible for having placed in office.

Mr. NICHOLSON: What happened in 1923?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know to what my hon. friend is referring.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The gentleman brought here to be president of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If this clause had been inserted in the original act, how would the ministry of to-day have felt had they been obliged, notwithstanding whatever argument or reasons they might urge, to retain in office whoever had been appointed? The leaving of the appointment of the president of the railway as at pleasure was the only sound and sensible position to take. I do not think the ministry can do other than agree with this statement because, when they came into office, they became responsible, and they assumed their responsibility in the way in which they believed it should be assumed. If they assumed it in the wrong way, and without justification, their action is subject to criticism. The very fact, however, that as a responsible ministry they found it advisable to make a change is the strongest reason why they should hesitate in binding any subsequent ministry.

May I say this with reference to the appointment of Sir Henry Thornton. The government of the day before it was able to secure Sir Henry, had sought high and low for a president of the national railway. As I recall the circumstances, it was a matter of a search of a year or more before the person regarded as suitable could be found to take the position of president of the national railways. When we appointed Sir Henry, we believed we had secured one who was in no way associated with either the Canadian National or the Grand Trunk, who would as between these former rival systems have no preference or feeling one way or the other, and who was independent of all other former influences. He was given a free hand. He came to us from England; his experience had been largely in the United States. If there ever was a man who was ideally fitted so far as general qualifications and the like were concerned, and calculated to be impartial in the discharge of his duties once given a free hand, Sir Henry Thornton was that man. Whatever hon. members may now wish to say about him, or of his administration during the last year or two, they will have to admit that they themselves when on this side of the house were as strong in endorsation of Sir Henry Thornton's management of the road at the time as were the members of the government in office.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. McGIBBON: They could not find out anything about the situation.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We must admit that at any rate up to a certain period there was general agreement throughout the country that the best man possible had been found for the position. But the man who was regarded the best at the time was evidently not thought to be the best man to continue indefinitely. A like situation may arise as regards any appointment. Therefore the ministry of the day, of whatever complexion it may be, should be given a free hand to assume and discharge its responsibility in its own way

The hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario has made a reference to political interference. I am not going to bring that subject into the discussion except to put on record one statement which I think it is owing to the former administration should be on record so far as alleged political interference on the part of the government of the day is concerned. Sir Henry Thornton himself gave to the Saturday Evening Post on July 6, 1929, a statement of the circumstances under which he took office as president of the railroad, of the manner in which he managed its affairs, and of the extent to which up to that time there had been aught in the nature of governmental interference. I shall quote just one paragraph from page 9 of the Saturday Evening Post of the date mentioned. I shall say nothing at present about what Sir Henry Thornton may have subsequently said on the same subject. After mentioning the circumstances of the problem with which he was confronted he continues in this article as follows:

> But, as I have mentioned, I love a good fight. So I crossed the ocean and had a talk with the Right Hon. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister. He, too, said, there would be no politics. I took the job.
>
> There never has been any politics. But that wasn't the fault of a great many persons. Premier King kept his promise. And during the period between elections when the Conservative party was in control no one laboured harder in the real interest of the property than Sir Henry Drayton, who carried on governmental administration during the election period. Within a year a bulwark had arisen to back him—the opinion of the people of Canada. To-day there is as much chance of politics getting into the Canadian National Railways as there is of an elephant walking a tight-rope. Both have yet to be done. Last year, for instance, the railways which I am fortunate enough to administer bought $99,000,000 worth of supplies. Not one cent of those purchases was dictated politically, nor any that preceded them.

I place this statement on record because it has been before the public for some years and no exception has ever been taken to it;

it was before the House of Commons at the time it was made, and exception was not taken to it then. I shall not enter into any argument over what may have taken place since, but I submit that so far as I know the situation, that was the relationship of the government of the day to Sir Henry Thornton and the railways under his management. The minister himself I think has said that, so far as politics are concerned, the kind of thing to which he had reference and which we all had in mind was not so much the possible influence of the ministry of the day or of members of parliament upon the trustees as it was the kind of influence that may be brought to bear from different sections of the country, a sectional influence that may be very real at times. That kind of influence upon the trustees is not going to be in any way affected by the manner in which this particular clause is framed. The trustees will do their duty according to their lights; making them removable for cause is only a just and fair way of proceeding, and if there is cause there should be freedom on the part of the ministry to remove them. Whether there may be cause or not, there should not be in the statute an implied reflection that the ministry of the day will do other than what is honourable in the circumstances in which they may be called upon to act.

Mr. BENNETT: I wish the committee would calmly consider this matter from another angle. I quite appreciate all that has been said, but the effort to secure good men for this position has already commenced. I know exactly what the former government had to contend with at the time they secured the services of Sir Henry Thornton. I think it is only fair to say this; the whole affair is past and gone; the gentleman himself is now no more. I came back from England and I left for the then Prime Minister, who was at the time out of town, a memorandum stating that I had been interviewed by two or three gentlemen who had spoken in the highest terms of Sir Henry Thornton's railroad experience; I thought he was admirably qualified by reason of his experience to undertake the task. I left that memorandum at the office of the Prime Minister at the time I returned from England. I was not then in the House of Commons. If we are to secure the kind of trustees that I believe are essential—and I cannot say how seriously I regard the matter; I cannot overstate the seriousness of it to the country—we must get men who will not think that by accepting office they are "conscripted," which I think is the word used by the hon. member for Quebec East. If we have to conscript them, we cannot hope that men are going to take these positions who will be subject to, shall I say, the ill treatment of any government, even the government that appoints them. The leader of the opposition says that I suggest governments will not do thus and so. I know, for instance, that the international joint commission was originally appointed by the king in council. The appointment had not been completed when Sir Robert Borden came into office, and therefore the positions were filled by three Conservatives: Mr. Powell, Mr. Casgrain and Mr. Magrath.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Sir William Hearst.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I am referring to the first ones. Then the government of my right hon. friend had the matter amended so that the governor in council could appoint them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Any government.

Mr. BENNETT: I mean the government in Canada—I want to remove it from any possible chance—and the pressure upon the right hon. gentleman was very great, as I happen to know. Now under those circumstances, knowing as I do and as every hon. member knows, just what the feeling is in a young country like Canada where you have not a great reservoir to draw upon such as you have in an older country, of skilled and trained men, we face this situation, that if we ask men to take one of these positions they are going to refuse unless they know that they are not going to be kicked about like men holding such offices too often are. When we say that good cause must be assigned for their removal or dismissal I am glad to hear the right hon. gentleman say that he thinks that is fair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with that entirely.

Mr. BENNETT: We say just what a board of directors would say. The House of Commons and the Senate, not simply the House of Commons, but both houses of parliament, represent the shareholders, if you will, and we say that no government weak with the frailties of political life, at least, shall be in a position either from mere caprice or what they believe to be good cause to make these men walk out. The approval of parliament must be given. If the approval of parliament is given the government is vindicated.

If parliament refuses its approval the government will have to vacate its place.

The right hon. gentleman must also realize that in determining what constitutes good cause you raise an issue of the utmost importance. The courts, for instance, have always had difficulty in deciding as a matter of law whether or not a given set of facts constitutes cause or not. Therefore in every case where an employer dismisses his employee before the termination of his period of employment the employer must face the responsibility of either paying damages or satisfying the court that he has done what he has done for good cause. The cause is a question of law. I can give one illustration that many hon. gentlemen may be familiar with. We had a case in the courts under which an employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway sued that road for damages for dismissal. The cause assigned was that he had appropriated to his own use fares on the railway received for the carrying of passengers. The railway company dismissed him. In accordance with the provisions of the schedule he appeared before his superior officers and he contended that he had made good his defence, but the company dismissed him. He then sued the company, and the learned judge decided that he had been dismissed without good cause, and awarded him $10,000. Apart from the fact that the damages were improper because the measure of damage could not be that in any event, the question at issue was whether or not that was good cause. The case went to the appeal court and finally to the privy council, where the judgment of the trial judge was reversed, as it was by the court of appeal. The issue was the sufficiency of the cause. The man himself was not permitted to say whether it was good or bad. He took the risk. Now in order that we may be able to induce competent men to accept this position we say that we are not going to leave it to the caprice of any government, our government or any other, to say that a given condition constitutes good or bad cause to exercise the power of dismissal. Therefore once a decision has been arrived at to terminate the employment by dismissal we say that before final action is taken parliament must say, just as the privy council had to say, that the cause assigned is a good cause, and if this house and the Senate say that it is not good, then the government of the day must go; but if on the other hand the commons and the Senate say it is good the government is vindicated in the position it has taken.

The reason why the Senate is introduced into this, apart altogether from the fact that the tenure of office of judges is during good behaviour subject to age and other conditions which will be before the house presently as defined by the Judges Act, is this: We want the board to be independent of the executive, just as no executive action should be capable of terminating the services of a judge. Therefore the appeal is made to parliament. In the case of the judges that is as old as the statute that provided it. It has come down through all these years, and parliament means both houses. The answer that at least one hon. gentleman would make if the commons alone were mentioned would be that the government of the day has always a majority in the commons and therefore is always sure of being sustained in that chamber. But the government has not always a majority in the other chamber, whether in this country or any other, and therefore the government of the day may not be sustained in the other house; it may not secure the joint approval of the two houses of parliament by which these men may be removed. You thus secure the possibility of men of position in the commercial world accepting at the hands of the government positions which they otherwise would not accept, and having accepted the position they know that their tenure of office is not to be subject to the caprice of any government which in its anxiety to change the personnel of the trustees may determine that a given set of facts constitutes good cause. The question must be submitted to the high court of parliament, and the government of the day having submitted its cause, not to this house alone but also to the other branch of parliament which may not conceivably support the government, and that has very often happened, if it is unable to secure the approval of that other branch of parliament, as well as the approval of the commons, it fails and the government must go.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend is not suggesting that if a government measure is defeated in the other house the government must resign.

Mr. BENNETT: It would in this case.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That makes it worse than ever.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not a question of defeat. There must be joint action by both houses to make it complete. Both bodies must approve before you can deprive of his office a man who may be taken out of a great place in the commercial life of the country and induced as a high matter of public service to give years of his life—this

house has now reduced the term to five years —to the country in this way, and giving his services to the country in this way we say that he shall not be subjected to dismissal unless the sufficiency of the cause assigned is approved by the parliament of Canada.

Mr. EULER: Just to clear up the point raised by my hon. friend from West Edmonton, I can hardly believe what I understood the Prime Minister to say. Does he say seriously that if such a joint address initiated by the government were refused by the Senate, the government would be compelled to resign?

Mr. BENNETT: In my judgment the government would certainly have to resign.

Mr. EULER: Because the Senate does not approve?

Mr. BENNETT: The government assumes the responsibility of asking the approval of parliament for the dismissal of Mr. A, the chairman of the board of trustees. The House of Commons says yes and the Senate says no. The government has failed.

Mr. EULER: Not at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course, it has failed.

Mr. YOUNG: Then let us amend the bill before it is too late.

Mr. BENNETT: Parliament takes that action not on a statute but on a resolution, a joint address, and the government risks its all on the sufficiency of the cause for dismissing a man from this position. There is no doubt about that, not the slightest doubt in the world. It would not be so with respect to a statute, but this is a case in which the government has taken the risk of putting a man out of his position, throwing him out on the street for cause assigned which was wholly inadequate—the commons says it is adequate; the Senate says it is not. The government has failed. How can a government carry on?

Mr. YOUNG: Then the trustees can get rid of the government?

Mr. BENNETT: No, the trustees cannot get rid of the government, because it is a question of termination of the relations of employer and employee, the trustee as an individual. What is the good of this business of always talking high platitudes with respect to parliamentary institutions, when you have to deal with facts and realties? The reality is that if the House of Commons does not approve of the action of the government, that is the end of it; the government goes. And if you have said that the House of Commons plus the other house must approve, and it does not, the government goes equally. That applies with respect to the dismissal of the individual. That is not so about a statute at all. What is more, there are illustrations of it; it is not a new question at all. When a joint address is to be agreed upon, if one party does not agree to it, there is no joint address, and the government which initiates it must accept the responsibility for it. That is the difference between that and a statute. A government's measure may be defeated in the Senate, and that is the end of it. But that is not this case. The government has risked its fate by dismissing a man from his job. It has risked its all on that dismissal, and it has made that dismissal subject to the joint approval of two branches of parliament.

Mr. HEENAN: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. EULER: I believe I had the floor first.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes; as a matter of fact the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) withdrew for me.

Mr. EULER: I am sure the Prime Minister will believe me when I say, without in any way trying to be offensive, that the statement he made at the conclusion of his remark provides for me the strongest reason why this bill should not go through in the form in which it appears.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I thought you would say, and that is the reason that I made myself clear.

Mr. EULER: I cannot conceive that the life of the government, for any reason, can be dependent upon the action of the Senate of Canada. The Prime Minister laughs at that, as he so often does.

Mr. BENNETT: The Senate put the Macdonald government out.

Mr. EULER: I am looking at the matter in a common sense way, and I believe in the way that the average citizen of Canada would look at it. Like the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario I do not regard the Duff commission report so very highly. I do not believe that the bill which we are now discussing again can accomplish a very great deal. On the second reading I gave it support, which was not at all enthusiastic, but I did it because it went at least some length in the direction in which I desired action to go. It offered a certain amount of cooperation, and decrease in the expense of running the road.

If there was one clause of the bill to which I objected, it was the clause we are now discussing, namely 7. A little while ago the government accepted the suggestion that they should take full responsibility for making appointments. I was rather in favour of the panel idea, if it could be made nonpolitical —I admit it would be difficult—because I always had in my mind that if the government would change clause 7 so that it or the House of Commons would have the power to discharge these trustees, their responsibility would be very well maintained. Now they have declined to eliminate clause 7. There are two reasons given, one by the Minister of Railways and the other by the Prime Minister. The Minister of Railways gave as his reason that a politically minded government, if we wish so to describe it, might unfairly discharge these trustees. I believe I am correct in my interpretation of what he said. I have put it bluntly, but I believe that is what was at the root of his statement, namely that a politically minded or partisan minded government might unfairly desire to discharge these trustees, and that the Senate would prevent such an injustice. I contend that if it be true that for political reasons a Senate might prevent a government from discharging these trustees, it is just as fair to assume that a politically minded Senate, or a partisan Senate might prevent the removal of these trustees for the same political reasons. So that upon that score it seems to me that we are even.

The Prime Minister advanced another argument in which there may be some weight, but against which I think provision could be made. He stated that unless the men asked to take office as trustees could be assured that they could not be discharged by a politically minded government, the best men for these positions could not be obtained. If there were no safeguard, I believe there would be something in his argument. But at this point I am going to suggest a safeguard, as I did previously, upon which occasion I incurred the ridicule, if it may be so termed, of the Prime Minister. I stated that it should be the duty of the House of Commons alone, and the government—not of the Senate—to discharge the trustees, if they wished to do so. I hold to that. I stated frankly before, and I repeat it at this time, that to my mind the responsibility should not be placed upon the Senate, that this House of Commons should not share the responsibility with the Senate, because only the House of Commons and government are responsible to the people of Canada. I hold to that principle very consistently, and, I suggest, very soundly. If there is danger that, from fear of partisan governments, executives or cabinets, the best men could not be secured for the positions, and if there is fear that for political reasons they might be discharged, I believe such fear might very well be allayed and the danger very definitely averted if we inserted a provision or amended this clause so that the trustees could be removed not by the executive or by the cabinet, but by a vote of the House of Commons, not including the Senate. If the men were competent, no House of Commons or no government would dare to introduce a resolution or bill into the House of Commons providing for the removal of such trustees, unless for very good cause. On such occasion the debate in the house and the fear of the criticism of an alert opposition would prevent any government from introducing such a measure, unless it were absolutely certain of its ground. The press throughout the country would take the matter up, and in my opinion, that would be ample safeguard against that which the Prime Minister seems to dread.

I shall conclude by repeating the statement with which I began, namely, that when the Prime Minister now claims or states—and he knows more than I do about constitutional law—that because of the rejection by the Senate of a resolution initiated in and passed by the House of Commons, the government must resign, he is, if stating the fact, giving the very best reason why this clause should not be passed as it now stands.

Mr. HEENAN: I desire to commend the Prime Minister at this stage for his frankness. I recall that only a few evenings ago I was in the company of two government supporters, and while discussing section 7 I said that I thought that we might go to the point where a government in power could introduce a resolution to dismiss the trustees, and that in the event of the resolution being rejected by the House of Commons and the Senate the government would have to go to the country. I do not mind saying that although the two Conservative members were friends of mine, they laughed at me. I am very glad to sit here to-day and to hear my idea substantiated by the Prime Minister.

Why are we so solicitous of gentlemen whom we are going to appoint as trustees? Why is there the discrimination between employees of the railway and trustees? Here we have an economy measure which will result in thousands of employees being thrown on the street, but the man who will be appointed to carry out these measures of economy, the chairman of the board of trustees, cannot be

put out of office unless the government stakes its life on a resolution which must be adopted by the House of Commons and the Senate. Every man working on the railroad, whether he is a section man, a carpenter, a machinist, a bridge builder, an engineer or a conductor, is just as important in the life of that railroad as the trustee will be, yet now we are going to engage a man for five years, during which time he will have to throw thousands of men on the streets without a moment's notice. We disregard their lives and the lives of their dependents, but we cannot dismiss the gentleman responsible for this unless we have an address of the House of Commons and the Senate. Why should there be this discrimination between Canadian citizens?

We heard the hon. member for East Algoma and the Minister of Railways say that we must have big men. Yes, in connection with the operation of the Canadian National we must have big men, but I think they must be big railroad men. And why should these big railroad men have their jobs ensured for five years while they have the power to dismiss the employees without notice? For the life of me I cannot see why we should be required to ensure their positions while other men, who are just as necessary for the successful operation of the railroad, may be dismissed without very much consideration being given. I believe that a really big man would not take a job such as this unless he knew he was big enough to handle it, and if he handled it to the satisfaction of the country that in itself would ensure his job. I think that is the only barometer we should have.

While we are dealing with this question of trustees I want to repeat that one man on the board should be appointed to represent the employees. I know the government takes the position that the two hundred thousand railway men in Canada should not receive greater consideration than the million or more agriculturists, but I want to point out to the minister that these railway men have devoted their lives to this work. One might say that everyone who deals with or uses the railways is interested. I believe it costs ten or fifteen cents to send a suit of clothes from Winnipeg to Regina, and the gentleman in Regina who pays that sum might be said to be interested in our railways to that extent. Surely, however, he should not be compared with the men who entered the railway service in their youth and have remained there for many years. These men have built their homes and brought up their families in that service, and surely they are entitled to representation on this board. The Minister of Railways said the door was not closed yet; I am very glad he did so, because I cannot conceive any government appointing trustees for the Canadian National without giving representation to the men who have invested their lives in this work.

The hon. member for East Algoma said that if we emasculated the bill much more it would be better to abandon it because it would mean almost nothing. On the other hand, however, I know that many amendments from this side, and even from the other side, have been refused and that the only amendments accepted by the government have been those which in their opinion would strengthen the bill, so I do not think there is very much in the argument of the hon. member for East Algoma. I should like to point out to the hon. gentleman that these trustees will not be ordinary men after they are appointed; turn to section 16 and see what powers they are to have. They can form new companies, grant leases, enter into agreements, grant licences, agree on the division of earnings arising from joint operations, grant joint trackage, running rights, joint ownerships or joint operating agreements, and so on. Yet these gentlemen cannot be dismissed for five years unless the government in power stakes its life on a resolution of the House of Commons and the Senate. I am very glad the Prime Minister was frank enough to give us that information; I mentioned that fact a few evenings ago to some hon. gentlemen opposite, and they laughed at me. It is no laughing matter now, however, since we heard the Prime Minister make that definite statement on the floor of the house. Therefore I am heartily in sympathy with the amendment moved by my right hon. leader, and I hope the House of Commons will accept it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry to say that when the Prime Minister made his remarks he lost a prospective supporter of this section. I was inclined to give my support, but my right hon. friend has given an interpretation which surely we must accept, because this section is the work not of the commission but of the government. The Prime Minister says that if a government undertakes to dismiss one of the trustees for an assigned cause, for mismanagement or something else, and is supported by the House of Commons but not by the Senate, it means the resignation of the government. I cannot follow the right hon. gentleman that far, and I shall vote against the section.

Mr. YOUNG: In his remarks the Prime Minister said we must deal with facts and

realities. It seems to me he is making this board of trustees a reality, so much so that the government will be reduced to a mere shadow. Let us suppose that a quarrel developed between the government and the board of trustees; naturally the government would ask for the dismissal of the board, and the Senate would have to decide whether or not that should be done. If the Senate happened to be of the opposite political complexion from the government does anyone suppose for a moment that the matter would be dealt with on its merits? The Senate naturally would want to see the government out of office. There is a very simple method of getting rid of them, and that is, simply to refuse to dismiss the board of directors. Let me give an example of what might happen. I have before me the report of the bureau of statistics showing the earnings of the two railway companies for two four-month periods. They are the latest periods I could get, November and December 1932, and January and February 1933, being one period, and the corresponding period of the year before, November and December 1931, and January and February 1932. The earnings of both railways declined in those periods but the decline in the Canadian National Railways was 24·89 per cent and on the Canadian Pacific 19·35 per cent, or a difference of 5½ per cent.

Ordinarily speaking, the Minister of Railways should call before him the board of directors and demand an explanation of such a state of affairs, and if a satisfactory explanation were not forthcoming he would naturally request the resignation of the board. He would ask for dismissal for cause, because they would have shown their incompetence. But what would happen? They would immediately canvass the Senate to see what support they could get if they decided to refuse to resign, and if they could get sufficient support they would refuse and the government would be forced to resign.

I cannot see how the government can escape responsibility for the management of the railways. Set up any structure you like and the people of the country will hold the government responsible; and if they go before the people and say, "We cannot help it; we have created a board which is beyond our control, having given them full charge of the railways," the people will reply, "You had no business to set up any such board because you are the people and the only people we hold responsible for the management of the railways, and if you cannot manage them you had better get out and let someone else do so." Public control and public ownership are inseparable, and if we cannot control the railways we have no business owning them. If the government, elected by the people, cannot manage the railway, then the sooner we find that out and the sooner we get rid of it the better. That is my opinion.

Mr. BROWN: I have had a good deal of hesitation about intervening in the debate with regard to the railways. When this clause was brought to the attention of the committee my first reaction was that I could not offer any very strong objection to it; indeed, I felt it was possibly an instance in which the Senate might discharge the functions it was originally intended to discharge in preventing hasty action on the part of the government and the House of Commons. But the statement made by the Prime Minister, that the refusal of the Senate to endorse the action of the government and the House of Commons would necessitate the resignation of the government, is a doctrine to which I could not possibly subscribe. In view of that statement I certainly agree with the hon. member for North Waterloo and the hon. member for Quebec East. I cannot support the clause in question under these circumstances and certainly I shall have to register my objection to it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I intended to oppose this clause in any event. I do not want any misunderstanding; I am opposed to it in every particular. I believe that the responsibility should rest in the hands of the governor in council. I do not insist, as my good friend from North Waterloo has done, that it shall be the responsibility of parliament, but I do maintain that the responsibility should rest in the governor in council.

Let me put this to the leader of the government and the government itself. When they felt that the interests of this institution would be better served without the services of Sir Henry Thornton, they took the responsibility in that matter and I find no fault with them. The responsibility, I say, was theirs. But do they mean to say that if there had been an adverse majority in the Senate, or if there had been a Liberal Senate, they would have succeeded in having Sir Henry Thornton dismissed, particularly if that Senate thought for a moment that they could put this government out of office on the question? The thing is almost ridiculous. With all respect to the Prime Minister, I cannot conceive that even he would suggest such an arbitrary manner of dealing with the government.

I will vote against this proposal more heartily than I did before, much more heartily. So far as I am concerned, I am bound to say that this is the worst imposition that has ever been offered the House of Commons of Canada. Are we going to be made subservient to the Senate in a grave matter of this sort? And that is exactly what will happen. The members of that body do not have to appeal to the electors at all; they are there during their lifetime and, if they saw fit, willy nilly they would maintain in opposition to the elected representatives of the people a board which in the judgment of the latter should be dismissed, a board handling, as I said on a former occasion, just as much money as the government of this country is likely to handle.

May I say to hon. gentlemen who have been critical of the railway situation that I do agree with certain things the Prime Minister has said. I agree that we have overbuilt in Canada. I would ask my hon. friend from East Algoma however this question: Would he incur again in his lumbering business the same obligations he did in more prosperous days? We all know that hindsight is always better than foresight. I would point out to this house however that notwithstanding the severe losses incurred by the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific the people of Canada have enjoyed lower rates than those that have prevailed on the other side. We must admit therefore that there are advantages in the government railways, and if the government are to divest themselves of all responsibility for this institution then I say to them, turn it over to private enterprise at once and have done with the whole thing. I do not know whether the institution can be made a success or not, but I do know that no such method as is now proposed can be adopted by the government without their incurring very grave displeasure. I say that so long as the government are determined to maintain the national railways as a government institution they will have to accept the responsibility —any government will have to accept that responsibility. It cannot be otherwise. This attempt to remove it from political control is in my opinion so much hooey; it cannot be done, and that is one of the penalties we shall pay for government institutions.

Mr. ERNST: I thought "hooey" was banned.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I mean this bugaboo that is always trotted out about political control. I do not believe there has been very much political control. I do know that municipalities and communities have got what they should not have got, but they have got it from the Canadian Pacific Railway as well. I could cite dozens of instances where they received from the Canadian Pacific treatment they were not entitled to. I say, however, that if hon. gentlemen are genuinely opposed to government control they should say so outright; but if we are to have government control and operation, let the government take responsibility through the governor in council.

Mr. MANION: This clause has been debated fully to and fro but I should like to point out to the committee something that has already been mentioned by the Prime Minister. In the dismissal of any of these trustees exactly the same method is used as that which would be followed in the dismissal of a superior court judge. Let me read this extract from the British North America Act, section 99:

> The judges of the superior courts shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the governor general on address of the Senate and House of Commons.

While of course a judge holds a very high office, I would point out that from the standpoint of financial responsibility, from the standpoint of our whole financial structure, the trustees who are going to be put into power in the Canadian National Railways are in a much more important position. Without any doubt the object is to place the handling of the affairs of the Canadian National Railways as far away as possible from government pressure, from political pressure or from public pressure. That was the thought in the minds of those who drew up this clause. The right hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Waterloo have, perhaps unintentionally, put an interpretation upon my word which was unfair. I was continuing the discussion which took place the other day in connection with the possibility of there being a Senate of a different political colour than the government of the day. It was stated that they might block a dismissal. Generally speaking, I think it can be assumed that the Senate will take as honourable and as highminded an attitude as this chamber. The hon. member for North Waterloo has suggested that any dismissal should be made by a resolution of the House of Commons only, but I think he will admit that any government in power having a decent majority would be able to get any reasonable resolution passed through the house.

Mr. EULER: I said that public opinion would prevent them from introducing a resolution which was not founded on proper reason.

Mr. MANION: And in the same way, public opinion would prevent another chamber of this parliament from refusing to dismiss a trustee who should be dismissed.

Mr. EULER: I was following the statement of the Prime Minister that they could put another government out of office.

Mr. MANION: I would not like to argue with the Prime Minister as to constitutional questions, but I must confess that I do not interpret the matter in the way he does. Suppose a government of the day wished to dismiss a trustee. The procedure would be something like this: the government of the day would introduce a resolution to the House of Commons in which cause would be given; that resolution would go to the Senate and if it passed the Senate, the man would be dismissed; if the Senate did not pass it, the man would not be dismissed.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is what we thought.

Mr. MANION: I have no desire to get into a constitutional argument with the right hon. leader of the government because he is much more capable than I in that regard; I am simply giving my interpretation of the clause. I have listened intently but I have not heard any real argument advanced as to the possibility of injustice being done by this clause either to the trustees or to the government of the day.

Mr. MARCIL: The only thing wrong with the minister's argument is the fact that these trustees will not be judges. Judges are appointed to interpret the laws passed by parliament. A judge may be impeached and brought to the bar of this house for trial. This is the high court of the nation and we merely delegate our powers to the judges of the land to interpret our laws. In this case we are appointing administrators who are going to administer these railways to the best of their knowledge and ability. We are not going to give them any directions as to how that is to be done; we are not going to pass a statute to say that this, that or the other thing shall be done. They are to be given carte blanche and will act entirely on their own volition. They are in an entirely different position from that occupied by the judges and there cannot be any comparison between the two.

[Mr. Manion.]

The assent of the Senate to the removal of an officer is quite competent when that officer is appointed by parliament. The general returning officer is appointed by joint address of both houses of parliament. The Auditor General of Canada is responsible to parliament. Parliament delegates powers to the cabinet council; the government of the day is merely a committee of parliament. Parliament has the power to remove these officials which I have mentioned but only by the assent of both houses. In the present case this argument would not apply because the trustees are not to be appointed by both houses, they are to be appointed by the governor in council.

Mr. BENNETT: Which comprises both houses.

Mr. MARCIL: The governor in council is responsible to this parliament. I have no desire to disparage the Senate, as I have heard splendid descriptions of its responsibilities and irresponsibilities. In this instance we are dealing with a money question which comes entirely within the jurisdiction of this house. The Senate has not a word to say. The Senate can reject a supply bill holus bolus but it cannot amend it. When I was a young man this whole issue was brought to the fore in the Quebec legislature. A conflict arose between the cabinet and the legislative council and pandemonium reigned in that province for some time. Responsible government ceased to exist because the lieutenant governor arrogated to himself powers similar to those which we now seek to confer upon the Senate. The result was that the government of that province was sustained for two years by the casting vote of the Speaker. A precedent was established by the removal of the lieutenant governor by the governor in council. He was declared to be merely a federal officer and not a representative of the crown. The then governor general referred the matter to the home authorities who declared that the lieutenant governor of a province was a nominee of the dominion cabinet which had the power to remove him for cause. At the present time we are merely using our prerogatives as members of this house dealing with a money matter. We are appointing trustees to administer public property, and with all due respect to the Prime Minister, I must say that I am amazed at his stating that a government would have to resign office and go to the people merely because an adverse vote had been cast by the Senate.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman has fallen three times into the same error—in spite of his wide experience in constitutional matters, he has referred to the cabinet as a committee of this house. It is not; it is a committee of parliament. Ever since confederation there has not been a cabinet in which there has not been a member of the second chamber. The hon. gentleman may easily be excused for falling into that error, but if it is corrected, the argument which he advances vanishes immediately. The cabinet is a committee of parliament and I trust it will always remain so.

The question of taxation would not arise in this case unless it so happened that the road did not earn enough to pay the salaries. I think it would be reasonable to assume that if the road did not earn enough to pay its salaries, the trustees would not come to this parliament to ask it to provide money. They are to be employees of the road and the bill is clear on that point. Their salaries are to be paid from the revenues of the road and not from the consolidated fund of Canada. There will be no charge upon the consolidated fund. The only way such a charge could be made would be in the form of an item. I cannot conceive of these trustees coming to this parliament for their salaries when the road had not made sufficient to pay operating expenses and to provide salaries. Usually that point does not arise in connection with companies of this character.

As to the point which I put to the committee a short time ago in connection with the possibility of the government falling by reason of there not being a joint address, I would state that that was predicated upon the fact that the dismissal took place before they came to parliament. Perhaps that point was not sufficiently clear in the minds of those who followed me. Assuming that the government of the day, that is the executive, took the responsibility of dismissing a trustee or trustees and assigned a cause. If, as has been suggested, that is not a true interpretation of the section but rather that the action follows a joint address of parliament, it is obvious that the government would not fall if the Senate did not agree. If the government risked its power—I am trying to make it perfectly clear—by giving notice of a dismissal from employment of John Smith and assigned cause, it is obvious the government has staked its life upon being able to carry through the action which it has initiated. That means a joint address of both houses of parliament and if one house only passes it, it follows that the government has failed. That would be a matter which should engage the attention of the administration of the day, and when I said that the government would resign, I mean only that a government that I lead would do so. Other governments might take a different view. It is always competent for the leader of the government of the day to take the view that such a situation does not constitute a termination of his office. Hon. gentlemen who have studied political biographies will remember that when Lord Rosebury resigned, it was thought that he should not have done so. He resigned because of an adverse vote on a cordite item in the estimates. It was not expected that he would resign, but all the commentators thought he was only making an excuse for doing so. I am merely expressing my personal and independent opinion that if the executive of the day, speaking through the governor in council, passed an order in council dismissing John Smith as a trustee and assigned a cause for so doing, the government then of course must face just what I said a moment ago, the joint support of both houses, that is, the Commons and the Senate, because the statute so provides, and if only one gave its approval, then the government had failed in the action which was taken by its executive.

Mr. EULER: It could still do as it liked about resigning.

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly; I was expressing my opinion that under those circumstances I would resign; I would have no hesitation about the matter.

Mr. EULER: I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that it was compulsory.

Mr. BENNETT: No; I was only trying to express my view of what the constitutional issue would be. As I say, Lord Rosebury did resign although it was thought he should not have done so. When the vote was taken there were only a few members in the house and the vote was on a cordite item in the estimates. Each prime minister must do what he considers is his duty. In the one case a prime minister resigned, was sent back by the sovereign and consented to form a new administration. I mention that merely because the matter depends entirely—and I am sorry my hon. friends have approached it from the wrong angle—on the method of approach. If the dismissal is made by the executive, the executive must take the consequences of failure to secure approval as provided by the statute. If, however, it asks for approval before making the dismissal, it would not be

bound one way or the other, but it would be an impossible situation to have a board of trustees or any member of it operating in that way.

But it all comes back to this—and I submit it to the committee with some confidence—if we are to secure the type of business men we require for the purpose of discharging this function, we must do as I have suggested. I do not desire in any sense to belittle the arguments that have been made as to political control of railways and references to public services. The fact is that as between private and public ownership, you must sharply differentiate between ownership and administration. If the public in the narrow sense is to manage and administer the enterprise, disaster is inevitable, but if the administration is to be conducted by those who are skilled and competent, under the same restrictions and with the same supervisions and safeguards as are imposed by shareholders upon their directors and as public ownership, that is the public ownership of a utility, exercises its power to ensure it that security, stability, continuity, efficiency and effectiveness in management and administration that are essential, then I believe we may succeed. But I do not think there is any chance for what I call public ownership if it is to be subject to the pitfalls that arise from purely public administration, and I draw a sharp distinction between holding administration responsible not to the whole body of the public and the delegation of administration of power by the government to the persons selected for that purpose. That has been the experience, at least in other countries. In Germany they have had for a long time a system of public administration. In Australia their railroads were so administered for a time, and it will be remembered that Sir Thomas Tait, then Mr. Thomas Tait, left for Victoria for the purpose of administering the state railways. Each state had a different gauge, so that the cars of one state could not go beyond its boundaries into another.

Many hon. gentlemen know we have had great difficulty in connection with what we describe in no offensive terms as the political effect on governments of the administration of government-owned property. I should like to give the committee an illustration of that because I should think every hon. member would be interested. One of the members of the pension appeal board brought an action against the crown for damages for his salary. It will be recalled that the position was abolished in 1930. I daresay hon. members will remember that by a joint committee we arrived at certain conclusions and they had the result of abolishing the appeal board as then existing. The consequence was that several gentlemen were out of positions; they secured a fiat and brought an action against the crown. This action was dismissed by the exchequer court and by the Supreme Court of Canada. The other day counsel applied for leave to appeal to the privy council. In reading the proceedings and the application I find that counsel said this: After this statute was passed, there was a general election in Canada and as a result of this changed condition, the appellant, not being of the political faith of the new government, did not secure a position under the new administration as he would have had the government of the day been sustained, and others who were of a different faith were more fortunate. That illustrates what counsel will say before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council regarding political matters in a country like this.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I suppose that did not have much effect on the court?

Mr. BENNETT: I hope not, but I give it as an illustration of just how men's minds run with respect to matters of that kind. I resent the statement because as a matter of fact the legislation in question was not passed by this administration and it unfortunately became the duty of the government to give effect to a portion of it.

The word "politics" in connection with matters of this kind has of course sometimes assumed a very sinister meaning. Politics in the other sense is the science of government and in the broad sense politics has played and always will play a considerable part in connection with everything that is done in the government of the country. But in this case I assure the committee that we are more concerned than hon. members have any knowledge of in our struggle to secure competent and proper trustees. In that effort we have gone a very long way to secure to those whom we appoint some, shall I say assurance that they are not at once to be in conflict with the executive under conditions that make it possible for it to terminate their employment suddenly for good cause if you will, or for a cause that is the result of an endeavour to find an excuse. The case put by the hon. member for North Waterloo might be one in point; I can conceive that possibility, because you can always give instances where the operations of one road are not to be compared with those of another in the territory

served and conditions of operating. Generally speaking, the human element is as capable in the one case as in the other; the physical equipment is as efficient in the one as in the other and results can be attributed to density of traffic and conditions of the country in which the service is being rendered. So with this hope we ask the committee to surround the employment of these people with the safeguards I have mentioned.

There is nothing I can add to what I have said and what has been said by the minister and by others on this side. All we can do is to say to the committee and to you, Mr. Chairman, that we believe it is essential in the public interest that this safeguard in this clause should be enacted, and the government is endeavouring to use the authority which belongs to government for the purpose of passing it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with the Prime Minister that there is nothing further that he could add to what he has just said which would enable him to wriggle out of the untenable position that he took at the outset, I do submit however, that while he has resorted with some degree of skill to endless circumlocution in seeking to wriggle out of that original position, he is far from convincing us that the position which he originally took did not differ very materially from what he is now saying it was. May I give my reason? A moment ago he said that the latter part of a statement of mine contradicted the former part. I would say the same of what he has just said. He said in the earlier part of his remarks that these trustees did not have to come to parliament for their salaries and they did not have to come to parliament for money—

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—unless they were in a hole where they were not getting sufficient to carry on with.

Mr. BENNETT: Every dollar that they get for the purposes of capital expenditure on that property this parliament gives them, and for deficits and everything else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: These gentlemen do not come to parliament for their salaries; they are secure in their position, and the Prime Minister by this clause is seeking to make them absolutely secure against dismissal except by an address of both houses of parliament. If a ministry were to dismiss them before asking parliament to dismiss them—

Mr. BENNETT: That is the usual course.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What then is the use of inserting a clause that they can only be dismissed by both houses?

Mr. BENNETT: To prevent any abuse of the power; just exactly that. No executive is going to dismiss people when they know that behind their action there must be the approval not only of this chamber but of the other chamber.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When this section becomes law any action of any ministry in the direction of dismissing these gentlemen is of no avail at all until both houses of parliament have joined in an address to that end. The Prime Minister now says that a ministry that wishes to get rid of these gentlemen might get rid of them by dismissing them first, and then getting the approval of parliament. In so saying he is contradicting the language of the proposed statute because under this section these men cannot be dismissed until both houses have acquiesced. The Prime Minister might as well say at once, especially after his Minister of Railways has openly differed with him, and now that he recognizes that he has not support in his own cabinet for the doctrine he was putting forward, that his original position is untenable and that he is now recanting what he said. For that he might well be commended.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, we have had quite a lengthy discussion from all sides, the right hon. gentleman has put himself on record and other hon. gentlemen, and with all respect I would suggest that we take the vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All right.

Mr. HEENAN: I would be prepared to support this clause if the minister would take into consideration the insertion of a provision that no railway employee on the Canadian National would be dismissed except on a joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HEENAN: Why the laugh? What right has a trustee to be appointed with all these safeguards, a man who has a right to dismiss employees without justification, a man who has the right to dismiss the manager of the Canadian National Railways if he does not do his bidding, a man so entrenched in power that his salary cannot be reduced or he himself be dismissed from office unless the government risks its life upon passing a joint resolution of the Senate and Commons. I never heard anything so preposterous in all my life. We have heard of dictatorships,

but Mussolini and Hitler in Germany were never surrounded with all the safeguards that these trustees will have after they are appointed. The easiest way for the Prime Minister to get out of power would be to appoint these trustees as soon as we get this bill passed enacting this clause. That would be the easiest way for him to get out and go to the country, and if I thought that that would be the result I would vote for this clause immediately so that the people could pass upon the record of this government. Here we have been discussing this measure for the last three weeks, and we have now come to the point where we are asked to pass a clause providing for the appointment of a dictator with all the worst elements of a dictatorship because the government appoints this man to-day and cannot dismiss him to-morrow. This dictator has power to make an onslaught on the railroad unions of this country as provided by this measure, he can create new terminals and create new companies, fifty per cent Canadian Pacific and fifty per cent Canadian National, and he can say to the employees of these companies: You used to have rights on the Canadian National and on the Canadian Pacific, a certain wage scale and certain working conditions, but under this new company you start in as new men if you start at all. No matter what he does to these men or to other men in the employ of the Canadian National Railways, no matter what he does to all this railway property worth billions of dollars, this government cannot dismiss him unless it risk its life on a joint resolution of the Commons and the Senate. Mr. Chairman, I never heard of such a thing, and I cannot believe that the government is seriously considering enacting such a clause. I would suggest that they consider it further between six and eight o'clock. Here we have a bill with two clauses in it pertaining to labour. As I said before, section 179 of the Railway Act is not applicable to the present act.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment carried?

Mr. MANION: No.

Mr. HEENAN: Mr. Chairman, I heard the minister say "no" when you put the question, which indicates that the government has not changed its mind in reference to clause 7 of this bill. In view of that fact I was wondering if the minister would consent to let clause 7 stand until we had discussed other features of the bill. There is no doubt about it that the trustee is fairly safeguarded, and that he has more power than I should care to give him, if I had anything to do with it. I should like the clause to stand, however, because I would like to see what protection railroad employees would have against a man who might, while in office, use his dictatorial powers.

I have in mind two amendments to other subsections which are now standing, and which provide the safeguards for employees. So far as I am concerned my further opposition to clause 7 would depend greatly upon the consideration given the other amendments. When I have discussed this bill in public some people agreed as to the possibilities I had pointed out, but suggested that to imagine them happening was drawing considerably on one's imagination. One or two of the railway employees actually suggested that I was drawing too much on my imagination. But anyone who was in the house this afternoon and heard the Prime Minister's interpretation of clause 7 must admit that in comparison with his, my interpretations were mild indeed. In fact, as I said this afternoon, I was out with a couple of government supporters the other evening, and while discussing this measure I pointed out that if the government presented a resolution to both houses of parliament calling for the dismissal of a trustee, and the resolution were rejected, the government would have no option but that of resigning. I do not like to use the words they used, but the fact is that they laughed very heartily. I am sure they must have sat in amazement this afternoon when they heard the Prime Minister place the very same interpretation on the clause. In connection with section 16 I have offered two amendments for consideration. I do not know whether or not the minister has them before him. I believe my first amendment is disposed of by the amendment which was accepted a week ago last Thursday night. That amendment affected employees laid off as a result of economies effected. I believe they are not provided for, intentionally or otherwise, owing to the fact that the government accepted the suggestion that after the merging of services the apportionment of work would be done only through negotiations with representatives of the railway employees. My last amendment, however, is still necessary. It is to the effect that wages and conditions of employment would not be changed in an arbitrary manner.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to keep to the clause.

Mr. HEENAN: One more sentence and I shall have finished. I am explaining why I should like the minister to allow the clause to stand. My amendment asks that wages and working conditions of employees shall not be changed, except through the usual method of negotiations. Will the minister let clause 7 stand until we have completed the rest of the bill?

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, we have been letting so many clauses stand that we are not making any progress. I cannot see any association between the hon. member's proposals and the clause now under discussion. We discussed this clause for at least half of the afternoon. With all due respect to the hon. member I think the rest of the committee were ready to deal with it before six o'clock. The government takes its responsibility in the matter, and has decided to allow the clause to stand as it is. After all, the right hon. leader of the opposition and his friends have put themselves on record as opposed to it. I think that should be sufficient.

In regard to the amendment which the hon. member suggested in connection with a later section, I may say that we are trying to pick out those parts which might fairly be put into the bill. As a result we are considering putting in a subclause to section 16, which would read as follows:

The National company and the Pacific company for and on behalf as aforesaid are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company created as in subsection (2) of this section referred to shall give preference for work to employees in any services or on any works taken over by such new company.

There were legal reasons why we could not make it wider than that. While we were just as anxious to protect the men as is my hon. friend, we thought the provision I have just read would give the men as much protection as possible. I believe the hon. member's point is very well covered by the amendment which we will propose at the proper time. I should like if possible to have this clause dealt with.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Section 7 agreed to on division.

On section 9 subsection 6—Approval of His Majesty or of shareholders not required.

Mr. MANION: The wording of subsection 6 of section 9 was opposed in various parts of the house. It was pointed out, perhaps correctly, that the words "approval of His Majesty" appearing in the subsection were not clear. We therefore decided that we would strike out the words "His Majesty or that of any other shareholders" and insert the word "shareholders" the clause then reading as follows:

(6) No order, regulation, by-law, act, decision or proceeding of the trustees shall require the approval of the shareholders of any company to which this section applies.

As the government is a shareholder in certain cases, that would cover His Majesty as a shareholder. Therefore we do not need to put in "His Majesty." I believe the suggested change would cover the intention of the subclause.

Mr. BENNETT: And removes any possible ambiguity.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is right.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The marginal note would have to be changed to "Approval of shareholders not required."

Mr. MANION: Yes. I move that the change I have mentioned be made.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On section 11, subsection 2—Majority votes ineffective unless the chairman included in majority.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott) moved an amendment the effect of which was to make it a straight majority vote, instead of giving the chairman of the board of trustees a deciding vote. In other words, according to this clause no vote of two of the trustees shall prevail unless the chairman is one of the majority. We have discussed it very thoroughly and in all fairness, and we have come to the conclusion that it is better to leave it as it is. After all, even though it is the intention at the moment that in all probability the three trustees will work full time for a certain period at least, the chairman, whoever he may be, will have very much more responsibility and will be a man of outstanding ability, we hope, and he will be the man to whom not only the government of the day but the people generally will look for results. Without doubt the other two trustees will be of importance in the organization, but we adhere to the idea that the chairman will have a position of such outstanding importance that certainly he should be of the majority.

Some arguments have been advanced against this provision, to the effect that a certain

amount of jockeying might take place, but we hope that the chairman will be sufficiently broadminded that if a thing is right and the other two members are unanimous they will be able to convince him that he should be in accord with their views, and with all due respect I think that is a reasonable attitude. I think the clause as it stands is safer for the railways generally and perhaps even for the government of the day as well, because they can look to one instead of to three. I believe the clause is better as it stands.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If the government are absolutely decided on the question I suppose there is no great object in taking up the time of the committee in repeating the arguments I have advanced already. I hope the minister is not wedded to the idea, however, to such an extent that he will not change his opinion if good reason is shown.

I have already indicated, Mr. Chairman, that this is perhaps the most important board or commission the government has appointed or may appoint. It has to do with assets of the people of Canada worth many millions of dollars, and I think it most important that if the work hitherto carried on by a board of seventeen in the case of the Canadian National and a similar board in the case of the Canadian Pacific is to be carried on by a board of three, those three members should be able to exercise their power to the fullest extent. I do not know that I can impress that point upon the government more forcibly than I have already. There can be no doubt that a trustee cannot and will not function, that it is not human for him to function, in the same way if he thinks, "Well, I am able to exercise my powers on this board only when I agree with the chairman." May I point out to the minister that he is going to select three trustees. While under the act he has power to select men who will work part time, I sincerely hope the three trustees will be full time men, for this reason: The minister knows, as I think every member of this committee knows, that we are imposing upon this board of trustees the most onerous duties that have been imposed upon any board ever appointed in this country. You cannot get the best service from them if they are in a position of inequality so that one man is inferior to another. That is bound to produce dissatisfaction because it restricts the powers of the members, and I submit that this is bound to impair the efficiency of those gentlemen. It could not be otherwise.

I should like to take a moment to point out the difference between this and some of the other boards that exercise functions somewhat similar to those that will be exercised by these trustees. Under section 118 of the Railway Act a majority of the directors shall form a quorum. The section states:

> The directors at any meeting regularly held, at which not less than a quorum are present, shall be competent to exercise all or any of the powers vested in the directors; and the act of a majority of a quorum of the directors present at any such meeting shall be deemed the act of the directors.

I am bound to say that under section 119 I find the following provision:

> No director shall have more than one vote, except the chairman, who shall, in case of a division of equal numbers, have the casting vote.

If the minister cannot see his way clear to go the full distance, as I should like him to, I think the chairman surely would be vested with sufficient power if he were put in the same position as the chairman of the board of directors under the Railway Act. That is, he would only have a casting vote in case of a tie. Then take another very important commission. The Radio Broadcasting Act, which is chapter 51 of the statutes of 1932, appoints a commission to be known as the Radio Broadcasting Commission. Subsection 3 of section 3 provides that two members of the commission shall constitute a quorum, and subsection 4 provides:

> In any proceedings of the commission the vote of the majority shall govern, but in case there are only two members present the chairman or vice-chairman may cast an additional vote.

That is perhaps the next most important commission functioning in this country today. Then we have the Canada Grain Act, which sets up a commission known as the Board of Grain Commissioners, to consist of three commissioners appointed by the governor in council. By subsection 7 of section 4 two commissioners shall constitute a quorum, and no vacancies on the board impair the right of the remaining commissioners to act. Then there is the Canada farm loan board, which is to consist of four members, one of whom is to be the minister, who shall be chairman, and the other three to be appointed by the governor in council on such terms and conditions as the governor in council may prescribe. The board may, subject to the approval of the governor in council, make regulations not inconsistent with the act for the conduct of the business of the board. Those are the most important boards or commissions functioning in Canada at present. We have also the Civil Service Commission and one or two others, but I cannot under-

stand why on this board, which will exercise the most important, onerous and difficult functions carried on by any commission in Canada, and which will have control over a vast amount of property, we should not have three members with an equality of votes. No doubt the minister will select the best three men he can get, but when he selects his chairman I do not think he will say to himself, "Well, this is the man who is going to work practically alone." I think he will endeavour to get two other good men as well. It may happen, after this board functions for a certain period, that one of the trustees other than the chairman will prove to the satisfaction of the minister and everyone else who observes the operations of the board that he is the most capable and efficient man on the board. So I say the board will work under a severe handicap if these other commissioners are not vested with full voting power. They cannot take that interest in the work which they should; it is not possible. I am satisfied that the government cannot expect to get from that commission the same results that would be obtained if there were three full grown, full fledged trustees all functioning. I do not know that there is any object in my taking up the time of the committee further. I cannot agree with the minister that we should be doing justice to this great enterprise by handicapping it in the way this section proposes. I have already moved the amendment.

Amendment negatived on division.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 12—Annual budget.

Mr. MANION: In connection with this section the hon. member for North Bruce proposed an amendment, adding the words "subject to approval of parliament," so that the section would read:

The annual budget of National railways shall be under the control of the trustees, subject to approval of parliament.

To this amendment we have also given full consideration. I was strongly of the opinion when it was proposed that it would not be a wise proviso, for it would give to parliament a more strict control over the national railways than has ever been exercised under any government. Let me read the sentence following the one I have just quoted, with the amendment as I have added it:

Amounts required for income deficits, for interest on obligations outstanding in the hands of the public, for capital expenditures and for refunding or retirement of maturing securities shall be submitted by the trustees to the Minister of Finance for the consideration of the governor in council prior to presentation to parliament.

In the original argument on the proposal of my hon. friend from North Bruce I read that sentence, pointing out that under that provision all branches of the railway management might, if parliament so desired, be brought under discussion inasmuch as the Minister of Finance will have to come to parliament with his estimates to cover the items indicated—deficits, interest on outstanding obligations, capital expenditures, and so forth—and in connection with those estimates the House of Commons will be able to do anything that it does to-day. It can appoint a committee to go into matters just as thoroughly as they are investigated at the present time, and if the house at any time decided that it had not received sufficient information from the trustees who were brought before the committee, the house would be in the all powerful position of refusing to pass the estimates. If, however, we are to make the budget subject to the control of parliament, we are simply putting the operation of the railways, the technical operation, absolutely under parliament; we are making it subject to the control of parliament, which is something that has never been done before. Parliament has never, under any government, had to do with the detailed operations of the railways. Under these circumstances I regret that we cannot accept the suggested amendment.

My hon. friend also said that the time was coming shortly when the national railways would not require moneys for deficits, additions and betterments voted by the house; the trustees would not have to come to parliament at all. My personal opinion is that if the Canadian National Railways within the next few years could reach that state of perfection they would have attained the ideal; in other words, it would be evidence that the trustees were handling the affairs of the railways with entire efficiency. I doubt whether it is likely that in the near future they will be in that position, but if they did succeed in getting there—and that success, attained in so short a time, would be more rapid than I expect—then the government of the day, whichever it might be, could bring in an amendment to the act to institute any greater measure of control which might be thought necessary in the public interests.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister's statement is that the government's policy is

one of public ownership but not of public control; the most that one can say is that it is quasi-public control but not public control in the full or any real sense of the word.

Mr. MANION: Not control of detailed operations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The operations, I should say, are distinct from the financial aspect. Of course, in one sense everything connected with the railways must depend upon the finances; but the budget means receipts and expenditures, and I submit that you cannot have public control of any railways unless you have the entire financial affairs of those railways subject to review by parliament. Assuming that the railways are obliged to come to parliament only in so far as it is necessary to make good deficits and the like, these deficits bear a relationship to original expenditures, as well as to original receipts; and to ascertain whether or not such expenditures have been justifiable, and whether the receipts are what parliament had a right to anticipate, involves of necessity a full review. The minister says that we can discuss all these things anyhow. I say that if we can discuss them, to make our discussion of any value we ought to have the final say. Discussion means nothing if as a result of it parliament cannot voice its opinion to effect one way or the other.

Mr. MANION: But parliament can discuss these things as much as it has ever done. According to my interpretation of the clause, parliament can in the future discuss such matters as extensively as it has done in the past, although what my right hon. friend says is true, namely, that the loss would already have been incurred. But that has always been so; we have always dealt with the budget only in so far as deficits, betterments and additions have been concerned. Under my right hon. friend's government as under this, that has been the method pursued. My absolute conviction is that under this clause we have as full power as we have ever had to go into any matter we wish to discuss, but I do not think it would be wise to make the operating budget of the railways subject to approval of parliament. That would be carrying parliamentary interference to an extent unheard of in the past.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the government be still obliged to authorize capital expenditures?

Mr. MANION: Yes; that is distinctly indicated in the next sentence.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The situation with respect to additional capital expenditures will remain as it is.

Mr. MANION: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It seems to me that the government and parliament are really on the horns of a dilemma in dealing with this matter. My difference with the minister is perhaps most simply stated by citing the actual facts, in the words that seem to be most applicable. I think it is a mistake to talk of public control when parliament is deliberately handing over the control of the budget to three trustees who are independent entirely of the House of Commons. I think we might as well say that the government are of the view that public ownership and public control in the full sense of the word are not possible; that the most the government are prepared to concede is that there can be public ownership with a degree of quasi public control. If the minister feels that it will embarrass the situation to have the entire budget brought before parliament, the ministry being held responsible, I will not press the matter further. My own view however is that the Minister of Railways should be continued as such and should be answerable to parliament for the action of the trustees. He should as minister, as a member of the cabinet, review the situation of the national railways in its entirety, and the budget of the railways in its entirety should be brought to parliament; whether to be discussed in detail or not, whether to be discussed in a special committee or in the committee of the whole house, are matters for the government to decide. If you are going to have public control, I think it is necessary that some minister of the crown should take responsibility for the budget framed by the trustees, and being clothed with the necessary authority the government should be prepared to stand or fall as it is supported or not supported.

Mr. RALSTON: I wonder if the minister has considered fully the wording of this section? I understand that his intention is that the items mentioned here, that is, income deficits, interest on obligations outstanding in the hands of the public, capital expenditures and refunding or retirement of maturing securities, shall be submitted to parliament. The minister is perhaps more familiar than I with the act, but let me point out that the act provides for the issuance of securities for equipment purposes without the approval of parliament. That is a capital expenditure which may be made without the

approval of parliament. I mention this because it seems to me the section is none too clear in requiring that these expenditures shall be submitted to parliament. It is worded rather vaguely, the effect being that they shall be submitted by the trustees to the Minister of Finance for the consideration of the governor in council prior to presentation to parliament. Section 28 of the act provides for certain capital expenditures which do not have to be submitted to parliament but which may be passed by the governor in council. Section 30 provides that after parliament has authorized expenditures on equipment to the extent of twenty-five per cent of the cost, the company may make equipment issues for the remaining seventy-five per cent. Under subsection 4 of section 28 equipment certificates and other obligations may be issued without the intervention of parliament. I think the section should be worded a little more clearly so as to provide definitely that these things shall be all submitted to parliament, rather than having the nebulous provision that they shall be submitted to the governor in council prior to presentation to parliament.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member is right as to section 30 of the act. For the information of the committee, I shall read that section. It is:

> Where parliament has authorized expenditures on equipment to the extent of twenty-five per cent of the cost of such equipment, the company may make or cause to be made one or more equipment issues for the remaining seventy-five per cent of such cost.

My hon. friend is slightly in error. In the past these matters had to come before parliament. It is quite true the railway could borrow seventy-five per cent of the cost but it had first to submit to parliament the twenty-five per cent. This is known as the Philadelphia plan and is followed by all the railways on the continent in the purchasing of equipment. Let us say that a railway desires to buy $1,000,000 worth of equipment. They would get twenty-five per cent of the cost from their shareholders—in this case the parliament of Canada—and they would go out and borrow the remaining seventy-five per cent of the cost in the form of equipment trust bonds. These were usually sold in the United States but during the past year, because of the financial situation in the United States and the financial condition of the Canadian National Railways, these have had to be taken up entirely by parliament. I am afraid that for some time to come the amounts needed for equipment will have to be considered in parliament in the estimates of the Minister of Finance just the same as other additions and betterments. But in any event, twenty-five per cent of the cost would have to be approved of by parliament before the railways could go out and borrow the other seventy-five per cent. At the present time there is no chance at all of the Canadian National Railways borrowing money on their own guarantee. As my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce points out, in any event they would have to come here for twenty-five per cent of the cost. I do not think that clause 12 lessens the powers of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. RALSTON: Would the minister just look at the section. I am suggesting that after the word "submitted" there be inserted the words " to parliament". There would then be no question at all as to these matters having to be submitted to parliament. The words "prior to presentation to parliament" would be struck out. I think that would make the section much clearer and would leave no necessity for implication.

Mr. MANION: I would point out that irrespective of the act, these matters have to come to parliament. The Minister of Finance has to provide the money and the only way he can do that is by an estimate. The money must be voted by parliament, so the matter must come to parliament.

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand it, seventy-five per cent of the cost is raised by equipment issues without coming to parliament.

Mr. MANION: They must first come to parliament for twenty-five per cent.

Mr. STEVENS: They could not raise the seventy-five per cent without first getting the twenty-five per cent.

Mr. RALSTON: Section 30 of the act is an enabling clause. Where parliament has authorized expenditures on equipment to the extent of twenty-five per cent of the cost, the company may authorize issues for the remaining seventy-five per cent. Subsection 4 of section 28 refers to equipment certificates or obligations in any form intended to be issued to the public. Under that section they are issued by the governor in council and not by parliament. I contend that this section could be drafted in such a way as to require the submission of these things to parliament instead of stating in an indirect way that they shall be submitted to the Minister of Finance for the consideration of the governor in council prior to presentation to parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: It could be made to read "and thereafter submitted to parliament."

Mr. RALSTON: Instead of "prior to"?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. The section now reads:

—of maturing securities shall be submitted by the trustees to the Minister of Finance for the consideration of the governor in council prior to presentation to parliament.

I suggest that after the word "council" there be added the words "and thereafter presented to parliament", striking out the words "prior to presentation to parliament".

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Could not the section be further improved if instead of the word "consideration", the word "approval" was used?

Mr. BENNETT: Is not that the word usually used when anything is submitted to the governor in council? That word implies a possible disapproval, while consideration is distinct from approval. The section as amended would read:

—by the trustees to the Minister of Finance for the consideration of the governor in council and thereafter presented to parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had in mind the making sure that the governor in council approves every capital expenditure. If it is simply for consideration, capital expenditures might be made by the company in advance of any approval.

Mr. MANION: They must get the money from parliament.

Mr. BENNETT: As the right hon. gentleman knows, that did happen on one or two occasions and it caused trouble.

Mr. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANION: There was an amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Bruce.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Morand): It was only a suggestion.

Mr. YOUNG: Before the amendment carries, I would like to ask the minister whether some time before parliament prorogues he will endeavour to give an explanation of the figures I put on Hansard this afternoon.

Mr. MANION: With what was the hon. member dealing? In the lengthy discussion I have forgotten what it was.

Mr. YOUNG: I quoted figures to show that the decline in earnings on the Canadian National Railways was 24·89 per cent while on the Canadian Pacific it was 19·35 per cent, or a difference of 5½ per cent.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Mr. MANION: I might as well dispose of that now. I noticed some time ago some of the newspapers and my hon. friend and one or two other members were making the statement that in the last few months the decline in earnings on the Canadian National was greater than on the Canadian Pacific. I naturally wondered why that should be. At that time I asked the question of the management. I shall first give the explanation briefly in my own words and then Mr. Hungerford's explanation which is in the shape of a telegram addressed to me. My recollection of the explanation was this, that the Canadian Pacific has not in the United States the connection that the Canadian National has. The Canadian National has the Grand Trunk Western in particular which in the past used to supply a very heavy traffic to the Canadian National by reason of the automobile business in particular and other commodities. The Grand Trunk Western runs from the Canadian side right through Port Huron and Detroit to Chicago, through a very heavily populated and highly developed industrial section of the United States, and because of the severe depression in that section—and Detroit perhaps has been hit harder in proportion to population than any other section in the United States—the Canadian National has suffered acutely. In other words, it was not being fed the business which it had heretofore been receiving. That in a nutshell was the explanation given to me. There was an article in one of the local Canadian papers, a paper which, while of Liberal leanings, is not unfriendly to the administration; I think, generally speaking, it desires to be fair in its criticisms, but this article was so severely critical that I telegraphed to Mr. Hungerford the same night, drawing his attention to the article and asking for his explanation. This is the telegram which Mr. Hungerford sent me in reply:

Mr. CASGRAIN: What paper was that?

Mr. MANION: That does not make any difference. The article was written on April 4, and the reply was sent to me from Montreal by Mr. Hungerford on April 5. The telegram reads:

A statement was given to the House of Commons last week showing the gross revenues of the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways for the first eleven reporting periods of 1933 as compared with the corresponding periods of 1932. The fact that the Canadian National Railways returns showed a decrease of 23 per cent as compared with 1932 and those of the Canadian Pacific Railway a 17 per cent decrease has led certain editorial writers to draw unwarranted deductions. One Toronto newspaper said yesterday:

"On the face of things the Canadian National Railways is getting the worst of the cooperation deal."

The cooperative economies have had nothing to do with the fluctuations in the amount of decrease on the two major Canadian railway systems. The Canadian National management is continuously watchful of the traffic and other interests of the system and there has been no diminution in its efforts to safeguard its business. The fluctuations to which attention has been drawn are no greater than previous fluctuations which were in favour of the Canadian National. The relative traffic situation of the two properties varies from time to time in accordance with changes in the crop conditions and trade conditions in the territories respectively served by the carriers. The explanation of the present swing is to be found in two major factors. The first is that the Canadian Pacific gross earnings are at present receiving a stimulus from a comparatively good crop in 1932 in southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, in which territory that system is the chief transportation agency. For the previous three years that territory had suffered from crop failures. The second condition affecting the relative showing at this time is the falling off in traffic between the United States and Canada and the reduction in United States traffic passing through the dominion, the business disturbance which accompanied the "banking holiday" having accentuated this decline in recent weeks. The Canadian National, by reason of the location of its lines in Canada and the United States, is a larger factor in business of this character than the Canadian Pacific. The earnings of the Canadian National Railways therefore reflect more closely the conditions which have prevailed in the United States and international traffic. In the working out of cooperative measures between the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railways, you may be assured that the best interests of the Canadian National system will be fully protected.

That was a telegram which, in so far as its contents are concerned, was unsolicited by me. I merely drew to Mr. Hungerford's attention this editorial which was a very severe one along the line mentioned, and asked him for an explanation. This is his explanation which is a very full one. In giving mine from memory, I had forgotten that not only he but other officers had mentioned to me the fact, to which he draws attention in the telegram, that crops in southern Saskatchewan and Alberta had increased in the last year as compared with the previous three and that the Canadian Pacific serves, as the committee knows well, the southern portions of those provinces to a greater extent than does the Canadian National, the latter having been built later and serving to a large extent the northern areas. That, I think, is a fair explanation of the figures given by my hon. friend. I thank him for mentioning the matter, because I have had this telegram since April 5, a month ago, and I am glad to have this opportunity of giving it to him and to the committee.

Amendment (Mr. Bennett) agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the section as amended is carried, I think the Prime Minister agreed with me that it would be wise to substitute the word "approval" instead of "consideration" in line 46. I would like to suggest that that be accepted if possible. I have under my hand an amendment to that effect, but I would much rather the amendment came from the ministry itself, if they deem it proper. My reason for again mentioning the matter is this: we seem to be assuming all along that the three trustees will be paragons of virtue, the ministry dark angels and all members of parliament suspect in some way. That may or may not be the case.

Mr. BENNETT: Under present conditions it might be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall not go even that far at the moment, but certainly if these three trustees are going to have power for an indefinite time and to be free from any kind of supervision, I think they ought to be obliged to get the approval of the governor in council before they incur vast new expenditures on capital account.

Mr. BENNETT: I am afraid the right hon. gentleman did not quite follow me in my statement as to why I thought the word "consideration" would be the apt word instead of "approval." Would he be good enough to observe the language of the clause?

Amounts required for income deficits, for interest on obligations outstanding in the hands of the public, for capital expenditures and for refunding or retirement of maturing securities shall be submitted by the trustees to the Minister of Finance—

Not for his consideration, but "for the consideration of the governor in council prior to presentation to parliament." The word "consideration" involves the right to cut them down. If it is merely approval, as the right hon. gentleman will see, there would be no power in the governor in council to cut them down. The addition of another word may be necessary, but the word "consideration" is the apt word there. I quite agree with the idea of my right hon. friend, but the word "consideration" is inserted for the purpose of

indicating that the governor in council may approve or disapprove and if it disapproves, obviously the use of the word "approval" would not be quite apt.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But the words "consideration and approval" might be used; add the words "and approval." Otherwise I think the section will be construed by the trustees to mean, that they are free to incur fresh capital expenditures, and that only after they are incurred will they be obliged to send along a statement of what they have done for the consideration of the governor in council, not necessarily for his approval at all. Then the statement will come to parliament and parliament will be told: "Oh well, the governor in council had nothing to do with this. It was all done before we knew anything about it." I think all capital expenditures ought to be made subject to the approval in advance of the governor in council.

Mr. BENNETT: If the right hon. gentleman desires to make that clear beyond peradventure we might add after the word "consideration" in the forty-sixth line the words "and approval or disapproval in whole or in part" of the governor in council.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is all right.

Mr. BENNETT: It is rather long but I am perfectly willing to put that in.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The leader of the opposition wants to load the government of the day with the onus of approval or disapproval. I think he speaks with feeling on that subject for my mind goes back to the days of the Scribe hotel when a capital expenditure of very great magnitude was made by the railway company without, we were told, the knowledge or consideration of the government. If that lesson has sunk in and this government will be good enough to take notice of that lesson I am heartily in favour of the proposed amendment.

Mr. BENNETT: Then I move, Mr. Chairman, to add after the word "consideration" in the forty-sixth line the words "and approval or disapproval in whole or in part." It is rather awkward but it covers the point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Thank you.

Amendment agreed to.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. MANION: There is also an amendment to be made in the second line. The words "Estimates of the" should be inserted before the word "amounts."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MANION: Would you read the section as it now stands, Mr. Chairman, with the amendments?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Morand): It reads as follows:

The annual budget of National railways shall be under the control of the trustees. Estimates of the amounts required for income deficits, for interest on obligations outstanding in the hands of the public, for capital expenditures and for refunding or retirement of maturing securities shall be submitted by the trustees to the Minister of Finance for consideration and approval or disapproval in whole or in part of the governor in council and thereafter presented to parliament. Income deficits shall not be funded. Amounts provided by parliament to meet capital expenditures shall not be diverted to cover deficits in operation unless with the express authority of parliament.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 16—Cooperative measures, plans and arrangements by C.N.R. and C.P.R.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River proposed two amendments which I shall read so that the house will get the gist of them. The amendment I read a few minutes ago takes in the better part of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Kenora-Rainy River and covers to a large extent the idea he had in mind. He proposed to add the following paragraph to subsection 2:

Employees laid off as a result of economies effected under the provisions of this section shall be given preference for employment in any terminal or other company organized for joint operations.

And then this paragraph:

Employees so transferred to or employed by any terminal or other company shall not be subject to any change in working conditions except through negotiations and shall be entitled to be represented through their labour organizations in all matters affecting their conditions of employment.

We are proposing the following in place of those two paragraphs. It will be subclause 3. The numbering will have to be changed:

(3) The National company and the Pacific company for and on behalf as aforesaid are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company created as in subsection (2) of this section referred to shall give preference for work to employees in any services or on any works taken over by such new company.

There were reasons why we could not go further than that, reasons for example which take into account cooperation, we will say, between two shops in one city with perhaps the complication of other sections of the country being brought into the dispute. If I understood my hon. friend aright, the idea he had in mind was that if two shops in Winnipeg, let us say, were amalgamated, then so far as possible the employees who had theretofore been employed in those two shops should be utilized in the new shop or the shop that was kept in operation. In our amendment we have covered that point without bringing in extraneous ideas that would complicate the matter and simply lead to difficulties between the men and the company. We have endeavoured to cover it as fairly as we could without making it wide enough to start nothing but disputes between the employees and the railway company.

Mr. HEENAN: I believe the minister has gone a long way to cover the point I had in mind, but I fear he has not grasped the full significance of all I had in mind. The minister will observe that section 16 gives the trustees the right to enter into an agreement with the Pacific company and to form new companies controlled by stock ownership between the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National. What the men feared was, and they have to look forward, that the new company might say to the employees that they have no seniority rights, that they are under the new company, and that therefore the new company was not obliged to take them over. The minister has covered that point. But I was not thinking so much of the merging of two shops into one as of the possibility that the new company that might be organized under subsection 2 (a) might tell the employees that they would take the men they required for the carrying on of the service but not under the old schedule of wages and conditions of employment. In other words, they could break their agreements; that is what I had in mind. The minister has gone a long way to cover the point, and if he will only add to his amendment a few words so that there will be no question as to the men having any say in the matter I shall be obliged. His amendment now reads:

> The National company and the Pacific company for and on behalf as aforesaid are directed to provide that any new company created as in subsection (2) of this section referred to shall—

Then I would add these words: "by negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected,"

> —give preference for work to employees in any services or on any works taken over by such new company.

I suggest the addition of only these words "by negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected." That would then be in line with the amendment accepted the other day from the hon. member for East Algoma. If the minister would approve of those words, I believe we would be satisfied.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the hon. member sent across to me the change which he had suggested. I am afraid however, that his proposed change would bring about one of the complications which we are trying to avoid. May I illustrate —I may be illustrating badly, because I do not know at all well how the two companies will go about cooperating as to terminals, shops and so on—but in my own humble way let me illustrate what might happen. I am convinced that the clause he has suggested would cause difficulty. Let us suppose that there are two shops in one terminal point where two railway companies have been operating, and that the two railway companies using two separate shops decided to operate with only one shop. I imagine that that is something which might take place at certain points. Perhaps instead of using the term shops I should use the word "terminals." At Toronto, for example, there is a joint terminal company which handles all the terminal work at that point. It is not a Canadian National terminal; it is not a Canadian Pacific terminal; it is operated by a separate and distinct company. Suppose at Winnipeg the same policy is decided upon,—and at this point may I add that I have no reason for choosing Winnipeg as an example. I have no wish to be quoted as saying that there is any suggestion of this practice being adopted at that point, but it is possible that it may be done at some points. We will suppose that in Winnipeg a terminal company is decided upon such as is operating in Toronto. Such terminal company would be separate and distinct from the Canadian National or Canadian Pacific railways. In working the terminal, by the amendment which we propose, we are directing them to employ so far as possible the men who were employed in the two terminals previously operating. But if we provide that they must negotiate with the representatives of the employees affected there is a danger that the new company would be placed in a difficult position. I may not be able to explain clearly the point I have in mind, but we must remember that it would be a new company. It would not be the

Canadian National Railways and it would not be the Canadian Pacific Railway. Therefore the agreement which they had had with the men would cease to be operative for the time being. There is no reason to think that, necessarily, conditions of labour would be altered; there is no reason to believe that wages would be changed. But at the same time it would be a separate and distinct company negotiating with the men, and I am not sure that the suggestion of the hon. member would not complicate matters. After discussing the matter with the railway companies, and discussing it very fully with my officers, we came to the conclusion that we would not be justified in accepting the suggestion. As the hon. member admits, we did cover the ground fairly well by the amendment which we proposed. I ask the hon. member to accept the clause in its present form, and if it is found that in any case the men are not being treated fairly, there should be no difficulty in arranging an amendment to improve their position. I have no reason to believe that the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian National would treat their men other than fairly; I believe in years gone by they have always done so. I hope the hon. member will accept the amendment which is made in the best of good faith as a reasonable compromise in regard to his two amendments.

Mr. HEENAN: I wish I could, because I am just about as tired of this debate as the minister is. However I am satisfied that the minister would be doing a good turn if he were to invite the representatives of employees to come in, because they always help rather than hinder. Let me give an illustration. We will suppose that in Winnipeg there are two shops. As a matter of fact there are four shops, namely at Fort Rouge, North Transcona, the C. P. R. shops, and the new roundhouse. We will say however, that there are two shops, and that we are forming a new company from them. As I read the clause, it is provided that preference will be given to the employees taken over. However the very fact that preference is given immediately opens up the question as to which men will be taken over, and as to whether they will be selected according to seniority, fitness, age, or for some other reason. Therefore I suggest that as in the last fifty or sixty years the railway companies should negotiate through the two channels. I believe the minister will agree that that is a helpful suggestion. I have left out all questions of wages or working conditions. The minister will note that a week ago last Thursday he accepted the very same amendment, in the following words:

[Mr. Manion.]

They are further directed that whenever they shall so agree they shall endeavour to provide negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected.

The suggestion I am making now is really the same that I made on the former occasion. I do wish the minister would accede to my request.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I do not know exactly what thoughts are in the mind of the minister which lead him to feel that by the inclusion of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, complications may arise. In my own judgment complications would be very substantially avoided by accepting the hon. member's suggestion. I have had much experience in connection with the amalgamation of the two railroads, the operations of two railroads, and the incorporation of the employees of the two railroads into one body. I am certain that if the minister could see his way clear to accept the hon. member's viewpoint he would be making it much easier for those who are bringing about the cooperation. The change suggested by the hon. member would be very helpful if a new company were formed where two now exist.

Mr. MANION: I am just as anxious to satisfy the men as anyone is, and I am very happy to hear the opinions expressed by the hon. member for East Algoma. I still fear, however, that the suggested change would complicate the clause. In the event of the formation of a third company, the two old companies, namely the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific, are directed by our amendment to endeavour to give preference to former employees. The new company, owing to the fact that it is new, will have no agreements; I cannot understand, however, why it would not desire to pick the men according to seniority, as is done in every other section of the railway works. I am afraid if we put in the words suggested by the hon. members for Kenora-Rainy River and East Algoma we would be inserting words which might possibly give rise to difficulties. I propose that for the moment the clause stand, and that we proceed with the two other clauses with which we have to deal. We could return to this one later.

Section stands.

On section 23—Certain orders of tribunal require formal written consent of presiding officer.

Mr. MANION: We are changing the wording of this section merely to clarify it. In

place of section 23 as it now stands I am proposing the following:

23. Where the execution of an order, or the carrying out of a decision of a tribunal, involves the doing of any act which by any statute requires the leave, sanction, assent or approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners, or where in the opinion of the presiding officer of a tribunal composed of not more than three members the public interests involved are of sufficient importance to warrant it, no order made by a tribunal shall be operative without the concurrence of the presiding officer and his formal written assent, and on such concurrence and assent having been given, no such leave, sanction, assent or approval of the said board will be required.

Perhaps that was a little difficult to follow, and I might explain it in a few sentences. Originally it was provided that in a case with which the Board of Railway Commissioners had a right to deal in the ordinary course of events, or in a case where the chairman thought the public interest was involved, he could veto the decision of the other members. It was drawn to my attention, I think particularly by the hon. member for Dauphin, that the chairman should not be in a position to overrule the other four members if they differed from him. I thought this was a reasonable attitude, so this change has been made. In a case where, in the ordinary course of events, the Board of Railway Commissioners would be consulted, the chairman of the arbitral tribunal, who is also the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, can veto the decision if he wishes, because he is acting in the dual capacity of chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners and chairman of the tribunal. In the second place, when there are three members of the tribunal and the chairman considers the matter in the public interest he can overrule the other two members. He has that power because as chairman of the board he is supposed to be, and I think has been and is at present, more familiar with railway questions and with the public interest as it bears upon those questions than the other members may be. So when there are three members of a tribunal the chairman can overrule the other two if he considers it in the public interest that he should do so. Then, in an arbitral tribunal consisting of five members—because as my hon. friends know there are cases in which two other members may be brought in—where it is only a matter of public interest the chairman cannot overrule the other four members; if three of the other four take a certain position he has not the power to overrule them.

I hope I have made myself clear. We have endeavoured to clarify the clause and I believe we have really made it more useful and, if you like, more democratic.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This may or may not be a rather serious power to give the chairman, but I suppose these will be largely cases involving both railways with regard to the elimination of duplication and expenditure. Could the minister cite a case in which the ruling of the board might be overruled. Frankly I do not think this is very serious, but I do not like the idea of an order of the railway commission being overruled.

Mr. BENNETT: The privy council has that right now.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, but this is not the privy council; this is a tribunal. If the minister could give an instance where an order of the board might be overruled by the tribunal it would help us understand this section better.

Mr. MANION: I do not know that I can give a specific case, but as my hon. friend knows there are many instances in which the railways must get the approval of the board before they can cooperate, even without this law. For example, supposing one company leases to the other company running rights over one of its lines. That agreement must be approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners. Suppose that in such a case the board took one attitude and the arbitral tribunal took another. That does not come under this clause, but suppose that happened: in such a case, where the two railways wish to carry on the measure of cooperation and the tribunal decided that they should be allowed to do so, the tribunal could overrule the decision of the board. The real point here is that the chairman of the arbitral tribunal is the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners; he knows the regulations of the Board of Railway Commissioners and, in a sense, he possesses the powers of that board except in cases of abandonment, which my hon. friend will remember we dealt with particularly. With that exception he has the powers of the board in ordinary cases, and in those cases which in the ordinary course would have been submitted to the board he has the power of veto. His agreement with the decision must be put in writing or it does not become law.

I do not think there is anything in this provision that we need fear; I think it is absolutely fair and just. As a matter of fact I believe we have made it better by the change, because we have allowed four members of the tribunal to overrule the chairman in matters of public interest.

Mr. VALLANCE: When a tribunal of five members is appointed who determines who shall be the other two members?

Mr. MANION: If it were a very serious case the two railways might ask for a tribunal of five, and in most cases the president of the exchequer court would be the man to choose the other two members.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 24—Tribunal orders prevail over orders of railway board.

Mr. MANION: This section reads:

In the event of any conflict between an order of the Board of Railway Commissioners and that of any tribunal, the order or decision of the tribunal shall prevail.

We have already adopted a clause providing that in cases of abandonment the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners must be obtained, and the right hon. leader of the opposition suggested we should make that exception in this clause. I took the attitude at the time, with the advice of my legal officers, that this provision was already made in part II of the bill, which overrode section 24. If there is any doubt about it, however, there would be no harm in including at the end of the clause these words:

except in the case of any abandonment of any line of railway.

This is really a repetition, but it will not make any difference and if the right hon. leader of the opposition thinks it adds to the safety of the railways I have no objection.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not pressing that; I do not think that was really what I was emphasizing. What I had in mind was the sort of thing the minister himself had in mind with regard to the previous section. The Board of Railway Commissioners is the body that more particularly represents the public. The tribunal represents the railways plus the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the final word, so to speak, in a conflict should rest with the Board of Railway Commissioners rather than the tribunal. I thought the minister had the cart before the horse, that was my point.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MANION: Then there is to be a section added, which will be clause 28, as follows:

28. This act shall come into force on the 1st day of July, 1933.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I should like to be sure as to the status of the Intercolonial railway before this act is passed and we give this unnamed board of trustees power to administer railway matters in this country.

[Mr. Vallance.]

Mr. MANION: In my opinion there is nothing in this act that will in any way interfere with or take away the rights of the Intercolonial railway, which was built under obligations agreed upon even before the British North America Act was passed. While the British North America Act merely states that the Intercolonial railway will be built, there are at the same time understandings which have never been interfered with and which I do not think will be interfered with under this act. I do not think that any government would disturb the rights of the Intercolonial, so that my hon. friend can set his mind at rest in that regard.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is the minister in a position to advise the committee what salaries will be paid the trustees?

Mr. MANION: No, I am sorry; that is a matter that has not been discussed. The opinion is that if we get the right type of men we shall have to pay reasonable salaries, but personally I do not believe that we shall have to pay any such salary as was paid the late president. I say that without any intention of reflecting on anyone. I have looked into this matter carefully and I believe the three trustees will be paid less than the amount paid the seventeen directors plus the president, because one of the trustees is chairman and acts on occasion as president. I think there will be a considerable saving, even allowing for exceptionally good salaries such as might be demanded.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Even if they give all their time?

Mr. MANION: Frankly, I cannot go into this matter fully because it has not been discussed. I have a few ideas on the subject myself but so far they have not taken definite form, and therefore I do not care to express them at the moment.

Section agreed to.

On section 16—Cooperative measures, plans and arrangements by C.N.R. and C.P.R.

Mr. MANION: We have given a good deal of study to the framing of an amendment to cover the point made originally in connection with this section by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, a section in which the hon. member for East Algoma is also very much interested. Having done that, I do not like to accept any amendment of a kind which my legal adviser, two or three

times in the course of the discussion, has given me to understand that, like myself, he fears will confuse the issue. If the two hon. gentlemen whom I have referred would agree—

Mr. HEENAN: If the minister will pardon me, I will make one more attempt at this stage to convince him. The proposal he is about to submit to the committee means practically that the railways shall give preference to employees. Which employees, may I ask, the senior employees, those most fitted for work, the youngest or the oldest? Many of these questions will come up, and it is absolutely necessary that the negotiations should be carried on through the representatives of the men as has been done in the past. I am not asking the minister to accept my amendment; I am not offering it as an amendment; but I would ask the minister to change his amendment in such a way as to incorporate in it the idea I am putting forward. I believe that is what he wants to do, and it cannot be done properly with the proposal as it stands. What the minister proposes would exclude negotiations with the men.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for East Algoma takes the same attitude as the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, but having given a good deal of attention to the drafting of the clause I regret that I cannot accept it. I assure the committee that I am prefectly sincere when I say that if difficulties arise later on and are pointed out I shall have no objection then to considering an amendment. But I should not like on this short notice to make any change, although I am just as anxious as my hon. friend to safeguard the interests of the men. I think we have gone as far as we can be reasonably expected to go when we stipulate that the railways are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company created shall give preference for work to employees in any service or on any works taken over by such new company.

Mr. HEENAN: The minister says he has discussed this matter with the law officers, and after that discussion he is reluctant to change it. He has listened to me representing what I regard as the sentiments of the men, and he has also listened to the hon. member for East Algoma, a supporter of the government, who has had some experience in these matters; yet he hesitates to accept an amendment which is the practical working out of all these problems.

Mr. MANION: Will the hon. member give a concrete illustration of his meaning?

Mr. HEENAN: Yes, I will, because I believe that the minister wants to do the right thing. Suppose we created a new terminal in Winnipeg, where there are four yards at the present time, three of them operating, and three back shops. On the formation of a new company under this act, with the amendment which the minister suggests, the officials of the railway company will give preference in connection with works or services that are taken over. That means that the railway company can pick and choose among the men, and they might not place them according to seniority, because there is no provision as to what men are to be chosen, or how, or what shall govern in regard to age, seniority, or anything else. All I want is that they shall be taken over after negotiations with the men, so that the representatives of the men will come to an agreement with the company to fill the several positions satisfactorily. The minister knows that we have had a Montreal agreement which has been the subject of dispute for many years, involving the appointment of boards of conciliation, and after the expenditure of large sums of money the men are not yet all satisfied.

Mr. MANION: And never will be.

Mr. HEENAN: Maybe.

Mr. MANION: It is impossible to satisfy all because some are naturally demoted.

Mr. HEENAN: But we can satisfy as many as possible, and if we satisfy the representatives of the men that at any rate will withdraw the railway companies from further controversy. I do regard this matter as important, and I can assure the minister that I am not proposing it off my own bat, because the men really want it. The amendment now suggested by the minister however practically excludes the men from negotiations, for it instructs the railway companies to do the choosing.

Mr. MANION: It does not say so.

Mr. HEENAN: No, but it says this, to put it briefly. The national company and the Canadian Pacific company shall give preference. That is to say, the two railways shall give preference and therefore the representatives of the men have nothing to say as to who should get the preference.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend is not reading it correctly. It is not the national company and the Canadian Pacific company that shall give the preference. The national company and the Canadian Pacific company

are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company created shall give preference. This will be a new company and that is where the complication arises in dealing with the organizations. The new company would not have any contracts with the men. If a new company is formed, as it was in the city of Toronto in the case of the terminal, it would not have any agreement with any organization. Within the last few minutes it has been pointed out to me by an hon. member who represents one of the big divisional points that even though there is no specific mention in the bill, the men's organizations will be in just as good a position as they were formerly to deal with the new company. This clause was drawn up after much study and work in an endeavour to meet the wishes of the hon. member for East Algoma and others, and the legal officers advise me that the clause would be complicated and the men would be given no greater protection by the insertion of this amendment.

Mr. HEENAN: How would it complicate the clause to insert the words "through negotiations with the representatives of the men"? The minister and the government accepted a similar amendment last Thursday.

Mr. MANION: To what clause?

Mr. HEENAN: To clause 16. The minister will note that that section now reads:

> They are further directed that whenever they shall so agree they shall endeavour to provide through negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected.

The words "through negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected" formed the amendment moved by the hon. member for East Algoma which was accepted by the government and the committee. All I ask the minister to do is to ensure that these new companies shall give preference for work through negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected.

Mr. MANION: Can the hon. member give me an illustration of where a complication might arise through his suggestion not being accepted?

Mr. HEENAN: There might be a case where the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific were to use one terminal or one yard. A new company would be formed under this section and it would be directed to give preference to employees of the companies taken over. That means that the new company would have to take men from the Canadian Northern, from the Grand Trunk and from the Canadian Pacific. Some of these men might have seniority rights only in one district and not in another; others might have seniority rights applicable to the district generally, while others might have seniority rights applying to practically all the eastern lines. All this would have to be negotiated under some scheme.

Mr. MANION: Does the hon. member suggest that men might be brought from the eastern lines to work in Winnipeg, for example?

Mr. HEENAN: No.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member mentioned the eastern lines. Let us stick to Winnipeg as an example, as both my hon. friend and myself have been using that city as an illustration.

Mr. HEENAN: There are only the two railroads running into Winnipeg and the seniority rights are fairly uniform. The situation would not be quite so complicated as it would be in the case of a divisional point into which ran three different roads. The new company would have to take men from each organization and they would have the right to say that they would not take men over forty-five years of age. They would have the right to say almost anything and yet the men's representatives would have no say in the negotiations. I think I have shown the complications which might arise and I think the minister would be well advised in the interests of the new companies and in the interests of the men to provide that any arrangements shall be made through negotiations with the representatives of the men.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Will the hon. member permit a question? Does he really think that the seniority rights of any member of the brotherhoods will be interfered with by this bill? If he can give me one instance where they will be interfered with, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. HEENAN: I would not like to see my hon. friend voting against the government.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I have the courage of my convictions.

Mr. HEENAN: That fact alone would make me hesitate to give an illustration. I want to point out to the minister that these complications have arisen and will arise. I am quite satisfied that during his and my lifetime we will not see the end of these disputes. Why the minister should hesitate to incorporate in this section the provision

that these things shall be done through negotiation with the representatives of the men is beyond me. I suggest to the minister that he will yet see the advisability of accepting this amendment.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Are the seniority rights of the men employed by either the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian National Railways jeopardized by this bill? If the hon. member will give me one specific instance, I will vote against the bill.

Mr. HEENAN: I think the minister is aware of the Montreal agreement and he knows what complications have arisen in that part of the country through the abandonment of lines and the merging of services. I am sure that if he insists that this section pass in its present form these grievances will exist during the lifetime of many of us now sitting in this chamber. The amendment now before us would give the men no say at all in the matter.

Mr. MANION: It does not do that at all.

Mr. HEENAN: Surely the government has no intention of providing a measure whereby in Canada new railroad companies will be created that might have for their purpose depriving the railway workers of their rights on the properties of the Canadian National or the Canadian Pacific. Why, this is even worse than anything that was ever contemplated! I have been talking to some of the men and I have drawn illustrations of what could happen under this bill. I have pointed out to them that new companies could be formed and the management of such new companies could call those men in and tell them that they had rights on the Canadian Pacific; they had rights on the Canadian National, but under this new corporation they had no rights at all. That is possible under this measure. I have pointed out to them that the new company could say to them: You did have a scale of wages and working conditions on the Canadian National and on the Canadian Pacific, but on this new company you have no rights, no standards of wages and no conditions of employment. That is possible under this legislation. The minister himself acknowledged that by saying that the national company and the Pacific company could create a new company.

Mr. MANION: I hope the hon. gentleman will make his own speech and not say that I acknowledge anything? I do not wish to acknowledge anything the hon. gentleman says without examining it. I do not acknowledge anything he has just stated.

Mr. HEENAN: If the minister will contain himself, I shall make my speech. He said only a few minutes ago that the National company and the Pacific company could create a new company.

Mr. MANION: At a terminal.

Mr. HEENAN: Or a new terminal, and I say: when they do that, that new company can tell the employees of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National that they have no rights.

Mr. QUINN: The hon. member is absolutely wrong and he knows it.

Mr. HEENAN: All I want to do is to protect the men from that sort of thing. I do not for a minute believe the minister or the government intends that, but under this bill it can be done. Why should we pass an act of parliament that will permit any new company, with a dictator at the head of it, to tell the railroad men that the representation which they have had for the last sixty years is now gone by the board? Some of the men have said to me: "Why, you are drawing on your imagination!" I was told that the other night when I said that my interpretation of clause 7 as it would work out was that if the government recommended the dismissal of a trustee and the Senate of Canada did not pass the resolution, the government would be practically forced to the country. Those two gentlemen with whom I was speaking, supporters of the government, laughed at me. This afternoon we had the Prime Minister from his seat in the house giving the same interpretation. Those two gentlemen are not laughing to-night, and I see both of them in their seats. Therefore one cannot draw on one's imagination sufficiently to cover all the possibilities that are contained in this legislation. We have just passed clause 7 of this bill providing that a trustee cannot be dismissed for five years; that his salary cannot be reduced unless the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada pass a resolution to that effect. He is to be entrenched with all possible safeguards and he cannot be dismissed unless the government of Canada takes its life in its hands. The government that appoints this man to-day cannot fire him to-morrow unless it takes the chance that the Senate may defeat the resolution and put the government to the country. Yet we are going to give this trustee all these powers, power to create a new terminal, a new company, which will have author-

ity to tell the employees that they have now no more rights on the railways than has the man in the moon. Is that the intention of the government?

Mr. MANION: No.

Mr. HEENAN: All right; I shall take the minister's word for that and I believe that is not the intention of the government. I do not believe they ever thought of such a thing, but under this legislation there is the possibility of it and after you appoint this man to administer the legislation, you cannot dismiss him unless the House of Commons and the Senate acquiesce.

Mr. MANION: Let me point out to the hon. gentleman where there is a fallacy in his argument. He says that we are appointing a trustee to administer this measure. The trustee is only one of a group which has anything to do with the act. We are discussing the arbitral tribunal, the cooperative measures in clause 16 which the two railways work together, so that the trustees whom we appoint are only one portion of those who work under clause 16 which we are discussing. The other group consists of the Canadian Pacific, so that the hon. gentleman is not right in saying that we are appointing one man or three men to administer this legislation. The part we are discussing is the cooperative measure which is dealt with not by the trustees but by the two railway companies, by the management of the Canadian National on the one hand and the management of the Canadian Pacific on the other.

The hon. gentleman mentions the Montreal agreement. I know there have been difficulties as to that but everybody cannot be satisfied for the reason the Montreal agreement was made when the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern were all linked up together, and consequently the question of seniority of the men on the different lines of railway came into the picture. It was finally settled on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number. They did not expect by the Montreal agreement that all the men would be satisfied, and under no rearrangement under this legislation can all the men be satisfied. If men lose their positions, they will certainly be dissatisfied, so that it is impossible to put into this bill a clause that will ensure satisfaction to all classes of employees. Though the railways are not specifically enjoined in the case of a new company to deal with the organizations of the men, they will naturally deal with the organizations and the latter will look after the interests of the men. The hon. gentleman is conjuring up many things that are not at all likely to occur. Some of the dissatisfaction that has been expressed—and I say this without in any way meaning to be unfairly critical—by the railwaymen has been induced by the statement of the hon. gentleman that this bill will do such a terrible amount of harm to them. I do not agree with any of the statements of the hon. gentleman as to the immense injury this will do to the railway men. I repeat that under this legislation and a proper revival of business, men will be taken back and not dropped out, and if we do not have a revival of business, whether under this or any other legislation, the railways cannot get on their feet; this bill alone cannot save the railways unless the whole world experiences a revival of business.

[Mr. Heenan.]

Mr. HEENAN: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANION: Does the hon. member wish me to withdraw this amendment?

Mr. HEENAN: I would just as soon he withdrew it.

Mr. MANION: Then perhaps it might be just as well, if the hon. gentleman takes that attitude. In other words he takes the position that if he cannot get his way 100 per cent, he does not want the men to have anything. That is the attitude he is taking at the moment.

Mr. HEENAN: After the minister has that outburst out of him, if he will listen a little while, we shall try to make him see reason. Neither the minister nor any other man on that or this side of the house can filibuster me into accepting anything that I do not think is in the interests of the railwaymen of this country. No threats of withdrawal will scare me out of that position. I will say to the minister right now before I go any further that I would rather see that amendment withdrawn, whether he offers the threat or not, than accept it without the provision to safeguard the railway employees of this country. It is making it even worse that it was before.

Mr. MANION: It is not doing any such thing.

Mr. HEENAN: Here we have a bill that is intended and designed to put between twenty and forty thousand railway men of this country on the streets.

Mr. MANION: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. HEENAN: There are only about two little sentences in the whole bill that refer to labour at all. We discussed the question of inserting section 179 in its entirety, and after

nearly a whole day's discussion I withdrew my amendment on the word of the minister that we could take care of the matter at some future time. Then after nearly an hour's discussion on Wednesday and for the whole of Thursday afternoon we discussed the question again on the clause that we are now discussing, and the Minister of Railways was finally kindly disposed, after a member on the government side had moved practically the same amendment which I had been contending for all afternoon. But I am not going to discuss that at this time.

Here we have an amendment to section 16 which was put in, the minister says, at my suggestion, but it is not the amendment that I proposed. It is not an amendment that I consider amply protects the railroad men of this country. The minister took my amendment into his office and after discussing the matter with his legal officers brought in another amendment which I say goes a long way to take care of the situation, provided that these negotiations are carried on through the representatives of the employees affected, but when it comes to that suggestion the minister hesitates to accept it. The very fact that the minister refuses now to accept my suggestion —it is not an amendment—indicates to me one thing, that the government or the minister's officers or his legal advisers fear that there is something in those few words that will give the representatives of the railway employees some say in the matter. Consequently the amendment as now proposed by the minister practically excludes by law the representatives of the employees from negotiating with the company.

Mr. MANION: It does not do anything of the sort. The hon. gentleman is just building up a lot of straw men so that he can go out and parade them about on the hustings.

Mr. HEENAN: I would have a lot of straw men to build up before they would be as strawy as a lot on the other side of the house. I am not building up any straw men at all. The bill says that new companies may be created, and the new companies can say just what they like to the representatives of the men. The men have no say in the matter. I do not want to say it, but my mind is coming pretty close to thinking that that is what is designed by the government.

Mr. MANION: You have said worse than that lots of times. Why not go ahead?

Mr. HEENAN: I will say this: If the minister does not accept this suggestion, I will say that this was designed to be done by the government.

Mr. MANION: I do not care what you say. Go ahead.

Mr. HEENAN: I know, but there will be a time when you will care, just like the rest of us care. I would rather be elected or defeated representing the voice of the men than representing the voice of the bondholders and the money lenders of New York. I am not going to be a party, if I can help it, to sitting idly by while a law passes through this parliament which practically excludes the representatives of the employees from any negotiations in connection with these mergers. That is really the game, and we will see how far it goes. He laughs best who laughs last. The minister's amendment reads:

> The National company and the Pacific company for and on behalf as aforesaid are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company created as in subsection (2) of this section referred to shall give preference—

That is the new company shall give preference:

> —for work to employees in any services or on any works taken over by such new company.

The new company created shall give preference. What preference, and to whom? To what class of men? Will they take men in according to their age, their seniority, their fitness for service? Will they take a greater proportion from one company than from the other? All these things must be done as they have always been done for the past fifty or sixty years and that is through negotiations with the men, but the minister by his amendment practically says that the company shall discriminate, that the company's officers are the only ones with any right to a say in the matter, and consequently the men are excluded by act of parliament. This is far more serious than anyone contemplated. I challenge the minister to take me at my word when I suggest that this is being done designedly by the government. Let him show that it is not, but that on the contrary he intends to provide in a measure a safeguard so that the representatives of the men will have some say in the matter. The same argument prevailed a week ago last Thursday.

The companies under this bill are empowered to do what? To form new companies, enter into leases, entrusting agreements, or licences, or agreements for the pooling and division of earnings arising from the joint operation of any part or parts of freight or passenger traffic, and to make arrangements with respect to joint trackage, running rights, joint ownership, or joint operating agreements. The minister accepted an amendment that these things would be done through negotiations of the

representatives of the men affected. But when we come to the point where a new company is created, we fear to embarrass the new company. We feel that they may call in the representatives of the employees, and because of that we now have an amendment before us to exclude entirely the heads of the railroad unions. I cannot for the life of me see yet why we should pass a law in this country which is designed, and it is of no use if it is not so designed, to throw thousands of railroad employees out on the streets. The government refuse to accept any suggestions with respect to compensation such as were made by the hon. member for North Winnipeg. They refuse practically any consideration of the human element throughout the whole bill except in that one sentence which was adopted in section 16 a week ago last Thursday.

Now we are at a new stage entirely. We have a new proposal before us. We have a provision whereby a new company can be formed, and this company can say, and might say, and judging by the attitude of the government now, I am afraid that they will say, that the men on the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National will have no rights in this new company, and that if the men are taken over it will be under new wage conditions without any protection with respect to seniority or any other rights that they have earned. The minister has gone a certain distance by saying that these men will be given preference. But he has left out entirely the most important feature of the whole matter, namely that the work should be given after negotiations with representatives of the men affected. Consequently I am now concerned more than ever because I feel that the law is designed to deprive the men of certain privileges and rights. Why, such a new company could do the men out of their pension rights already earned. The new company could simply say: "You did have pension rights under the old Canadian Pacific or Canadian National railways, but you have no pension rights here." They could say all these things to the men. All I want to do is to provide that arrangements be made through negotiations with the men's representatives. If provision is not made for that, so far as I am concerned I would just as soon see the amendment withdrawn entirely.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Chairman, while I should have preferred seeing the suggestion of the hon. member accepted, yet I am wholly opposed to his suggestion that because it is not accepted the proposed amendment be dropped. I had not the privilege of reading the clause before I spoke earlier, but in the meantime the minister has allowed me to see it. Frankly I do not think the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River need be alarmed if the clause is included. He has said that the amendment is designed to make it impossible for the men to secure employment and maintain their rights. I shall come to a point in a moment or two where I believe I shall be able to convince even my hon. friend that the men will not lose their rights. The amendment as we read it is simply this:

> The National company and the Pacific company for and on behalf as aforesaid are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company created as in subsection (2) of this section referred to shall give preference for work to employees—

To what employees? To whom do they give preference?

> —in any services or on any works taken over by such new company.

May I use the illustration which my hon. friend has been using this evening, namely that concerning a Winnipeg terminal? If the different shops and yards of the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific in Winnipeg are taken over, the companies are directed by this provision to give preference to the employees in the shops, terminals, yards and so on, so taken over.

One other point, in relation to the brotherhoods or organizations, as they are sometimes called. These organizations are not units in relation to specific points; they cover the whole system. They cover the Canadian National Railways from Vancouver to the Atlantic ocean and the Canadian Pacific in the same way. I am not in the least degree alarmed that any of the employees who are members of these units, who are being and have been protected—units which have negotiated with the railway companies—will not be protected in the same way by the same units. In speaking to this subject the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River displayed considerable heat and made definite statements as to what the legislation was designed for. He has made definite charges against members on this side of the house in relation to their attitude towards railway men. I have stated to some railway men whom I know very well, representatives of organized labour, that if more temperate statements had been made perhaps things would have gone along more smoothly. Only last Friday night, speaking at North Bay, my hon. friend opposite made the statement that there was not a member on the government side of the house who was prepared to treat the railway employees any differently than Chicago gangmen on the streets

of that city on a dark night would treat people whom they happened to meet. I say to him that hon. members on this side of the house are just as anxious as he is to see that railway employees get justice. And I believe they are getting justice. As a matter of fact the bill is designed to make it possible for the railroads to earn enough money to employ men, and pay them the wages to which they are entitled. I, for one, want to hand back to the hon. member the statements he made not only in this house but throughout the country with regard to hon. members on this side of the house. I trust the minister will not accept the hon. member's requests for the withdrawal of the amendment. Perhaps it may not go as far in some directions as one might like it to go, but it does provide that in the event of a new company being formed, the companies from which that company is formed are specifically directed to provide that employees shall be taken care of.

Mr. MANION: In addition to what the hon. member who has just taken his seat has said, there are some other statements that I should like to make. To illustrate just how unfair the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River has been, I should like to read another clause which he knows is in the bill, which is part of the clause now under discussion, and an amendment to which was moved by the hon. member who has just now taken his seat. If the committee will direct its attention to the first subsection of secion 16, they will find there a direction that the national company and the Pacific company shall provide for cooperative measures, plans and arrangements. I want it understood that one of these measures, plans or arrangements would be the proposed formation of a new company.

Mr. BENNETT: It is specifically stated right below that.

Mr. MANION: It is pointed out in the bill that one of the measures, plans or arrangements consists of the formation of new companies. The first subsection contains the following:

> They are further directed that whenever they shall so agree—

For cooperative measures.

> —they shall endeavour to provide—

And this is where the hon. member interjected his amendment.

> —through negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected, as part of such measure, plan or arrangement or otherwise, for a fair and reasonable apportionment as between the employees of National railways and Pacific railways, respectively, of such employment as may be incident to the operation of such measure, plan or arrangement.

Then subsection 2 continues:

> Without restricting the generality of the foregoing, any such measures, plans or arrangements may include and be effected by means of—
>
> (a) new companies controlled by stock ownership—

And so on. "New companies" are companies such as we have been discussing. The very thing for which the hon. member is asking is in the legislation at the present time. The amendment simply supplements and strengthens the provision already existing. Yet the hon. member states that the purpose of the legislation—I believe his expression was "the design"—was to injure the men. We have protected the men, not on the recommendation of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, but on the recommendation of the hon. member for East Algoma. He suggested, and we accepted, a change which protects the men to a greater extent than did any proposal suggested by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River. The hon. member opposite ought to be fair in his statements, when he knows that there is legislation protecting the men, that the representatives have to deal with the railways and the railways in turn have to deal with the representatives.

Mr. HEAPS: If the clause which the hon. member read covers the point, is it not superfluous to move any further amendment?

Mr. MANION: Yes, I think it is. But I should like to point out to the hon. member for North Winnipeg, who has been most fair in his criticism throughout, that we have endeavoured on a dozen occasions to satisfy hon. members from all parts of the house. We have been endeavouring to compromise, and to show our interest in the men. As a matter of fact, I have a list before me which only a few moments ago I scribbled on the back of an order paper, which goes to show the amendments which we have made in our endeavour to satisfy hon. members. First there was the amendment we accepted with regard to the abandonment of lines; we included a clause to make the protection to the public in regard to the abandonment of lines stronger than it ever has been in the past. Then my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition suggested the application of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, and we put in a clause in that regard. We dropped the question of a panel; we cut down the

seven year tenure of office to five years; we changed the shareholders' approval in regard to the government. We inserted a clause with regard to amalgamation, though there was nothing in this bill to bring about amalgamation. We did not admit that possibility for a moment, but to show our desire to comply with the wishes of the whole house so far as possible, and to avoid if possible unnecessary fears that might obtain throughout the country that something with regard to amalgamation was hidden in this bill, my right hon. leader and myself agreed to put in the clause with regard to amalgamation. Then there was the amendment proposed by the hon. member for East Algoma, which I quoted just now. There are seven or eight amendments which we have accepted in our desire to protect the workingmen, at the same time giving the companies a fair deal, and in order to provide against any misunderstanding that might arise.

I think we have been eminently fair, Mr. Chairman. I have been in this house for seventeen or eighteen sessions, and I do not believe that in all that time I have ever seen a government measure to which so many amendments offered by the opposition have been accepted in a desire for conciliation and to show our fairness in every possible way. I submit that almost every hon. member opposite has been fair in his criticisms and suggestions with the exception of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, who has not been fair. That hon. gentleman again and again charged the members on this side of the house with a desire to injure the workingmen. No man in this house, whether he sits on the other side, in the far corner or on this side, desires to do anything but help the workingmen so far as that is possible. I think the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River should look at the first part of that clause before he brings forward —as I suppose he will as soon as I sit down —more of his unfair criticisms.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had not intended to take any part in the debate on this section, Mr. Chairman, but the minister, and more particularly the hon. member for East Algoma, seemed to feel that the ex-Minister of Labour was stressing his point unduly, and I think the minister himself said unfairly. I do not think the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, the ex-Minister of Labour, has had any intention of the kind. The other day the hon. member fought pretty much all day long for a certain amendment, and at the close of the day that amendment was conceded. This evening, however, my hon. friend the minister has been giving credit to the hon. member for East Algoma as being the one who in the main was responsible for that amendment being accepted. If we are to be absolutely fair in the matter, we must admit that the amendment was finally accepted by the minister owing to the very hard fight by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River. I believe the hon. gentleman feels that the railway men have placed a special degree of confidence in his judgment in this matter, and I must say that I have reason to think that they have that special confidence. Within the last day or two I have received two telegrams which speak for themselves. I need not say they were wholly unsolicited. I do not so much as know the parties who signed them. The first is dated May 2, and is from Montreal. It reads:

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Ottawa, Ont.

Gentlemen:

Whereas it has been brought to our notice that it has been expressed in the House of Commons and through the press that the Hon. Peter Heenan is not representing the sentiment of the railway employees in connection with railway bill now before parliament, the delegates representing the locomotive engineers on the Canadian Pacific railway from coast to coast of Canada and the Canadian National railways central region now in session in Montreal go on record as unanimously approving his position as taken in connection with railway Bill No. 37.

James G. Grieves, C.N.R.
D. Guthrie, C.P.R.

The next is from Quebec, under date of May 3:

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

General committee of adjustment, brotherhood of locomotive engineers, Canadian National railways, Atlantic region, now in session at Quebec City, wish to advise that the position taken by the Hon. Peter Heenan, M.P., on railway Bill No. 37 is strictly in accord with our views and we therefore want to be recorded as unanimously endorsing his action in connection with the railway Bill No. 37.

F. K. Chisholm, Secretary.
J. E. Mitchell, General Chairman.

These telegrams are from leaders of the brotherhoods named; they have come in response to or as a protest against just the sort of thing that was said to-night by the hon. member for East Algoma, namely, that the ex-Minister of Labour, in what he had been urging, did not represent the point of view of the employees. I will say quite frankly that I think the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River has perhaps reiterated his contention too often. I think he might have been content with making a strong pro-

test and allowing it to go at that, but that he has been doing so for any purpose other than to try to get what he believes to be a necessary clause included in the amendment, I do not think should be suggested for a moment. My own feeling is that the ex-Minister of Labour has stated his position very clearly, and if I were he I would take the word of the Minister of Railways and Canals that what has been done has been with good intent and good purpose, and that he has gone as far as he thinks he can go in the matter at present. Certainly if I were the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River I would accept the amendment before the house at present and allow my own words to speak for themselves as to anything further which should have been included.

Mr. HEAPS: I have not had an opportunity to see the amendment before the committee; I have only heard it read on two or three occasions. It appears to me, however, that if we have two conflicting amendments with regard to similar matters complications may result when the bill comes into operation. In other words, if we have an amendment in the earlier part of the bill which is all-inclusive so far as the bill is concerned, and on the other hand we pass another similar amendment dealing with a particular section of the bill, we may have some difficulty in understanding what is meant. Of course I am not a lawyer and cannot speak definitely on the subject, but if the amendment now before the committee has reference to the matter dealt with by the previous amendment, which is all-inclusive, there may be conflict in the future.

I believe this is what the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River has in mind in pressing his point: In case a new company is created which will take over large numbers of men, the rights of those men under their agreements with the two railway companies should be protected. There is the feeling, I think, in the mind of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River—and to some extent in my own mind—that this may not be the case. A new company may come along and take over some of the employees; the old agreements may be scrapped and the rights possessed by the men under those agreements may not be worth anything.

If I were a representative of the men's organizations I should not be very happy if I had to sit in with the executives of the railway companies to consider which men should be let out of the employ of those companies. The clause itself presupposes that the service of a number of men will be dispensed with, that the railways will have no work for them. If the amendment suggested by the minister is adopted, these men representing the organizations will be asked to sit in consultation with the representatives of the companies, and between them they will determine the men who are to be kept on by the new company and the men who will have to be let out. I know this is an evil which the representatives of the men probably will have to face, and I have no doubt that the railway men would prefer to have their representatives consult with the executives of the companies and amicably adjust the question of who should remain and who should not. In other words, it is a question of retaining for the men in the employment of the company those seniority rights which they have at the present time. That I think is the main point which the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River is now emphasizing. As an ordinary layman, I think myself that if the other clause in the earlier part of the bill, as amended by the hon. member for East Algoma, fits in with the clause now under discussion the bill might be better without the amendment as worded now. If the minister feels that there should be in this particular clause an amendment dealing with the rights of the men, it should be all-inclusive, exactly as in the other section in the earlier part of the bill.

Mr. MANION: I sincerely believe that the men are protected by the clause which I have read. The phrase "through negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected" covers the point made by the hon. gentleman. It satisfies, I think, the objections that have been taken by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, and so far as seniority rights are concerned, I do not believe that there is anything in the act that will interfere with them either on the Canadian Pacific or on the national railways.

Mr. MITCHELL: I support the position taken by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River and the hon. member for North Winnipeg, and I do not say this critically. I believe however that the government is largely to blame for the filibuster that has developed—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MITCHELL: Well then, the protracted debate that has taken place on those sections dealing with the men engaged on the two railways. I submit that the government should have followed the precedent established by the British government when the railways there were consolidated. The position taken by the hon. members for

Kenora-Rainy River and North Winnipeg is absolutely sound. As I have said before, the government must accept some responsibility in this regard. In my judgment the clause as now worded has the potential effect of wiping out seniority rights as a result of the consolidation of these companies. In this connection I wish to read into the record the opinion of a railway manager, Mr. Daniel Willard of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, given before the committee on interstate commerce of the United States Senate:

> . . . the economies to be realized eventually by consolidation—and I believe there will be very substantial economies—will come through making it unnecessary to provide as much new capital as might otherwise be necessary. That is one economy.
>
> The other economies which can be lumped in one item, are labour and material, less of both being needed, probably—particularly labour. In fact, the only way economies can be made to any extent in railroad service is by the use of fewer employees, and with that would always go the use of some less labour. Our figures show that the wages paid for labour constitute about sixty per cent of our total operating expenses, and material about forty per cent. It is safe to say that of that material probably fifty per cent represents wages paid to labour, so that when a railroad reduces its operating expenses by a dollar, it is a safe thought that eighty per cent of that represents less wages being paid to somebody.
>
> We must recognize that in accomplishing these economies that seem to have been thought desirable in the public interest, they will be brought about largely by the employment of fewer men, and that certainly does present a problem in which the men have a right to be concerned. As has been stated, I have expressed my views on that on different occasions and I have said that I thought it would only be fair and right if congress, in legislating on this whole matter, pursued action somewhat similar to that taken by the English parliament in connection with their amalgamation act. In that act, in round terms, it was provided that the men who had been in the employ of the company for five years should not be displaced, and should not be reduced in rank or in compensation, and they should be worked around in such a way as might be until they could be taken care of.

The suggestion is sound, I think, that unless there is some stipulation that the representatives of the men shall be heard in connection with any consolidation it might be better to do without the amendment. Frankly I cannot see any objection to incorporating the proposal of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River; I do not think there is any danger in it. It seems to me it would put the thing on an even keel and might set at rest the minds of men directly affected when any new companies were established, because the minister has frankly admitted that agreements would expire on the establishment of a new company. I believe that seniority rights transcend any agreement, and anything that can be humanly done should be done to protect the men.

Mr. HEENAN: The minister has asked me a few times to-night, and I have tried to satisfy him, to give him an example showing where the suggestion I have made might be necessary. Will he be kind enough now to mention anything in particular that might happen, to prove that the words I suggest would clutter up the act or provoke bad feeling. Can the minister show me where they would do any harm? I have tried to show him where they could be distinctly helpful, and I should be glad if he would show me in what way they would have the opposite effect.

Mr. MANION: I have already replied to my hon. friend on this point and I do not wish to go over it again. What he suggests is amply covered by the amendment which was moved by the hon. member for East Algoma. Something has been said with regard to credit for it, and I am not going to quarrel with anyone on that score. As a matter of fact it was my own amendment and I discussed it with the member for East Algoma. I repeat, what my hon. friend opposite has in mind is covered by the phrase "through negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected."

Mr. HEENAN: Is there any harm in repeating that?

Mr. MANION: Just the harm pointed out by the hon. member for North Winnipeg, that we should not have a lot of clauses that are redundant and unnecessary. We have already accepted a number of proposals to satisfy my hon. friends and I do not think it is necessary to put this in again. The hon. member chose to modify my amendment. My amendment covers the taking on of employees while the amendment of the hon. member for East Algoma covers the negotiations with the representatives of the employees affected. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is covered now.

Mr. HEENAN: With that explanation I am willing to take a different attitude, but I should like to point out one or two things to the minister. Had he in the first instance given the interpretation to the amendment passed last Thursday which he now gives, we would not have wasted most of this evening. Someone must have put it into his mind at the last moment. When section 16

was first introduced I expected him to say that the member for Kenora-Rainy River had placed two amendments upon the minutes last Thursday and that he considered we had the matter covered in the amendment which was accepted by the government at that time. But he did not do that. He offered another amendment and it was in order to make that amendment worth while that I added the additional words in order to carry over the provisions contained in the first part of the section. After all is said and done, this measure is not going to be interpreted by the courts of the country; it is going to be interpreted by the two railway companies and I believe the government will have some say as to what is intended. If the minister says that everything is covered by the amendment moved by the hon. member for East Algoma, well and good; I am satisfied.

Mr. MANION: Then let the section pass.

Mr. HEENAN: I am not going to let it pass before I complete what I have to say. The hon. member for East Algoma has been blowing hot and cold. First he springs these suggestions and then he blows out of the chamber.

Mr. MANION: He had to catch a train for Toronto.

Mr. HEENAN: I am leaving on a train for Toronto also.

An hon. MEMBER: When?

Mr. HEENAN: The hon. member for East Algoma commented upon the speech I made in North Bay last Friday. I am not going to take back one word that I said in that speech. The least consideration that could possibly be given to any body of men has been given to the employees of the railways of this country by this measure.

Mr. MANION: That is not so.

Mr. HEENAN: The minister has been playing around in the most childish way possible. We spent all of last Thursday afternoon discussing an amendment to provide that these negotiations should be carried on through the representatives of the railway men after sixty days' notice. We fought the whole day and then my hon. friend got together with the member for East Algoma and they changed the wording of my amendment to suit themselves and so that it would appear that the amendment had been moved by someone on the government side. I do not know just how much the Prime Minister estimates it costs per hour to run this house, but at least five hours were wasted in order to deprive a member on this side of the credit for having made a constructive suggestion in order to protect the railway employees. Does the minister think that that is playing fair with the House of Commons, with the government of which he is a member, or with the taxpayers who have to pay the bill? Does he think it is playing fair to prolong the session by five hours in order to have an amendment, which he would not accept from this side of the house, accepted from his own side? I would like to have a picture of the people of this country sitting up in the gallery and watching the actions of some of the so-called statesmen last Thursday afternoon. It was the most ridiculous thing I ever saw in my life.

An hon. MEMBER: You were speaking.

Mr. HEENAN: With the explanation of the minister that this matter is covered, I withdraw my suggestion and accept the minister's amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Manion) agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the bill is reported, may I suggest to the minister that before the third reading it be reprinted to include all the amendments?

Mr. MANION: We intended to do that before third reading.

Bill reported.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved the second reading of Bill No. 45, to amend the Soldier Settlement Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

On section 1.

Mr. RALSTON: As this has come on rather suddenly, would the minister just explain the general purposes of the bill?

Mr. GORDON: The purpose of this bill is to give some relief to soldier settlers and to civilian purchasers of land under the Soldier Settlement Act. It is proposed that the interest accruing in the year 1932 shall be entirely remitted. Section 73 provides that any settler or purchaser whose contract was made prior to January 1, 1933, and who makes

payments during the fiscal years 1933-34, 1934-35, and 1935-36 on arrears or instalments due between April 1, 1933, and March 31, 1937, inclusive, shall have his account credited with an additional amount equal to such payment. Section 74 deals with what is known as the three thousand British family scheme. Heretofore settlers brought to Canada under that scheme did not receive the benefits of certain remedial legislation that was passed from time to time. Section 74 provides that the effect of this statute shall be applied to those settlers, provided, of course, that the imperial government takes such action as will permit us to take that course. As hon. members, I think, know, while the Dominion government provided the land, the imperial government provided stock and equipment. Thus there will be a division of the loss in proportion to the amount involved for each government. Generally speaking, the interest of the Canadian government in this scheme is 62½ per cent and the balance is taken care of by the imperial government. This is the way in which the loss would, generally speaking, be apportioned, if the imperial government takes appropriate action to bring their settlers within the scope of this enactment.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Has there been any correspondence between this government and the British government on that point? Has the British government indicated its attitude towards this legislation or been given an opportunity to do so?

Mr. GORDON: I wrote them only a short time ago advising them of the course we intended to take and I communicated with the Minister of Justice, who is at present in London, asking him if he would lay the bill before the imperial authorities in order to facilitate bringing the three thousand British settlers under this bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: How much would those various sums which are remitted under this bill amount to, approximately?

Mr. GORDON: It is difficult to determine the amount to which the various classes of settlers will become entitled, because it will depend entirely upon their ability to pay. I asked that question of the officials; I do not know whether their guess would be any better than ours, but having regard to the number and relying in a measure upon their forecast of the future, they believe that for soldier settlement loans it will run between $7,000,000 and $8,000,000 for the whole of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The amount of interest will, of course, be a fixed sum.

[Mr. Gordon.]

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Has any computation been made as to the amount of interest itself that is involved and which, of course, is a definite amount?

Mr. GORDON: I shall have the figure in a moment.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The other part, of course, depends entirely on how much is paid in.

Mr. SPENCER: I understand the soldier settlers will benefit for three years from this year onward?

Mr. GORDON: Yes; it will be really four years; it goes to the year 1937, as will be seen by the wording of the section.

Mr. NEILL: This bill is practically only one section and if we pass it we shall be passing the whole bill. I would suggest that the minister allow each of the subsections to be passed separately. Will he do that?

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: The minister mentions $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 as being the total amount involved. That means, including the arrears of interest which are foregone for just one year. Does that also include the double credit that is to be given for payments in connection with arrears or instalments due between now and 1936?

Mr. GORDON: Yes, that includes the amount of interest involved, and the balance of it—and I want to make myself clear on that—is purely an estimated amount depending, of course, upon the settlers' ability to pay.

Mr. RALSTON: Are we on new section 72 now?

Mr. GORDON: I was just explaining the bill generally in answer to the request of the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth, but probably we had better start with the first subsection and continue in that way.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that we take the bill up subsection by subsection?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

On new section 72—Certain interest charges remitted.

Mr. DONNELLY: What did it cost in Saskatchewan last year for the administration of this act, for the supervisors looking after the soldier settlers, and what amount of money was collected from the soldier settlers there last year on this land scheme?

Mr. GORDON: While that is being looked up, I should like to answer the question asked by the hon. member for Red Deer. The 1932 interest that would be remitted is $2,250,000. The bonuses as estimated are as follows:

Year	Amount
1933	$1,500,000
1934	1,500,000
1935	1,500,000
1936 (Prepayment for)	500,000

With this $5,000,000 and the remitted interest the total is $7,250,000, part, namely, the interest, a sum certain and ascertained, and the balance estimated according to the ability of the settlers to take advantage of it.

Mr. DONNELLY: I was asking for the cost of administering the act in Saskatchewan in the past year.

Mr. GORDON: The accounts of the soldier settlement board are not completely divided with respect to provinces, but the salaries in Saskatchewan amounted in the year ended March 31, 1933, to $106,915.65.

Mr. DONNELLY: What was collected by way of interest in that province?

Mr. GORDON: The collections from April 1, 1932, to March 31, 1933, amounted to $317,957.94.

Mr. DONNELLY: What is the total amount owing in Saskatchewan?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Can the minister give us similar figures as to Alberta, of the salaries paid and the amounts received?

Mr. GORDON: In Saskatchewan the amount of the loans as of January 31, 1933, was $14,297,421.49. The amount of the loans in southern Alberta as of the same date was $8,076,149, and for northern Alberta, $9,229,-431.61. The amount of the collections in southern Alberta from April 1, 1932, to March 31, 1933, was $169,407.71, and the amount of the salaries $61,437.60. The amount of collections for northern Alberta for the same period was $216,400.97 and the amount of the salaries $80,584.20.

Mr. DONNELLY: When the minister speaks of salaries, does that include travelling expenses?

Mr. GORDON: No.

Mr. DONNELLY: They are extra?

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. DONNELLY: Do you supply cars for the inspectors?

Mr. GORDON: Yes, the cars are supplied by the department to the field supervisors and to those who look after the collections. The number of cars has been very greatly reduced throughout Canada, from 164 to 120. There may be some further reductions that can be made.

Mr. VALLANCE: The minister gave a certain figure which under the Soldier Settlement Act was loaned to settlers in the province of Saskatchewan. Did that include advances to settlers under the three thousand family scheme?

Mr. GORDON: Yes, that included the amount loaned.

Mr. VALLANCE: How much of the amount the minister mentioned was spent in Saskatchewan with regard to the soldier settler and how much with regard to the three thousand family scheme?

Mr. GORDON: The amount of the outstanding loans for soldier settlers, as interpreted under the act, was $8,574,999.63. The amount of loans outstanding to civilian settlers was $2,784,768.83. The amount outstanding in connection with the British family scheme was $2,937,653.03, making a total, as I indicated, of $14,000,000 odd.

Mr. VALLANCE: I have a question to ask arising out of the information which the minister has just given. Does this bill apply to the soldier settler, the civilian settler and the settlers under the three thousand family scheme? Suppose the British government does not agree, as suggested by the minister, will it be applied to the 62½ per cent under the three thousand family scheme?

Mr. GORDON: If the British government does not agree, then the three thousand British families will suffer the same fate as they did under past remedial legislation. They receive no assistance, but I trust, and I think I have a fair ground for my assumption, that the British government will agree, particularly in view of the difficulties that these men are passing through.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS—SENATE BILLS

Bill No. 85, for the relief of Emily Florence Lawrence Knight.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 86, for the relief of Marjorie Bertha Willcox.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 87, for the relief of George Andrew Carruthers.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 88, for the relief of Lilias Torrance Newton.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Hilda Mary Falkenberg Gilmour.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill 90, for the relief of Eva Amy Falle Jordan.—Mr. White (Mount Royal).

Bill No. 91, for the relief of Joseph Claremont Carroll.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Venita Angeline Scotten Kendall.—Mr. Heaps.

At 11.04 o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 5, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. R. E. CHEVRIER (Ottawa): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes). It is this: When will those employees in the government service who have not been paid receive the cheque they should have received on the first of this month?

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): I could answer that question with greater accuracy, Mr. Speaker, if I knew when the interim supply bill, which is now in the Senate, will be passed. I would anticipate, however, that it will pass the Senate on Tuesday night, and we might have royal assent Wednesday so that the money would be available to pay the salaries in question.

WAYS AND MEANS

INCOME WAR TAX ACT AMENDMENT

The house, in committee of ways and means, resumed from Wednesday, May 3, consideration of the resolution of the Minister of Finance to amend the Income War Tax Act, Mr. MacDonald (Cape Breton South) in the chair.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): Paragraph 3 of this resolution reads:

> That the exemption for a dependent child or grandchild be $400.

This makes no reference to age. Has the age limit been changed at all?

Mr. RHODES: There has been no change with regard to the age.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): I believe the age limit is twenty-one years. Under present conditions I know many people who have educated their sons and daughters, but those children are unable to find work to-day, and though they are over the age of twenty-one years they are still at home with their parents. It costs just as much to feed and clothe a boy or girl of twenty-two, twenty-three or twenty-four as it does a child of eighteen or nineteen, and under present conditions, when these young people cannot find anything to do and their parents are compelled to support them, it seems rather unfair that they do not get any exemption in regard to income tax.

Mr. RHODES: I think it must be borne in mind that we have gone a considerable distance as it is. In the earlier stages the exemption applied only to those under the age of sixteen. It was then changed to eighteen and subsequently, whether wisely or not, to the full age of twenty-one. I can understand and sympathize with the cases to which my hon. friend has referred, but I think it must be borne in mind that we must legislate in matters of this kind for at least approximately normal conditions, and we should not put into a statute of this kind methods which are designed to meet a peculiar and abnormal and, we hope, transient situation.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The Minister says that we should legislate for normal conditions, but it is obvious that the government is now resorting to certain taxes to meet conditions that are not normal. There are people in this country with children over the age of twenty-one, who very often find these younger members of the family coming back home when they cannot find work, with the result that the parents have to look after them. In many cases young people are charged with the responsibility of taking care of relatives such as aunts, grandmothers and others. Surely we are facing abnormal conditions to-day, and in taxing incomes the minister should bear this fact in mind, all the more when we see that in the province of Ontario and in other parts of Canada as well the taxpayers have to pay income tax not only to the dominion but to the provincial authorities as well. I think the minister should give this matter a little more consideration and recognize that we are faced with abnormal conditions at the present time.

Mr. RHODES: The exemption in respect to children is based on the presumption that they are dependent, and I think it can be said with equal force that a child over

twenty-one years of age is presumably not dependent. Even if a law could be devised which would permit of exemptions in the case of those over twenty-one years of age, it would be opening the door to very wide abuses with respect to many children over the age of twenty-one who might be alleged to be dependent but who in fact were not so. I think we have gone as far as we ought to go in limiting the age to twenty-one.

Mr. DONNELLY: Under section 4 it is provided that the exemption for a dependent parent, grandparent, brother or sister shall be the actual amount expended by the taxpayer up to a maximum exemption of $400 for each such dependent person. I would point out to the minister that a man might have a son of twenty-five or thirty who because of physical incapacity might be absolutely dependent upon him. Why not make some provision with regard to such people?

Mr. RHODES: There is a distinction between parents or grandparents and children who are dependent because of physical disability, but a vigorous boy or girl of twenty-one is not to be considered in the same category. The presumption is that a child over twenty-one years of age is not dependent on the parents for sustenance.

Mr. DONNELLY: I notice that it is covered elsewhere.

Mr. RHODES: I am informed that if the child is physically or mentally incapacitated the exemption holds.

Mr. COOTE: Will the minister explain for the benefit of the committee and of the people of this country the principle on which this schedule has been worked out. Would it be correct to say that it is on the principle that the rate of taxation should increase with the increase in the income itself?

Mr. RHODES: The schedule as set out has been evolved as the result of experience not only in its application but in its effect upon those who pay. It is not worked out on the principle of a percentage increase on income but on the basis of the dollars paid by the individual or the corporation as the case may be. We cannot overlook the relative rates of income tax in Canada compared with the relative rates in the republic to the south of us, and in that connection I would point out that up to a substantial proportion in the various grades in the schedule it will be found that the total income tax payable under these rates is higher than that which obtains at the moment in the United States.

Mr. COOTE: In the first few items in the schedule the rate increases apparently one per cent with each increase of one thousand dollars of income, but by the time you reach the last items in the schedule the increase of one per cent in the rate occurs with each increase of fifty thousand dollars in income. I think the principle contained in the first part of the schedule might have been continued right through, that is to say, increasing the rate one per cent on each increase of one thousand dollars in income as in the first part of the schedule. That would be much fairer to the people generally. I do not see why a lower rate of increase in the tax is carried out in the schedules affecting the higher income. I suggest that the minister should not follow the example of the United States; we ought to draw up a complete income tax schedule to suit our own Canadian needs, and it would be better to impose a higher tax on incomes in excess of one hundred thousand dollars. If this were done we could do away with a good many taxes that are so oppressive at the present time, such as the sales tax discussed the other day. The tax now before us is the best place to make increases. The principle contained in the act which the Prime Minister introduced two or three years ago but later withdrew, of increasing the rate of tax one per cent with each one thousand dollars increase of income, would be the ideal method, continuing that until it reached ninety-nine per cent on the ninety-ninth thousand dollars of income. Let us adopt that as an emergency measure to meet some of the deficits of the country. If we are to increase taxation that is the form it should take.

Mr. RHODES: If my hon. friend were to apply in stages the percentage increase in income tax as he suggests, he would find that even if there were those larger incomes, they would in effect be practically wiped out. I think it is very unjust to take the case of a man with a small income and state that his tax will be increased by perhaps three hundred per cent because of the provisions of this bill. A man with an income of $2,500 would have paid $2 tax under the old schedule; under the new, he will pay $15. There is an increase of 750 per cent which may sound alarming when considered in terms of percentages, but in fact his tax has been increased by only $13. Looking at it from that angle, which is a practical angle, this proposal does not seem unreasonable. If we taxed all incomes of $100,000 and over even

to the extent of confiscation, the result to the treasury would be practically negligible because such incomes are a very rare thing in these days.

Mr. COOTE: I did not want to suggest that there should be confiscation of anybody's income. The tax which I suggest would leave these very wealthy men with an income of at least $50,000. I am suggesting this only as an emergency measure. I think this would be a better means of obtaining revenue than by the taxing of buns, which we discussed the other day. I do not think the minister has given any justification for leaving the tax on the higher incomes as it was. He states that it is similar to the tax in the United States but I do not think we should go to that country for guidance in connection with our income tax.

Mr. RHODES: May I say to my hon. friend that I did not attribute to him the argument in favour of confiscation. I was using that merely as an illustration from my own point of view. I was referring to the yield which might be expected from such a tax. I agree with my hon. friend's suggestion that we should not be dependent upon any country for the principle which shall govern us in our own legislation. However, it must be borne in mind that this country is in close contact with the United States. Money is such a sensitive and rapidly movable commodity that if we attempted to tax incomes out of line with the taxation in the United States, we would very soon find that our capital was migrating across the line. We have to legislate with that difficulty in mind.

Mr. COOTE: There is another suggestion I would like to make to the minister. I think he should endeavour to arrange a conference with the representatives of all the provinces to discuss this matter of income tax. Some of the provinces impose an income tax while a great many municipalities do likewise and it may happen that citizens may be required to pay three different taxes. If there is no consultation between these different taxing bodies, incomes may be taxed to the point of confiscation. I do not want to see that happen. I should like to obtain the minister's interest in this matter of a conference.

Mr. RHODES: I may inform my hon. friend and the committee that this subject was raised at the last provincial conference. As a result of the discussion a committee was appointed composed of the higher officials of the different provinces and the dominion. They are now at work upon this subject and I hope that as a result of their labours some understanding will be arrived at. In any event, we will have their report within the next two or three months.

Mr. SPENCER: Replying to a question asked by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote), the Minister of Finance stated that incomes of $100,000 and upwards were very scarce. I obtained some figures six months ago which gave the number of such incomes as 132, showing an increase from 75 in four years, 1928-1932.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend must bear in mind that those figures are for incomes of 1931. I can assure him that the incomes for 1932 were very much less and I think I am safe in saying that for 1933 they will be still further decreased. I had that fact in mind when I made my statement to the hon. member for Macleod. The figures disclose that the total number of incomes, not of $100,000 and upwards but of $50,000 and upwards were 614. This was the number returned in 1932 as being applicable to incomes of 1931. I venture to say that this figure will be very substantially reduced for the year 1933.

Mr. SPENCER: Has the minister the total number of incomes of $100,000 and upwards?

Mr. RHODES: I am advised by the commissioner of income tax that the policy has been not to give out these figures. The reason is this: these incomes are very rare and to give out the figures would be indicative of the incomes of individuals.

Mr. SPENCER: For the last ten or twelve years we have been able to obtain these figures, and I was able to obtain them as late as six months ago. Even if the figures showed that only one individual had an income of this size, I think the people would have a right to know. By what reasoning does the minister suggest that it is not in the public interest to give out this information.

Mr. RHODES: For obvious reasons the practice has been not to make public the incomes of individuals. I think that is a sound position to take. When the attempt was made to find out how many incomes there were of $100,000 and upwards, the question first was: How many in Canada? Then, how many in a province? Then, if in a province, in what city? It reached the point where you might just as well ask for the man's name. Naturally the department has resisted efforts of that kind and I think quite properly so.

Mr. SPENCER: But if the question is confined to the number within Canada and does not embrace a small area, it seems that the government is simply holding back information for which hon. members have a right to ask. I cannot appreciate the wisdom of the course taken by the government, nor can I see why the minister objects to giving, not names—I am not asking for names—but the number of people in Canada with certain incomes.

Mr. RHODES: There is no objection to giving that information, and if the hon. gentleman would call at the income tax office, I am sure he would be given it freely.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is all printed.

Mr. RHODES: Yes, my hon. friend can get the information. I am sorry my officials do not have it here, or I should give it now.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I just want to take this opportunity of stating that this type of statistics is available and I have no doubt it can be secured. But I wish to go further and register my protest against secrecy in connection with income tax returns. There should be the same freedom of information in Canada as there is in other countries, particularly in that to the south of us. After all, the minister must remember that in conditions such as these through which we are passing, more and more thought is being given to the causes that bring about such an unequal distribution of national income. A growing sense is invading every mind that interests itself in the subject, that this inequality of income is not necessarily the result of superiority on the part of the individual, but is due to advantages he is able to acquire by the possession of special privileges from governments, provincial and federal, and for other reasons including rather shady trickery in connection with commercial corporation life. The sooner this and other governments realize that they stand themselves as part of the destructive forces of modern society and modern parliamentary practice by hiding the facts that should be disclosed and not uncovering conditions that should be definitely stricken out of the society of our country, the better. As long as governments take the position of sheltering those people who without question are securing more of the national income than that to which they are entitled, just so long do governments place themselves in the position of being defenders of an unequal and unjust social order.

Mr. RHODES: I can only say that, so far as I can ascertain, the result of experience has been that governments in all countries have found it to be in the public interest not to disclose the affairs of private individuals. An attempt to do so was made in one country and publicity was resorted to, but as a result of the unfortunate repercussions which arose from that policy, they reversed themselves and reverted to the policy which had obtained previously and which has obtained since in all countries.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What really were the unfortunate repercussions?

Mr. RHODES: I do not know it is incumbent upon me to give that. All I can say is that in the judgment of that country it felt the experience had been unfortunate. I am not in a position to give my hon. friend the mental processes by means of which the government of that country arrived at that decision.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is strange. The minister gives the experience of the United States—I think that is the country to which he refers—as the reason we should not do this in Canada.

Mr. RHODES: I did not, not even by inference.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then I fail to follow the reasoning processes of the minister. I cannot see any meaning in the statement unless it is intended to be inferentially that. But leaving aside the United States or whatever other country was referred to, I would like the minister to give on his own behalf the real reasons the public should not be given this information. I think we are entitled to have the reasons. The minister simply says that the experience has been unfortunate in some other country, but he will not say why, and he gives no reason why the experience should be unfortunate or undesirable in this country. We expect him to give some particular reasons that such a course is undesirable, but the minister so far has not done so.

I take it that there is a growing conviction that the wealth of Canada is not properly distributed, and that owing to purely conventional or artificial arrangements in society, some Canadian citizens are able to enjoy very large fortunes while others are on the bread line. We have our tariffs, our special privileges of all kinds and financial manipulation which is permitted, if not in some cases almost encouraged by the government. Through all these means certain people are enabled to make large sums of money. On the other

hand, some of those same people who have made the money are drawing, through their ownership of bonds, enormous revenues directly from the public. Within the last day or two we have been discussing a tax on sugar and other necessities of life and this house has been asked to impose upon the common people of the country who are struggling to keep their heads above water a still greater burden in order to contribute indirectly or directly to those people who have more than they should have. That is the way in which a large number of people are beginning to think of things. It seems as if the government is undoubtedly contributing very largely to the popular unrest and to the destruction of our so-called democratic institutions when the wealthy are permitted to continue as they are doing and are shielded by the government in their actions. The minister has yet to give any reason for publicity of this kind not being given. This whole question arose because we simply wanted to get some information for statistical purposes. We cannot get it even when the information makes no disclosure of the names of individuals. Personally I join with some other members in asking for more than that.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The minister has just stated that the reason the increased percentage on the ratings by this year's amendments is higher on the lower incomes than on the larger is that it is feared that capital may leave the country.

Mr. RHODES: No.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is what I gathered from the remarks of the minister. The 500 per cent increase on the lower incomes plus the reduction in exemption, the reduction as regards single persons being $200 and as regards married persons being $400, makes a heavier burden on the small taxpayer. The same percentage of increase has not been carried into the higher incomes. I have frequently heard the statement made that the reason the higher incomes are not taxed according to the same percentage is that capital will leave the country. That attitude is unfair. If that is the case, what is the excuse other than what the minister has said, namely, the necessity of revenue, for taxing the lower incomes so heavily? I believe in the income tax; I do not for a moment desire to say that incomes should not be taxed. This form of tax is the fairest we have imposed upon us. May I say that I am not very much concerned about it; I do not pay very much, but at the same time I cannot see any reason for the inequality. I do not blame the present minister for making that statement; it has been made before in the house. It seems to me that if we are going to have an income tax it should be applied on a fair percentage basis from the lower to the highest incomes quite irrespective of any effect that it may have in diverting capital from the country. I think that bugaboo is raised too often. There should be a fair percentage of the incomes taken all along the line, not a five hundred per cent increase just in one case, as the minister mentioned, and particularly at a time when the Minister of Finance in order to raise revenue has to resort as he has done in this budget to increased taxation that falls upon those least able to bear it. If an individual has a large income I think his income should be taxed according to the same rate as the man with a lower income, and I rise to protest that that is not being done at the present time. Certainly it is not being done now because the minister himself has informed us that there has been a five hundred per cent increase in the income tax in one grade, but he says that only means raising the tax from two to fifteen dollars, and that therefore, after all, it is not so great. Nevertheless it is a five hundred per cent increase, and it is just as difficult for the individual to provide that additional taxation as it is for the man with $40,000 or $50,000.

Mr. RHODES: May I say to my hon. friend from West Edmonton that he entirely misapprehended my reference to the United States.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I did not refer to the United States.

Mr. RHODES: I only referred to the United States in answer to a question raised by my hon. friend from Macleod who urged that we might have still higher income taxes. I was not referring to the individual tax paid in a given schedule. I might point out to my hon. friend from West Edmonton how impossible it would be to apply a fixed percentage. The case I cited was of an increase of five hundred per cent. What would he do in the case of a man who is already taxed fifty-six per cent of his income? How could he increase that man's tax by five hundred per cent?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): There would be very few of them.

Mr. RHODES: I do not think we have any, but I am dealing with the schedule.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If you cannot make an increase in his case, why increase the tax on the lower income? Just reverse the argument.

Mr. RHODES: I am dealing first with the hon. gentleman's own argument. He says that we have increased the tax five hundred per cent in one of the schedules, and asks why we should not increase it five hundred per cent in the case of the higher income. How are you going to make an increase of five hundred per cent in the case of the man who already pays fifty-six per cent of his income? That simply shows that you cannot deal in percentages in a matter of this kind. That is why I said to my hon. friend from Macleod that the gradations were not based on percentages but upon the amount of money which the individual could afford to pay to the treasury.

Coming to the question of lowering the exemptions, my hon. friend thought that bore more heavily on the man with a lower income. Strange as it may appear, the exact opposite is the fact. It bears far more heavily upon the higher incomes than upon the lower because the higher incomes are affected through all the various stages, and in the final analysis the man who pays higher income tax has his income tax increased by a very large sum because of the lowering of the exemptions of income tax.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I did not follow the argument of my hon. friend in one or two matters. He suggested as one reason why secrecy should be maintained in connection with income tax information that the practice in that regard in the United States or some other country had been found distasteful and unsuitable. My reading in connection with the matter has not been possibly as extensive as I should have liked, but from what information I have been able to gather the real reaction in the United States was a sense of injustice on the part of the general public and a sense of deep inconvenience on the part of those who had the high incomes which were disclosed. In other words, it made those with the higher incomes feel a little ashamed of their position, and very properly so. My personal view is that in an orderly society any man who possesses an income out of all relation to that of the masses of his fellowmen ought to have a sense of shame and disgust. He ought to recognize that it is not his wealth. Goods of that kind should never be regarded as his. It is the surplus wealth produced by those who may have been in his employment or in the industries from which he draws his profits.

So far as I am concerned the argument of the minister with regard to the flight of capital, if there was an increase in the income tax, is not tenable. We have not had that experience in Canada where income tax is imposed by some of the provinces and not by others. If the minister's argument were sound, why did not capital flee from the income taxing province to the province where incomes are not subject to taxation? There are other illustrations that might be given. I have no hesitation in saying to the minister and the government that I think it is the duty of the government under present economic conditions in Canada, where we have such a terrible problem of increasing unemployment to meet, to confiscate all incomes over $50,000. Any man or any family that cannot live a luxurious life at present price levels on $50,000 does not deserve to possess more than that. It is plenty for any family. It is an ample allowance, and as it was made through the community effort of the entire state and never through the individual's own efforts—that is the most ridiculous argument anyone could put up, for no man could earn that amount alone; it depends entirely on the community—I would strongly recommend an income tax that would go to the point of confiscating all incomes over $50,000 as long as an emergency of this kind lasts.

Mr. ROBERGE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to these new taxes, especially as they affect the workmen, the farmers who are forced to sell their products at ridiculous prices, and the unemployed whom the government should relieve. I am quite aware that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) requires revenues to balance the budget; however, in order to succeed he should call upon companies or people who are in receipt of an income to supply the necessary funds and not upon citizens who possess nothing.

A number of suggestions made by members in the opposition are worthy of consideration and, if they were given a trial it would help the hon. Minister of Finance to raise the necessary funds for the administration of this country. In a speech which I delivered in the house on April 14, 1932, with reference to the ten per cent cut in salaries of civil servants, and which was to effect a saving of $8,000,000 to the government—such were the contentions—I stated at page 2022 of Hansard:

> If the government actually requires these $8,000,000 to balance its budget, why call upon the small wage earners instead of requesting those who are making large profits and are in

a better position to put up the money, for a year only? Why not increase the tax on profit from 7 per cent to 50 per cent, after deducting what the act allows for living and overhead expenses. I am quite sure that millionaires and high financiers, who boast of being so patriotic when they force small wage earners to pay, would be willing to help the government to balance its budget, since it would only be a matter of one year.

The present budget contains new taxes which are not popular and levied in numerous instances on citizens who should be exempt of such imposts. The tax of 2 cents per pound on sugar will raise a revenue of $20,000,000. The hon. Minister of Finance replying on May 2, 1933, to a question of a member on this side of the house, page 4513 of Hansard, stated:

My hon. friend wants to know what these imposts will yield. Our estimate is that altogether they will yield $57,000,000 but that figure will be subject to change, because there have been some variations.

Mr. McIntosh: That includes $20,000,000 from sugar?

Mr. Rhodes: I have given the figure that was in our minds at the time the budget was brought down. I shall now direct my remarks to the tax on sugar. I know it is not popular; no tax is popular.

Further he repeats:

The sugar tax will not be popular; I realize that.

It certainly will not be popular during an election. At page 4516 of Hansard, on the same date, the hon. minister replied to another member:

My hon. friend has suggested that the tax should be reduced. If we reduce this tax we must make up an additional sum by some other form of taxation.

The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), at page 4517 of Hansard, May 2, 1933, stated:

Now I come to the question of sugar. I think by this time the minister is convinced that this is not a popular tax; it strikes at everyone in the country.

And the hon. Minister of Finance replied to him by the following question:

Mr. Rhodes: Can my hon. friend name a popular tax?

At page 4527, the hon. Minister of Finance, in reply to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm), added:

Mr. Rhodes: Well, who pays the tariff? The people in this country pay. Hon. gentlemen discuss that phase of the question as if they were going to relieve the people of the country of the burden of taxation.

Mr. Malcolm: The tariff is paid by those who are able to pay.

[Mr. Roberge.]

The hon. minister made the following statement at page 4558 of Hansard:

Mr. Rhodes: However, if the committee would give unanimous consent I am content that the list should be printed in Hansard. Perhaps this would be a good time to do so, because Wednesday is a short day, and we would not be unduly encumbering the record.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

1933 BUDGET

Résumé of Changes in Sales and Excise Taxes

The following goods, formerly exempt from tax, now taxable at the full rate in force:

Self-raising flour, oatmeal, rolled oats, cornmeal and rolled wheat, when in packages exceeding five pounds each in weight; buckwheat meal and pea meal; pearl barley; split peas; barley meal; pot barley; rice, cleaned; macaroni and vermicelli; bran and middlings when sold for human consumption in packages exceeding five pounds each in weight;

Molasses: corn syrup; sugar cane syrup;

To a question of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) the hon. Minister of Finance replied on May 3, 1933, page 4566 of Hansard, as follows:

The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay has just returned to the chamber and I am reminded of a question he asked and which I inadvertently failed to answer. I know his absence was necessary because he happens to be the chief whip of the opposition. The articles which we have included in the list to be subject to the sales tax and which have been exempt since 1926 will, according to the best estimate which can be made by the officials of the Department of National Revenue, yield $13,000,000 per year in revenue even under existing conditions.

The budget further imposes other taxes which are too numerous to enumerate. As one may judge by the above quoted list, the hon. Minister of Finance has thought proper, this year, to tax certain staple commodities among the primary necessities of life and to increase the sales tax by 6 per cent on other articles. However, there was already last year a tax on many articles the list of which is too lengthy to enumerate here.

After having closely examined the budget, I find that a large number of my constituents whom I have the honour to represent in the house, will have to face further taxation; they cannot afford it as the wages of the working class, throughout the country, have been cut 50 per cent and work has decreased 75 per cent since the government has assumed power. As to the farming classes they can neither afford this new taxation since they are selling their products at ridiculous prices.

Judging from a number of years' experience in business, I can realize that the hon. Minister of Finance requires revenues, however,

he should be able to obtain them without having to resort to a tax on sugar which will bring in $20,000,000; this does not include the tax on primary necessities which will raise $13,000,000, or the 10 per cent horizontal cut in the salaries of civil servants which will effect a saving of $8,000,000 to the government making a total of $41,000,000.

According to the report of the inquiry held by the government some time ago, and which I wish to consign to Hansard the government could have, in 1932, raised $78,000,000 more had they followed the suggestion I made on April 14, 1932. The following is the report of the inquiry mentioned above:

INCOME TAX

Mr. Roberge:

1. How many persons, companies, corporations or others paid income tax in 1932 on an income of (a) $10,000 to $20,000; (b) $20,000 to $50,000; (c) $50,000 to $75,000; (d) $75,000 to $125,000; (e) $125,000 to $175,000; (f) $175,000 to $225,000; (g) $225,000 to $250,000?

2. What was the total amount of revenue collected by the government in 1932 under the heading of income tax?

Mr. Ryckman:

1.	Individuals	Corporations
(a)	8,306	849
(b)	2,867	879
(c) (d) (e) (f) (g)	614	971

It is not deemed in the public interest to answer (d), (e), (f), (g) separately.

2. $61,254,399.80.

The total amount received is $61,254,399.80. On April 20, 1933, I directed another question to the minister:

INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS

Mr. Roberge:

What amount did the government receive in 1932 by way of income tax from individuals, companies, corporations or others, who paid a tax on an income ranging from $10,000 to $500,000?

Mr. Ryckman:

Individuals, $21,753,463.37; corporations, $35,749,230.32.

To complete this inquiry, on May 2 last, I directed another question to the minister:

INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS

Mr. Roberge:

What amount of money has the government collected by way of income tax during 1932 from individuals, companies, corporations or others who pay a tax on an income ranging from $500,000 to $1,000,000?

Mr. Ryckman:

$20,764,572.05.

Thus the government received from individuals, companies or corporations in receipt of an income of $10,000 to $1,000,000, the total amount of $78,267,265.74.

I am sure, sir, that if the hon. Minister of Finance put into practice the suggestion that I submitted to him last year, the people of Canada would be very grateful to him, and even the individuals or companies affected would understand that, during the crisis we are passing through, those who are in receipt of the incomes mentioned in the report must pay their full quota for the country's administration.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have made some computations. I wonder if the minister can tell us the percentage of increase on the $25,000 income?

Mr. RHODES: I am sorry I have not the percentage figures, but my hon. friend will find a tabulated statement in comparative form in the budget speech. On a $25,000 income the tax formerly was $2,788.80. Under these proposals it will be $3,349.50, making an increase of $560.70.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It is twenty per cent, practically. I have made some estimates rather hurriedly of the increase in percentages, and my estimate shows that on a $2,500 salary the tax was increased by over five hundred per cent.

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: On a $25,000 salary the increase is over twenty per cent. On a $100,000 salary the increase is 8·6 per cent and on a $250,000 salary it is six per cent. I would not be positive as to the accuracy of these figures but they are the percentages I obtained. I submit that those increases are in the wrong direction. I do not know that I will be able to convert my friend the Minister of Finance to this doctrine; but it seems to me that as you get higher up in the salary scale the percentage increase should be greater, just as the previous tax should be greater. Referring to the tax on which there was so much debate in this house the other night, the tax on a household commodity very much in use in this country, sugar, that tax bears upon the man with the $2,500 salary just as heavily as upon a man with a $25,000 salary having a family of the same size. I submit that the percentage of increase should be greater as the salaries increase, instead of the reduction we find.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, I have sent my figures over to my hon. friend. If my hon. friend will show me how he can increase the rate of tax on an income of which the treasury already gets over half, then he will have converted me. My hon.

friend may not have heard my reply to a similar objection which was raised at an earlier stage. It is impossible to deal with this scale in percentages. The very illustration I have given him indicates that. To increase the tax on the income I have referred to even one hundred per cent would mean that the individual would have all his income taken and would have to find some more money to pay it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Pay it next year!

Mr. RHODES: The principle which has been followed is not to have regard to percentages but to have regard to sums, which are substantial, and which the individual can afford to pay.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I just call the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that you have to get above the $500,000 income under this schedule before your fifty-six per cent is added, that is on the excess over $500,000.

Mr. RHODES: I understand that this man is a mythical person who has an income of $250,000, and he pays an income tax amounting to 48 per cent of that income. How would you increase his tax by 500 per cent? This only illustrates the fact that you can twist percentages around and come to any conclusion or no conclusion at all, according to your point of view. I am prepared to admit that we may be taking too great a percentage out of one income and perhaps not enough from another, but certainly you cannot start with the basis of a 500 per cent increase in the case of the $2,500 income and apply that percentage all the way through.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Are we to understand, then, that my hon. friend now says he thinks the increase of 500 per cent is too great?

Mr. RHODES: No, Mr. Chairman; on the contrary I said that while it sounded terrible it really meant an increased revenue to the treasury of $13 from the man with an income of $2,500. That is all it means.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I want to assure the minister that I do not think it sounds any more terrible than it feels to the man having that income, with the various other burdens under which he is labouring at the present time. I want to direct the minister's attention to this fact: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the man having an income of $250,000 was a mythical person?

Mr. RHODES: Yes, largely so, if not entirely. I have not seen the income tax returns for this year, but I think he is a mythical person.

[Mr. Rhodes.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: Then of course this 56 per cent to which my hon. friend refers will not come into operation.

Mr. RHODES: I do not anticipate that there is the slightest danger.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Then this is merely window dressing, providing for a case that cannot arise.

Mr. RHODES: We have followed out the gradations as they have obtained for nearly twenty years, that is all. In former years there were incomes in some of the very high schedules, but it requires no exercise of the imagination to realize why there are none to be found these days.

Mr. BOWMAN: It might be interesting to view the remarks of the hon. member for West Middlesex in the light of the record of the previous government during the nine years they were in office. We all know that during that period family and individual corporations were formed for the purpose of evading taxation, but they were wiped out by this government. We also find, on examining the record with regard to the corporation tax, that when the King administration took office in 1921 that tax was 10 per cent on corporation incomes in excess of $2,000 and less than $5,000, while in the case of an income of over $2,000 and more than $5,000 the tax was 10½ per cent. In 1926 that tax was reduced to 9 per cent, in 1927 to 8·1 per cent and in 1928 to 8 per cent. So from 1921 to 1930 there were successive reductions in the rate of taxation on corporations, and this at a time when corporations were better able to pay a tax than they are at present. Since this government came into office, however, the rate has been increased. In 1931 it was made 10 per cent, later 11 per cent and finally 12½ per cent.

Now let us look at the record with regard to individual taxation, and I will refer to the figures mentioned in that regard by the hon. member for West Middlesex. In 1921 the tax on an income of $4,000 amounted to $80, and when they left office in 1930 that tax had been reduced to $16. By this legislation it is now suggested that this tax be increased to $70. On an income of $25,000 the tax amounted to $3,024 in 1921, and when the King administration went out of office in 1930 that tax had been reduced to $2,024. It is now proposed to increase it to $3,349.50. The next figure about which the hon. gentleman inquired was an income of $100,000. In 1921 the tax on such an income amounted to $32,749.50, and by 1930 it had been reduced

to $19,064. It is now proposed that this tax shall be $27,447. The hon. gentleman also inquired with regard to an income of $250,000. In 1921 the tax on this income amounted to $133,549.50, while by 1930 it had been cut almost in half, amounting to $69,072. This government proposes that the tax be increased to $96,558.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that these figures clearly show the record of the past government with regard to taxation on corporations and individuals as compared with the taxes imposed by the present government.

Mr. BROWN: It may or may not be the case that the higher incomes are not being taxed as heavily as they should. I am prepared to agree in some measure with the hon. member for Bow River, who suggested that under present conditions all incomes in excess of a given amount might be confiscated, but I do agree with the minister when he says we do not get a proper picture of the matter by dealing in percentages. I am of a mathematical turn of mind; sometimes I like to work out mathematical problems, and I have often had occasion to point out the fallacies that we hear spoken in this house based on averages and percentages. Not long ago we had occasion to deal with an item concerning the importation of poultry for breeding purposes. It was pointed out that in one year one rooster was imported and that in the next year two were brought in, an increase of one hundred per cent. I think our friends on this side of the house who have been dealing in percentages have fallen into a similar error.

Mr. RHODES: I have an amendment to move to this resolution, Mr. Chairman, as paragraph 20. It is as follows:

20. That the exemption heretofore afforded with respect to war pensions be repealed.

It will be within the knowledge of the committee that this is part of the arrangement which was arrived at after conferences with the representatives of the several veterans' organizations.

Mr. SPENCER: Before that amendment is put, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of the minister to a question which was placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Roberge). May I read to the house the question and the answer, which will be found at page 4062 of Hansard for April 19 of this year:

1. How many persons, companies, corporations or others paid income tax in 1932 on an income of (a) $10,000 to $20,000; (b) $20,000 to $50,000; (c) $50,000 to $75,000; (d) $75,000 to $125,000; (e) $125,000 to $175,000; (f) $175,000 to $225,000; (g) $225,000 to $250,000?

2. What was the total amount of revenue collected by the government in 1932 under the heading of income tax?

Mr. Ryckman:

1.	Individuals	Corporations
(a)	8,306	849
(b)	2,867	879
(c)		
(d)		
(e)	614	971
(f)		
(g)		

It is not deemed in the public interest to answer (d), (e), (f), (g) separately.

2. $61,254,399.80.

It will be seen that from (c) to (g), both inclusive, they are lumped together, and there is the note at the bottom, that it is not deemed in the public interest to answer (d), (e), (f) and (g) separately. How long has it been the rule of the department to take that stand in answering questions? This information has been given from time to time up until a fairly late date, and although the matter does not come directly under the minister, perhaps he can inform the house whether some new ruling has been given to the department instructing them not to give such information in the future.

Mr. RHODES: There has been no new ruling. The answer was prepared in the income tax division and I am advised by the commissioner of income tax that no change has been made. The practice of the department however has been to resist requests for information leading to inquiries with respect to individual concerns. At the same time, as I intimated to my hon. friend, he can get information from the department—I would give it here if I had it—as to how many people paid last year on incomes in excess of $100,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Am I to take it that if the hon. member for Megantic had applied again to the department he would have been given as full information as he wanted?

Mr. RHODES: The hon. member for Megantic certainly has the same rights as the hon. gentleman who submits the question, and if he had applied to the department they would have given him the information. But this information was given in conformity with the practice that has obtained hitherto with respect to replies to questions of this kind.

Mr. SPENCER: The official must have had instructions to answer the question in the way he did, because I have never yet seen an answer submitted limiting the information in this way.

Mr. MARCIL: I want to put in a word, not for the large income but for the large families. I have seen the tax changed two or three times and I come from a district where incomes are not large but families are. In the province of Quebec, and I am glad to know that in other parts of Canada as well, Canadians have the habit of raising large families, and I think the exemption with regard to children should be graded; the same rate should not be paid by the man and woman with one or two children as by parents who have families of ten, twelve, fourteen or fifteen. The greatest asset of the country is the home, and the greatest asset in the home is the child. We should encourage large families. France, Great Britain, Italy and other countries are now paying bonuses to families with more than three children, graded according to the number of children. Instead of discouraging large families, I would ask the Minister of Finance to give further consideration to this question, if not in this budget at any rate in the coming one, because in his own province families are also large. He should give the father and mother of a large family some encouragement in bringing up what is after all the greatest asset in the country, its population.

Mr. RHODES: I always listen with extreme interest to my hon. friend from Bonaventure, with whom I have had the privilege of associating in this house for many years; but it is news to me, even from him, that the good people of Quebec require encouragement to raise large families. As a matter of fact, to the extent that large families are raised are their heads spared the necessity of paying income tax, because those who receive the exemption multiply the total figure to such an extent as to wipe out any fear on the part of people who are not able to pay that they will be called upon to do so. There is this to be said. If the figure of $500, which was the exemption that obtained until this year, was a fair one having regard to the cost of living, the figure of $400 is to-day more generous. I do not think I can give a better answer than that. Turning to other countries, we find that in Great Britain the exemption to the married person is only $750, and so far as children are concerned, the first child has an exemption of $250 while for every other child it is only $200. So that, bearing in mind these various considerations, I think that on the whole it may be said that we have reached a fair figure. Certainly, under existing conditions, $400 is reasonable.

Mr. DUFF: The minister has introduced an amendment that war pensions shall be exempt from taxation. In his budget speech he said that these pensions under certain circumstances would be taxable. I am willing to admit that in that speech, acting for the government, he went too far. There are certain cases where it would be a hardship for the ordinary individual receiving a small pension to pay an income tax on it. But there are certain men in this country to-day who are receiving one hundred per cent disability pensions and in addition thereto are drawing from this country as well as from private corporations very large salaries. If a man is physically fit and competent to be in the employ of the government, taking the place of some other man who is also physically fit and able to work, he should not be exempt so far as the amount he receives in pension is concerned. I am therefore opposed to the amendment as the minister has introduced it. I am willing to go a certain distance, because I know of men who are receiving very small salaries, either in private life or in the service of the government, and it would be a hardship for them to lose part of their pensions through income tax. There are to-day, however, certain men drawing eight or ten thousand dollars as employees of the government and where they are also getting one hundred per cent disability pension they should certainly pay their fair proportion of income tax.

I congratulate the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Bowman) on the very able speech he made; there could have been no greater compliment to the late government. He said that when the Liberal government was in power they decreased the percentage of taxation imposed on private corporations and other concerns. He went down the line from the time the Liberal government came into power, when the rate was very high, until they went out of power in 1930 when the rate had been decreased considerably. I am very proud that the Liberal party were in a position to do that. The reason they were able to do that was that business, from the time they took charge in 1922 until they went out of power in 1930, was on the upgrade and consequently they did not have to resort to the methods of the present government in order to raise revenue to carry on the affairs of this country. I think he paid this government no compliment when he said that they had been compelled to increase the rate from eight to ten per cent and might be compelled to increase it still further. Let me say to the hon. member for Dauphin that if this government stays in power another two or three years, instead of the rates which appear in this item, still higher rates will be in force. This will be necessary because of the policies of

this government. Trade has decreased by more than fifty per cent since they came into power and in order to raise revenue they have been compelled to increase not only the income tax but the business and other taxes.

Mr. RHODES: I am sure the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough will not expect me to follow him in the major portion of these remarks.

Mr. DUFF: I do not see how you can.

Mr. RHODES: I would be happy to under other circumstances. I rose only to touch upon one point. My hon. friend referred to the proposals as originally brought down in the budget. It may be that, in the words of my hon. friend, those proposals went too far but I would point out that whatever merit they have, they were designed to meet the very case my hon. friend has in mind. They were not intended to be discriminatory against the returned soldier. There are returned soldiers who gave valiant service at the front walking the streets to-day without either a pension or a salary whereas, on the other hand, there are a number of their comrades who are in receipt of both. We abandoned those proposals for reasons which are well known. We desired to come to an amicable and satisfactory solution if at all possible. There has always been a general meritorious desire to keep proposals touching the welfare of the returned soldier free from political considerations. Conferences were held with the heads of the various veteran organizations who agreed to the proposal that pensions should be subject to income tax. This action was taken for the very reasons given by my hon. friend. It was felt that this tax would have a bearing only upon those whose incomes were large enough to be subject to income tax. It will not touch the great majority of pensions. These proposals will not bear at all except in the case of a returned soldier who has in addition to his pension an income from private or other sources running into substantial figures. We are asking for a contribution from the individual who can well and properly afford to make one by way of income tax. With all deference to my hon. friend from Antigonish-Guysborough, I submit that he ought to support the amendment for the very reasons he himself mentions.

Mr. DUFF: If I understand the amendment correctly, those men who are drawing full time pay as officials of this government or in a private capacity and who are in receipt of one hundred per cent disability pension will not pay anything by way of income tax. I agree that the man in the ordinary walks of life who is receiving only a small pension and perhaps a very meagre salary from others sources should be exempt, but if I understand the amendment correctly, such men as are in receipt of salaries of $8,000 or $10,000 from this government as well as a pension of $2,000 or $3,000, will not have to pay a tax upon their pensions.

Mr. RHODES: Under the provisions of the Income War Tax Act pensions have been specifically exempted, and the amendment proposes to strike out those exemptions. Once the exemptions are struck out, pensions will hereafter be subject to income tax.

Mr. DUFF: This year?

Mr. RHODES: The tax will not apply to incomes of last year. The returns were passed on April 30 and it would be highly inconvenient to go back and deal with pensions received last year. However, when a man fills out his return next year he will have to pay a tax upon his pension and other income received in 1933.

Mr. DUFF: Did not the minister in his first proposal expect that all pensions would be taxed for last year?

Mr. RHODES: No, that had no reference to a tax. The proposal in the budget was merely that we should eliminate conditions which obtained where returned soldiers were in receipt of both pension and salary. I have not exactly in mind the details, but the general principle to be applied was that the returned soldier should not receive both beyond a certain amount, the object in mind being that there would be available a number of positions for other returned soldiers who to-day are without either pension or salary. But there was no provision in the budget by way of taxation.

Mr. DUFF: I do not know that I am in order, but since the Minister of Finance has brought the matter up, may I ask: Why was that proposal entirely dropped, as far as it refers to men who are now drawing $8,000 or $10,000 in salary from the government and also 100 per cent pension? I can understand their dropping it in regard to elevator men and some others, but why should the man who is drawing an $8,000 or $10,000 salary from the government still receive a pension of $2,000 or $2,500? That is wrong, and I want to say to the Minister of Finance that unless something is done with regard to this whole pension scheme, this country will be ruined. There is no question in my mind that in Canada there are hundreds of people who have no right to the pensions they are drawing, not only those men who are getting

salaries of from $8,000 to $10,000 and drawing $2,000 in pension, but a number of others, and somebody must have courage enough to say to the people and to the government that there must be an entire revision of the scheme whereby money is paid out in pensions. We are to-day paying out $55,000,000 or more in pensions and part of it is going to men who are drawing large salaries in addition to their pensions. That is not fair in view of the present condition of the country. Those men have no right to draw such high salaries in addition to receiving 100 per cent disability pensions, because any man who is entitled to 100 per cent disability pension should not have any position; he should sit back and draw his pension and not draw in addition a salary. The minister would have the sympathy of the country if he would deal with the matter properly. I know I have been a coward for fifteen years and there are other cowards in this country, but the time has arrived when the minister must agree with me that $55,000,000 or more is too much to pay in pensions to hundreds of people who do not deserve it; it is true there are thousands who do. For instance, I had one case yesterday of a man receiving $3.75 a month while in the Woods building there is a man drawing a salary of $10,000 and a pension of $2,000. Why should the minister exempt that man in the Woods building from the first proposal made in the budget? That is not right and it is time for the people to get up in arms in regard to the matter.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is he?

Mr. DUFF: Colonel Lafleche. There are others besides him and I am sorry I have to mention his name. It is neither right nor fair; there are hundreds who under the Pension Act are getting too much money, who are drawing 100 per cent disabality pensions and also receiving salaries of $5,000, $8,000 or $10,000 from this government or big corporations.

Mr. RHODES: I hope the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough will not think I desire to impart any party flavour to what I am about to say; I assure him I do not, but he will bear in mind that the financial critic of the opposition bore down very heavily in criticism on the proposals as outlined in the budget and those were designed to remedy in part the very injustice of which my hon. friend complains.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister allow me to say that I do not agree with anybody, whether it is the financial critic of the opposition or anybody else, who will load this country with a bill of $55,000,000 or $60,000,000 for pensions, where in my opinion and in that of thousands of others the pension bill is entirely too high and somebody must have the courage to have this condition remedied.

Mr. RHODES: Having made that reference, I wish to say again that I do not make it in any party sense nor do I complain of the fact, but I speak of it merely for the purpose of indicating the difficulty any government has, owing to the atmosphere which has surrounded the soldier problems, in dealing with such matters as this.

Mr. DUFF: It is cowardice that is the trouble.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend will, I am sure, be the first to appreciate the difficulty. I agree with him that there are injustices of which he speaks, inequalities which, in the interest of the returned soldier himself, ought to be remedied, because I fear this, that if those injustices are perpetuated, partly as a result of the policy which has hitherto been pursued by the officials representing the returned soldiers, in the last analysis there will be a revulsion of public feeling which will recoil upon the unfortunate heads of thousands of many deserving pensioners in Canada, some of whom are even to this day not getting as good treatment as they ought to receive. The reason the government withdrew this proposal was not that it is not in sympathy with the idea enunciated by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough, but rather that it hoped it might be able to deal with the matter without creating friction and bringing the soldier question into the political forum. So the government withdrew the proposal and accepted as a compromise different proposals, one of which is embodied in the amendment which is now before the committee, but it was by no means understood that the settlement we arrived at was final; it was a settlement for the moment. But our discussions went further and will call for a review of the whole position of pensions, with the result that perhaps we shall return to normalcy on these matters, if not next year certainly in the very near future. I hope—and I say this from a purely patriotic and public-spirited point of view—that we can now and in the future keep these soldier questions out of party politics, and if we do that, I believe we can, without injustice to the returned soldier who is deserving, eradicate many inequalities and injustices and in the process save a very substantial sum of money to the public treasury.

Mr. MALCOLM: On May 3, the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) brought to the attention of the minister inequalities which, in his opinion, existed in paragraphs 5 and 7 of the Income War Tax Act amendment resolution. I would like to know whether the minister has given any further consideration to the representations of my hon. friend. I want to submit to the minister, in supporting the complaint of my hon. friend, that a 12½ per cent corporation tax cannot be any more just than can an even rate of income tax and that the only way whereby I believe he can correct the inequality pointed out by the hon. member for North Waterloo would be to have some graduation in the corporation tax of 12½ per cent. The minister realizes, as do all other hon. gentlemen, that small family limited companies are not in the generally accepted sense of the term corporations at all. The convenience of operating one's business under a limited credit charter is very great. It allows in case of death the willing of the interest a man may have in his business to his heirs without the official winding up of the business. As a result through a great many years the practice has grown up in this country of forming limited companies of small private businesses. Under our legislation these small limited companies are treated as corporations, and there is no difference in the rate of taxation on these small companies and on a large corporation whose stock is broadly held.

The hon. member for North Waterloo has pointed out that should any one operate a private business where the total earnings were $5,000, he would pay $126, but the same business in the form of a limited company would pay $713. A private business earning $10,000 would pay $546, but if operated as a corporation or limited company would pay $1,667. It makes no difference whether salary is credited or not. I am taking the case where a man takes the profits out of his own business. I think the minister realizes that considerable inequality does exist in that regard, and I suggest to him that the only way I can see of correcting it is to modify the corporation tax by having the corporation tax graduated, as is the income tax, with a maximum of whatever the minister decides, whether it be 12½ or 10 per cent. The fact that a straight 12½ per cent is taken from the corporation first, and then the owner has to pay income tax on the dividend, means that if you operate as a limited company you are paying three times as much taxation as if you operate as a private business. I would ask the minister if he has considered any possible amendment.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, I have considered the question very, very carefully. In the first place let me point out that in the case cited by my hon. friend from North Waterloo it is a one-man company, of which there are very few, and so it is really a question of viewing the incidence of the tax as applied to corporations as a whole and as applied to just a handful. My hon. friend from North Waterloo overlooked one fact. He did not pay the manager of the company a salary, to which he was entitled. We will assume that a fair salary would be $3,000. I have a complete computation here with which I am not going to encumber the record, but which I shall send across to my hon. friend, which discloses that instead of that company paying a tax of $713.75 it would pay a tax of only $357.50.

Mr. MALCOLM: Allowing for salary?

Mr. RHODES: Yes, a reasonable salary, say of $3,000. So that even in the case cited by my hon. friend from North Waterloo and referred to by my hon. friend from North Bruce, you have the comparison of the company paying $357.50 as against the individual paying $120. But I might point out to my hon. friend that there are other incidental things to be borne in mind. If it is an incorporated company there must be some advantage in being incorporated.

Mr. MALCOLM: Convenience largely.

Mr. RHODES: It might be convenience, but it must also be borne in mind that in the case of an incorporated company the individual owning it derives all the privileges which go with incorporation. In other words, if the venture should prove unfortunate the total assets which would be available to the creditors would be the amount of capital in the business, whereas if the individual conducted that business he would be liable for all the assets he had. So whether it is done for convenience or for other purposes, all of which might be equally lawful and worthy, the fact remains that it is to the advantage of the individual to be incorporated rather than to conduct his business as an individual. Otherwise, he would not be incorporated. That being so, the difference is not so great as to cause any undue worry.

I might point out to my hon. friend, when he discusses the question of a graduated corporation tax, that he will immediately see the difficulties with which you would be confronted. The tax would have to be on a basis of percentage return on invested capital rather than on the amount of the income. A $3,000 profit, for example in a very small company, might represent one hundred per cent of the capital invested, whereas half a million dollars in the case of a larger company might be only ten per cent of the capital invested. My hon. friend will at once realize the difficulties and complications that would arise in attempting to apply a graduated scale of income tax to corporations. I think the reason is obvious why a flat percentage is taken off the incomes of all companies. In the United States it is 13¾ per cent. Here it is one-eighth or 12½ per cent, on all companies, and that has a bearing solely on their net earnings. I must say that I have given a good deal of thought to the incidence in question, not only with respect to what I have said, but other considerations, and I do not see how we can apply any amendment to the act which would afford any alleviation in the case in question without doing grave injustice in other instances and causing certain loss to the treasury.

Mr. MALCOLM: The minister knows better than I do that the withdrawal of the private family corporation privilege is what has caused this inequality to exist, as was pointed out by the hon. member for North Waterloo. In spite of what has been said with regard to the advantages of a limited company in freeing a man from the danger of having to hypothecate other personal securities in time of financial stress, I do submit that the general idea of taxation seems to be to get after corporations. Provincial taxes on corporations are mounting, and I am afraid that the result will be that a great many charters will be given up. Many small businesses which have been operating as limited companies will find it impossible so to operate, and the taxation derived from companies will be lost to the provinces as well as to the dominion. For that reason I would submit to the minister, without wanting to hold up his resolution at all, that I believe the subject is worthy of considerable study. I believe the inequality could be corrected by making some graduated scale that would put taxation charges on small corporations back to where they were under the family corporation privilege.

Mr. RHODES: I shall be very glad to give consideration to the matter, and if any remedy can be found without doing injustice to corporations as a whole I shall be very happy.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: May I, Mr. Chairman, revert to the question under discussion a few minutes ago? First I would like to indicate my unqualified approval of the suggestion of the minister to remove the income tax exemption from pensions. This does not affect the small pensions and small salaries, the men we are endeavouring to protect. It will only apply where the total income comes within the range of income tax. But it brings us to the proposal which the minister put forward that was afterwards withdrawn, and I must confess that with somewhat mixed feelings I watched both the introduction and the withdrawal of that proposal. Taking it on the whole I was glad that the proposal to suspend the payment of all pensions to civil servants in receipt of the full salary of their position was withdrawn; yet at the same time I recognize, as so many have recognized, that there are and have been many apparent injustices and anomalies throughout the service that not only should be corrected if possible but that unquestionably cause a great deal of heartburning and disturbance amongst the public and amongst the returned men themselves. I refer to cases of men in receipt of substantial salaries and performing responsible work and being at the same time in receipt of substantial pensions. I am not going to mention any names, but those of us whose work has brought us into contact with pension matters have seen a great many cases that I think are obviously unjust. As the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough said, where you find a man in receipt of a one hundred per cent disability pension, or indeed any substantial rate running from seventy-five per cent up, who at the same time is in a position the duties of which are responsible and onerous and drawing full salary, I think it is obvious to anyone that either the man is not entitled to that high disability pension or he is not qualified to perform the onerous duties of a high salaried position. I think there is no question that these cases scattered through the service bring to the mind of many people the inevitable contrast, which the minister recognizes, between the position of these men and that of other men whose services were just as great, whose disability is just as great, although it was impossible to prove its attributability; and who have neither pension nor

employment. That tremendous and striking contrast has undoubtedly caused a great deal of disturbance and trouble.

On the whole I am glad that the minister withdrew the proposal, not because of the effect on these men with good incomes, but because of the effect on large numbers of men in the lower grades of service, who are just able to make it go with their small pension and small salary. It has been said, and quite truly, that the pension is supposed to make up the difference between a man's present earning capacity and that which he would have enjoyed had he not gone overseas; to make him stand on a par with other men. It was said by some that any man who is earning the full salary attached to some of these positions must have his earning capacity unimpaired. That is not the case with all men receiving disability pension, there are many men in the position they are in on account of their disability, who but for that disability would have been qualified to occupy a much more difficult position and earn a much higher salary, but who because of their disability are able to perform only light duties, so they are low in the salary scale. They would have suffered, particularly as many of them were using that small pension to pay for the soldiers' insurance, the only way they could provide for the future of their families. The withdrawal of that pension would have necessitated the dropping of the soldiers' insurance.

But when the minister says that the matter is not finally settled I am with him. I agree that the service itself—I am not speaking now of the whole pension scheme—the service itself should be examined, and each of those cases of men in receipt of a pension and a salary should be dealt with individually, should be examined into and the anomaly removed if possible. I think no one will accuse me of being unsympathetic towards the returned men, I think my record in the house will establish that. I have sometimes been accused of being over thoughtful of their interests. But I am satisfied from what knowledge and experience I have, and assuming that the cases with which I am familiar give a fair cross section of the whole, that if the pension payments all through were to be dealt with with absolute justice there would be a very considerable saving; probably four or five million dollars could be cut off from our pension payments. But I am of the opinion that that four or five million dollars would not be saved to the country, but would be paid to those who are not at the present time receiving what they should receive if absolute justice could be done.

Our difficulty has been this, the minister referred to it and I agree with him, that although our purpose was right and we have done our best, parliament has been meticulously careful to withdraw pension matters from any connection with politics, and I think parliament has succeeded. I think no government and as far as I know no member of parliament has been guilty of mixing politics and pension matters. I have been on the committee every year there has been one and I certainly would not have known at any time to what party any member belonged from his efforts in the committee. But one thing that has been overlooked, and overlooked perhaps to a greater degree by the returned men and their friends than any others, is that just to the degree that you eliminate politics in pension matters, to that degree you nullify any influence that any private member or the government itself may have over pension administration. To the extent that you eliminate politics you take away from parliament and from the government the influence which sometimes should be exerted over pension administration, and it is left wholly to the officials themselves, to their sense of justice, to see that pensions are properly administered. I sometimes wonder if we have not gone almost too far in our desire to eliminate political consideration wholly from pension matters. However I do not want to go into that question now, I simply want to indicate my complete approval of the minister's suggestion to apply the income tax to all pensions where the total income comes within the range of income taxation. Also I wish to indicate my agreement with him that this question of pensions to civil servants in receipt of salary, also settled for the moment, is not settled finally, but that the anomalies I have mentioned will be removed in the only way possible if justice is to be done, that is by going through the whole service with a fine toothed comb and dealing with each case on its merits. You cannot go right through with one great sweep without perhaps doing more harm than good. When that time comes I am certain that every member in the house interested in the welfare of the returned men will interest himself in seeing that those who should have pensions get them but those who should not should have them taken away.

Mr. RHODES: I would like to say a word arising out of what has just been so

well said by my hon. friend from Red Deer. I think we all recognize that no one in the house is more entitled, from his experience and his service, to speak for the returned men than is my hon. friend. And few if any are better qualified than he to do so. I concur almost in toto with everything my hon. friend has said.

The reason I rose, Mr. Chairman, was to say that with respect to the proposals originally brought down in the budget we were met with the objection on the part of those who spoke for the different organizations that it was a violation of contract, and that was a difficult argument to meet. But here is where I met my first disappointment, and I should not be surprised if my hon. friend and myself are on common ground in that respect: I asked them if it would not be fair to agree that this should have application only to those in receipt of a salary in excess of $2,000, $2,500 or some similar sum. They still interposed the objection that it would be a violation of contract. Then I came back with this: I said very good, we will observe the sanctity of contract even though to do so will cause an injustice to individual returned soldiers who to-day have neither pension nor salary. Why not from now on, with regard to those who come into the service hereafter, make it applicable only when it goes beyond the sum of $2,500 per year, or $2,000 or whatever sum might be agreed upon. To that proposal they also objected, and if I may say so without reflecting upon them in any way, in my opinion they exercised bad judgment. I think it would have been a case of justice to the returned soldiers who, because of the application of that principle, might hereafter have an opportunity for employment in public service which otherwise would be denied them. For that reason I am doubly glad to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Red Deer, and I hope that when another year rolls round we may be able to apply that principle, which I think would be fair to all concerned.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That objection was brought to me, and I could not but agree that it was a powerful objection. There was a contract; we did agree in every phase of our pension legislation that the pension should not be taken into consideration in this way. But this also is an underlying principle of the pension legislation—and I made the suggestion—that the pension is paid because of disability. That is, a man with a disability which detracts from his earning power by 20 per cent, 30 per cent, 80 per cent or 100 per cent is paid a pension to bring him up to par, to make up for that deficiency. It is obvious that if a man suffers from a disability which impairs his earning powers to the extent of 80 per cent or 60 per cent, he cannot earn a full time salary at a full time job. If the pension is held sacred we might say to him. "If you are only 50 per cent capable you will only receive a 50 per cent salary, so you may take either the full salary and a smaller pension or the full pension and a smaller salary." Then we would be doing the fair thing and no contract would be broken.

Mr. McGIBBON: I agree very largely with what the Minister of Finance said, and I think the hon. member for Red Deer predicated his remarks on a wrong assumption. Rightly or wrongly the parliaments of the past decided that pension would be paid according to a man's ability, to earn a living in the labour market, that is, with pick and shovel. It is quite obvious that a man may not be able to earn much of a living with pick and shovel though he might be 100 per cent efficient in many other lines of business. I think we must bear that in mind.

I do agree that an injustice is being done the country when we have a public servant as instanced by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough, drawing a salary of $10,000 a year and a pension of $2,500. I do not think this country is under any obligation in a case of that kind. I am at a loss, however, to understand how that could happen. My recollection is that the maximum pension in the case of a private soldier was fixed at $60 per month, plus so much for his wife and so much for each child. I was wondering if the proposals of the minister could not be applied to officers, because I do not think many of the private soldiers will come under this taxation scheme in any case. A man with a total disability only receives $720 a year, so he would not come within the application of the income tax in any way, even with a liberal allowance for his wife and children. I do believe, however, that the returned men feel very strongly in the case of men drawing large salaries and large pensions. I do not think the elevator operators, for instance, should be taxed at all; I do not see how they could be taxed because I do not think their total income would be sufficient to bring them under the schedules, but I do think something should be done to protect the treasury if cases exist such as that mentioned by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough. In my opinion we do not owe any man, no matter what his services may have been, a return of $12,000 or $13,000 a year.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that for many of us it was a privilege to go overseas. It was an experience upon which we can look back and which we will never forget; we would not have missed it for anything. Personally I look upon that experience with a great deal of pride; I would rather have missed almost any other period of my life than the service I saw in the trenches. I think every returned man should be sufficiently interested in his country to share the burden that is being carried to-day by every man, woman and child in Canada, and I should like to see the minister do something with regard to these people who are receiving both high salaries and high pensions. I do not think that is just or equitable. As I said before, I do not see how the private soldier is going to be affected by this legislation; I do not think his pension and salary together would bring him under the schedules, but if his combined income is sufficient he should pay his tax.

With regard to the first proposal I have just this to say: I never saw how it could be defended, and I do not see that yet. A man went to the front and lost an arm, a leg or an eye, and the country said, "We will give you so much money to compensate you for your loss." Then we say to him, "If you enter government service and do the work that is done by another man, you must work for less money." That is penalizing him because he was injured in the war, always provided that he can do the work as efficiently as the other man. I do not believe that proposal could be defended. I do say to the minister, however, that he must do something with regard to these men drawing large pensions and large salaries. I think it is his duty to do so, and personally I will be quite willing to defend that policy at any time, because I think it is right.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: It is our job to find some way of putting that suggestion into effect.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MALCOLM: Before this resolution carries, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to paragraph 11, which reads:

> 11. That a tax of 5 per centum shall be imposed at the source on all dividends or interest paid or credited by Canadian debtors to non-residents of Canada.

I understood there were some amendments to that.

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps my hon. friend has reference to the statement I made in the house on March 31.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. RHODES: The provisions contained in that statement are carried out to-day, but it is done administratively. No amendment to the resolution is required to effect that purpose.

Mr. MALCOLM: What method is the minister taking to carry out the promise made on March 31?

Mr. RHODES: Will my hon. friend put his question in another form.

Mr. MALCOLM: Do sections 11 and 12 cover the new interpretation of the tax on dividends of non-residents?

Mr. RHODES: Dividends are still taxable when paid to non-residents,—

Mr. MALCOLM: All dividends?

Mr. RHODES: —and interest only to the extent that it is paid in Canadian funds. There will be one or two minor amendments but they will be presented when the bill is in committee; it will not be necessary to amend the resolution. I am advised by the law officers that there is no necessity to amend the resolution itself in order to carry out fully the provisions as outlined in the statement I made on March 31. There will be some minor changes which it is thought wise to have made in committee of the whole on the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will the minister indicate those minor changes?

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps I might table a summary of the proposals as applicable to this tax, which I think will answer succinctly every question which is likely to be submitted by my hon. friend from North Bruce or anyone else. I have copies in both English and French and I will table a few now, and more will be available as hon. gentlemen desire.

Mr. MALCOLM: The minister will remember that when the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth was speaking after the introduction of the budget he said he did not know very well how to criticize these provisions in the budget inasmuch as he had no idea what they would be when the budget was finally revised and amended. It was pretty common gossip on the street that on March 31 telegrams had reached the minister that the London stock exchange had deleted all Canadian securities from the official list and pro-

hibited further dealings, with the result that on getting this word from London the minister took fright and set about making amendments. I am told that the idea of the minister at the present time is to exempt from payment of this tax and interest all Dominion government bonds held by non-residents, but that other bonds, provincial or corporate, will still have the tax applied. I understand also, if I am correctly informed, that all bonds payable in the currency of any other country are to be exempt. It seems to me that the exemptions are so extensive that the amount of tax that will be collected will not be considerable enough to justify the complications that will arise in the minister's endeavour to collect them.

Mr. RHODES: Let me say this, particularly with reference to that part of my hon. friend's remarks touching what was said by the financial critic of the opposition, the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth. It must be borne in mind that in this tax we are breaking new ground so far as Canada is concerned, and it is quite obvious that in doing so we shall encounter difficulties here and there. Therefore I make no apologies whatever for any changes which may have been found necessary from the original proposals—none whatever. It is certainly nothing new in this country to have changes made in the budget, because we have not had a budget in years that has not been changed materially. Instance after instance could be cited, in the case of governments which were supported by my hon. friends opposite, and I am not the least bit worried about criticism of that sort. The man who does not make mistakes never does anything, and a government that would be so timid that it could not proceed for fear it might have to retrace its steps would not be worthy of the name. So far as I am concerned therefore I have not the slightest feeling of diffidence in making changes if they are for the better. I may say to my hon. friend that the consideration we had in mind was this. Britain for years has imposed taxes of this kind—

Mr. MALCOLM: Certainly.

Mr. RHODES: —but they are in the happy position of being a rich creditor country.

Mr. MALCOLM: Quite so.

Mr. RHODES: The United States also for some years has imposed similar forms of taxation, and it too is a powerful creditor country. Now, we in humble little Canada attempt to impose the same sort of taxation and of course we must dodge the big stick. Why? Because we are a debtor country, and a small country. It is true we had to relinquish some of this tax, largely by reason of the circumstances I have outlined and partly because it was pointed out to us that we had to honour contract obligations; and I regret that my hon. friend could even be able to refer to the incident with respect to the London stock exchange, because their attitude was not in keeping with that solid, sterling character which we have always associated with Britain, especially touching matters of finance. But they went off at halfcock—

Mr. MALCOLM: They certainly did.

Mr. RHODES: —whereas our friends in the United States who were subject to the same tax kept their heads, and were calm and cool about it, prepared to wait until they found out what the full incidence of the taxation meant. Our friends in London, however, became so hysterical that they went completely up in the air. They suspended operations. They did not wipe Canadian transactions off the boards but they suspended operations, "don't you know," until they could find out what the various proposals meant, in the meantime, no doubt, fully expecting that they would frighten the poor colonial.

Mr. MALCOLM: Which they did.

Mr. RHODES: Which they were able to do in part. If my hon. friend derives any comfort from that admission, very well; I make it freely.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry.

Mr. RHODES: I am happy to say that we have held a substantial portion of the tax and it will yield a substantial sum to the treasury.

Mr. MALCOLM: You should have held it all.

Mr. RHODES: In its essence, it is a fair tax as it enables us to pay into the treasury of Canada money which hitherto has gone into the treasuries of other countries. If a resident of Great Britain or the United States pays this tax he will receive full allowance for his payment.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is when he pays the British tax?

Mr. RHODES: When he pays his tax in Great Britain. I must say that the attitude taken by the London stock exchange seemed to be singularly unfair especially when it is borne in mind that we are asking only for a humble five per cent while the mother coun-

try asks for just exactly one quarter or twenty-five per cent under similar conditions. However, these are the facts and the circumstances and I recite them without any limitation or evasion whatsoever.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think the candor of the minister is to be commended. My criticism of the action taken by the minister is that there was a want of courage. He should not have been frightened by a gun at half cock. As he points out, there was no justification for this action by a country which itself taxes non-residents twenty-five per cent. It is a fair tax. The investor in a foreign country must realize that there are two entirely separate fields in which a government may operate. Because a government sells securities does not mean that it is going to give up control of taxation. The minister was perfectly justified in proposing this tax but I do not think he was justified in receding from the original position which he took.

Mr. RHODES: In part.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes, in part. I think the tax was fair and I think it was needed for revenue. I join with the minister in saying that the action taken by the London stock exchange to delete Canadian securities from the list in order to frighten the Canadian government was unfair. If I had been in the minister's place I would have gone through with the taxation as originally proposed.

Mr. LUCAS: In connection with the collection of the tax upon bearer bonds, would the minister advise the committee what position an individual would be in who had not sufficient total income to necessitate the paying of the tax or who had already declared the income received from bearer bonds? Would the tax be deducted by the bank and then application made for refund?

Mr. RHODES: A man who cashes a coupon in Canada of a bearer bond payable in Canada will be called upon to attach a certificate of ownership. No money will be deducted at the moment of payment but the certificate of ownership will be attached to the coupons and will subsequently come to the income tax office. If the individual does not come within the range of those who pay income tax, no tax will be collected, but, on the other hand, if he does come within the range, a tax will be collected. The advantage of the system is that it will prevent evasions which have hitherto taken place in the case of those who have not declared their whole income from bearer bonds.

Mr. MALCOLM: In order to get at the interest rates paid on bonds there must either be reflotation or taxation. The minister's first attempt at taxation is very fair and modest and should not be complained of by anyone. There is no doubt that there is a great difference in value in the interest received to-day and that received in 1928 when the bonds were sold and there is a necessity for increased taxation upon the interest paid or a lowering of the rate of interest. As far as I am concerned, I would be entirely in favour of having the original proposals in the budget remain in force.

Mr. MacLEAN: Has the minister ever thought of having a more simple income tax form? I think most hon. members have received complaints about the forms from farmers and others, who have had to fill them out.

Mr. MALCOLM: Have the farmers any bonds?

Mr. MacLEAN: Not so many bonds but still many of them are compelled to fill out the forms. My suggestion would be that a form of questionnaire be sent to the farmers. This could be filled out and returned to the income tax office and if the individual was liable for tax, the income tax form could be filled out at a later date.

Mr. RHODES: I can quite understand the attitude of mind of an individual who is confronted for the first time with an income tax form. I do not know whether my hon. friend has ever seen the form of ballot used in some of the states of the United States, but I shall never forget the first time I saw one of these. It was just about the fiercest document I have ever seen, filled with all sorts of diagrams and hieroglyphics and whatnots. Apparently those who had become familiar with its use were not awed by its presence. I think the same thing is true to a large extent of our income tax form. While they present complexities and difficulties to one who sees them for the first time, he gradually becomes familiar with their use. I do not think it is the form that bothers us so much as the figure which appears at the lower right hand corner. The income tax officials who have been able to profit by the experience they have gained in years gone by tell me that they feel that the form is as simple as it could be having regard to the safeguards which must be utilized in the collection of a tax of this character. I can say to my hon. friend and to all other hon. members of the committee that if they have

any suggestions of a workable character to offer in the way of simplification of the form, I am sure the commissioner of income tax will be ready to consider their adoption if they are at all workable.

Mr. MUNN: Referring to the bearer bond coupons, I am one of those who believe this, if carefully handled, will return to the coffers of the dominion and provincial governments a great deal of money. My opinion is that in handling the tax this year, the government should go back and see why the man was not able to pay the same tax last year. I hope the minister will have his officials instructed to have this made retroactive, because I really think a great deal of money has been lost to the dominion treasury through people who are dishonest in making up their returns.

Mr. RHODES: It was part of the object I had in mind when these proposals were brought down that not only should we collect from the individual this year, but we should find out what he was doing with his income in previous years. The law is ample to enable us to do that. It may transpire that Mr. A, in making out his income tax return this year, discloses that he has certain bearer bond coupons on which he has not made returns previously, and as a result his income bears a different proportion from the one hitherto disclosed. The question will then be put to him: When did you purchase those bonds? There will be no difficulty in finding out when the purchase was made, and if it is disclosed that he purchased those two, three, four or five years before, he will be called upon to recoup the treasury to the extent he has defrauded it in times past.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): I wonder whether the minister would clarify paragraph 16. I have been reading it over and I cannot make out the real sense of it, particularly where it reads:

Provided that in no case shall such interest or taxes be apportioned against the taxpayer's income from his chief occupation or business.

Just what does that mean?

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps I could answer my hon. friend's question, at least in part, by referring to a provision in the bill itself which will be based upon this resolution:

Section 6 of the said act is amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

(h) Carrying charges of property the income from which is exempt, except to the extent that such carrying charges exceed the exempt income.

[Mr. Rhodes.]

The explanation on the corresponding page of the bill is as follows:

This section provides that the carrying charges of productive property producing income—

That would be property real or personal; it might be bonds or it might be something else.

—which is exempted from taxation, such as tax-free bond interest or dividends received by one company from another shall be applied first against such exempt income. Any excess of such carrying charges may be applied against income other than the income from the taxpayer's chief position, occupation, trade, business or calling.

I do not know that I can make the matter any clearer than that.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to draw the minister's attention to paragraph 12. The purpose of that is that if a man cashes a dividend cheque in the United States at a premium, he shall have to pay 5 per cent, not on the premium, but on the whole dividend. That may be all right, but it will be noticed that in the income tax return in the form that you have to make out, there is an item inserted in which you have to show any income you have received from premiums obtained in that way, so that you will have to pay not only twice, but three times. Supposing the premium on a specific cheque of $100 is 10 per cent. You do not pay 5 per cent on the $10; you pay 5 per cent on the whole dividend. Then when you come to make out your income tax return, you again have to pay whatever your income tax rate is upon the amount you have received in that way. That is certainly paying it a second time. I do not know whether the minister understands me.

Mr. RHODES: I think I do.

Mr. NEILL: Then there is the third effect. I submit it is not in accordance with the usual custom to charge for that at all. Should it not be called principal increment? For instance, if a man bought something in the United States, as he often does in the course of a year, he has to pay a premium on the money and he does not receive any allowance for that in his income tax return, so he pockets the loss. In the one case it should be called capital increment, the same as in the other it would be called capital loss.

Mr. RHODES: To answer my hon. friend's last question first, our principle of taxation in Canada has been only to tax income. We have never taxed increment. I think the experience of the past two, three or four

years has abundantly proven that in that respect we have adopted the right principle, because to-day, despite the condition of the world and conditions in Canada, we are in receipt from our income tax of a total yield which is comparable with the tax which has been received in other years, whereas to take the example in the neighbouring country to the south where losses are to be taken into consideration in making up income tax returns, the result has been that the yield of their income tax has shrivelled to only a fraction of the normal amount. The result is shown in the enormous deficit which they had there last year.

Mr. NEILL: The government does not tax increment?

Mr. RHODES: No.

Mr. NEILL: But this is increment.

Mr. RHODES: We do not take into account the increment at all; they do.

Mr. NEILL: I claim that this is increment.

Mr. RHODES: Well, coming to the first question, when the man pays his 5 per cent tax, the amount that he pays, although paid upon the total, is less than the premium he receives.

Mr. NEILL: It might not be.

Mr. RHODES: Then the tax will not be applicable; that is the answer. When in making up his income tax returns he comes to show the amount of premium he has received, that premium as shown would be less the 5 per cent which he has already paid.

Mr. NEILL: But not less the other sums he may have paid as premiums if he had bought stuff in the United States during the year.

Mr. RHODES: We could not cover a case of that kind.

Mr. NEILL: Does the minister not consider the premiums as increment?

Mr. RHODES: I would not think so. If anyone were to consider as increment the amount of purchases he has made, our income tax returns would disappear very rapidly.

Mr. NEILL: I am referring to that specific case only; when you tax the increment, you ought to allow for the decrement, it seems to me.

Mr. RHODES: Apart altogther from the question whether the tax is applicable to increment as such, there is the question whether it would be wise policy for us so to regulate our income tax as to make it to the advantage of the individual to purchase in a foreign country to the exclusion of his own. That question would also arise and it has no reference to tariff or protection or anything else. The fact of the matter is that that is what we would be doing.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: There are two or three items standing in the customs schedules which I should like to take up.

PROTECTIVE SERVICE SALARIES

Mr. MACDOUGALL: While we are waiting I should like to bring up a matter which is not controversial at all. It has been brought to my attention this afternoon that members of the protective staff, charwomen and so forth, have not been paid for two weeks. I would ask the Minister of Finance if he has any idea of giving them a cheque on Saturday to bring a little happiness into their homes.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend perhaps was not in the house earlier in the day. I did all that I could, and this house did all that it could do when it passed the interim supply bill. It was sent to the Senate, but unfortunately the Senate, for reasons best known to itself—I do not know what the answer is—gave the bill only a first reading and then adjourned, so that we are now in the position that until the Senate returns and passes the bill we cannot issue the cheques. I hope, however, that the Senate will pass the bill on Tuesday, in which event I can assure my hon. friend that we shall get royal assent just as quickly as possible because it is unfortunate that the cheques cannot be paid.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

Mr. RHODES: I have an amendment to propose, Mr. Chairman, which is new, but to which I hope the committee will take no exception, and that is to add item 106d. The object of the amendment is to give to the British West Indies on grape fruit when imported in airtight cans or other airtight containers the same rate as is applicable in the case of the Australian treaty, namely, one cent a pound instead of two cents a pound, which is the ordinary rate. I beg to move that the following item, enumeration, and rates of

duties, be included in the list of items indicated in resolution No. 2, of March 21, 1933, as for insertion in schedule A of the Customs Tariff:

106 (d). Grapefruit, the produce of the British West Indies, when prepared in air-tight cans or other air-tight containers in the British West Indies and imported direct from the country of growth and manufacture, per pound, 1 cent.

Item agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: The next is a new item of a similar character. I beg to move that the following item, enumeration, and rates of duties, be included in the list of items indicated in resolution No. 2, of March 21st, 1933, as for insertion in schedule A of the Customs Tariff:

152b. Orange juice, the produce of the British West Indies, when imported direct from the country of production, free.

Item agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: The next is an amendment in connection with tariff item 208o, which has already been passed, and which I am going to ask the committee to delete. I might explain that it is a conference item. It was agreed that it be struck out in the first instance, but it has since been ascertained that by changing the content rate we can procure this commodity in ample quantity from the mother country, and the British have asked that in those circumstances we restore the item, which we are prepared to do.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the commodity?

Mr. RHODES: Tartaric acid crystals. I beg to move that resolution No. 2 of March 21, 1933, being a resolution to amend Schedule A to the Customs Tariff, be amended by striking thereout tariff item 208o wherever the said item, enumeration, and rates of duties occur in the said resolution.

In a word, the effect of the motion is to restore the conference item.

Mr. NEILL: It cuts out both items?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why was it ever changed?

Mr. RHODES: Because it was found that we could not under the British content regulation of fifty per cent procure a supply in the mother country, but by making the content requirement 25 per cent, which we have done by order in council, the commodity can be fully supplied from Great Britain.

[Mr. Rhodes.]

Mr. NEILL: Does it apply to cream of tartar in crystals as well as to tartaric acid crystals?

Mr. RHODES: No, just tartaric acid crystals.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: The next is 366b, which I had asked to stand. The rates as proposed in the budget were 10 cents intermediate and 15 cents general. I now move to reduce these rates from 10 cents intermediate and 15 cents general to 5 and 10 cents respectively.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: The next item is 568.

Customs tariff—568. Knitted garments, knitted underwear and knitted goods, n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, 25 per cent; intermediate tariff, 35 per cent; general tariff, 45 per cent; and 25 cents per pound intermediate tariff, and 30 cents per pound, general tariff.

Mr. YOUNG: In regard to this item 568, the rate prior to September, 1930, was 20 per cent, 30 per cent and 35 per cent. In September, 1930, the rate was changed to 25 per cent, 25 per cent and 45 per cent. Now the proposed rate is 25 per cent under the British preference, which is not being touched; 35 per cent plus 25 cents a pound under the intermediate tariff, and 45 per cent plus 30 cents a pound under the general tariff. It is difficult to estimate what that specific rate will amount to when reduced to ad valorem, but roughly it will be 60 per cent under the intermediate and 75 per cent under the general. The minister told us that the production of these goods in Canada amounts roughly to $48,000,000, and that the work is done in 161 establishments, paying wages of $14,000,000, and employing between 17,000 and 18,000 people. He told us that the object was not to increase the price but rather to secure a larger share of the market. He also told us that the importations were $1,500,000 worth, of which $900,000 came from Great Britain. The result therefore of this increase is that only $600,000 worth of business is left that can be captured from foreign markets, $600,000 of importations mostly from the United States and entering mostly under the general rate. That amounts to only 1¼ per cent of the Canadian production, so that all that these factories can possibly hope to accomplish is to increase their sales by 1¼ per cent. They employ, so the minister told us, nearly 18,000 people. If you increase their production by 1¼ per cent you will increase

the number of their employees by 225. The average wage paid in the industry is about $800 per annum. Two hundred and twenty-five new employees drawing an average wage of $800 would mean an increased wage bill of $180,000. Importations of $600,000 which at present carry a duty of forty-five per cent will pay in revenue to the treasury $270,000 per annum. The minister proposes to sacrifice that revenue in order to secure an increased wage bill of $180,000. He would be $90,000 per annum ahead if he took $180,000 out of the treasury and paid these men to sit on the sidewalk and do nothing.

An hon. MEMBER: Is this a conundrum?

Mr. YOUNG: It is not; it is the way the taxation works out. The minister wonders where the revenue has gone, why the budget does not balance; yet here he is proposing to take $270,000 out of the treasury in order that certain industries may pay an increased wage bill of $180,000. But no one believes for a moment that these gentlemen do not intend to raise prices; no one believes that they are asking an increased tariff to increase their sales one and one-quarter per cent. They do intend to increase prices. They could increase them thirty per cent under this legislation. Suppose they increase them only ten per cent, they take an additional $5,000,000 out of the pockets of the people of this country, all for the sake of paying $180,000 in wages.

How can this industry be helped? There is only one way to bring about any material increase in the sale of these goods in Canada, that is by lowering prices. Every increase in price will further restrict sales, will force people to buy some other kind of goods, and the result will be less sales rather than more. I do not believe for a moment that this industry needs this added protection. I have in my hand a report concerning the Regent Knitting Mills Limited for 1932. It is dated from Montreal, April 9, and is headed:

Sales Lower but Profits of Knitting Mills Mount

A wide increase in profits in the face of declining sales was reported to-day by Regent Knitting Mills Ltd. for 1932. While total sales declined 9·81 per cent gross profits at $317,355 were up 46·24 per cent compared with $217,003 in 1931. Operating profit at $110,993 compared with $19,958.

Increase in profits was ascribed by the president, C. G. deTonnancour, to widespread economies and attainment of greater efficiency.

I would recommend to the minister that he advise all other persons and companies engaged in that industry to adopt the policy of this mill—widespread economies. Let them look to the increased efficiency of their plant rather than to further tariff protection, which will enable them to raise prices.

I said a moment ago that the minister was sacrificing $270,000 of revenue in order to enable this industry to pay a little more in wages. That is not the only case where the revenue is being sacrificed. I know the trouble he is meeting with in trying to make his budget balance, yet here we have some examples of where the revenue has gone. Take the figures with respect to soup:

Year	Imports	Rate per cent	Amount of duty	Loss of revenue
1930	$1,974,000	25	$500,000	
1932	184,000	35	62,000	$438,000

The wages paid in the industry in producing that much more soup amounted to about $250,000.

The figures for mats and hearth rugs are as follows:

Year	Imports	Rate per cent	Amount of duty	Loss of revenue
1930	$583,000		$162,000	
1932	37,000		27,000	$135,000

Other examples are:

Oriental Carpets

Year	Imports	Rate per cent	Amount of duty	Loss of revenue
1930	$1,461,000	35	$488,000	
1932	389,000	40+20c.	242,000	$246,000

Velvet Tapestry

Year	Imports	Rate per cent	Amount of duty	Loss of revenue
1930	$ 99,000		$ 25,000	
1932	66			$ 25,000

Tweeds

Year	Imports	Rate per cent	Amount of duty	Loss of revenue
1930	$2,953,000		$755,000	
1932	759,0000		381,000	$374,000

Overcoatings

Year	Imports	Rate per cent	Amount of duty	Rate of revenue
1930	$1,624,000		$436,000	
1932	402,000		221,000	$215,000

The minister has in these few items sacrificed in revenue nearly one and a half million dollars, to be exact $1,433,000, in order to encourage these industries to manufacture things at home which could be much more profitably imported, and the manufacture of which did not pay in wages as much as the loss of revenue.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And made the cost of living higher for everyone.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes. Is it any wonder that we find the minister, to quote the words of Sir Robert Peel, "sitting on an empty chest by the pool of bottomless deficiency fishing for a budget." I urge the minister to strike that item out. There is no sense at all in proposing in times like these to sacrifice $270,000 of revenue in order to give $180,000 in wages. Seriously I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, I hope my hon. friend will not consider me in the least disrespectful if I refuse to follow him in his discourse. My reason is—

Mr. YOUNG: That there is no answer, that is all.

Mr. RHODES: Well, let us for the sake of argument say that. I was going to say that whether we are right or wrong in our tariff proposals, this item is on all fours with the woven goods tariff, which we threshed over and over, discussed and rediscussed, and which is in the statute book, although we are not going as high in the matter of protection on this item as in connection with woven goods.

Mr. YOUNG: Two wrongs can never make a right.

Mr. RHODES: If we are wrong in the former case we are wrong here. I can only say to my hon. friend—because I would like if possible to dispose of this before six o'clock—that the proof of the pudding is the eating.

Mr. YOUNG: We have the proof.

An hon. MEMBER: There is no pudding.

[Mr. Young.]

Mr. RHODES: If it transpires that we are mistaken in our view as to what will be the result of our tariff in respect to woven goods, we are wrong here.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Mr. YOUNG: No, it is not carried.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod) moved the second reading of Bill No. 81, to amend the Interest Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, under section 91 of the British North America Act interest is one of the matters placed under the control of the Dominion parliament, and the present Interest Act is chapter 102 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927. The bill I am introducing proposes to repeal section 2 of that act, which reads:

> Except as otherwise provided by this or by any other act of the parliament of Canada, any person may stipulate for, allow and exact, on any contract or agreement whatsoever, any rate of interest or discount which is agreed upon.

Because of the very difficult economic conditions existing in Canada many persons are being compelled to pay very high rates of interest, and this bill asks that a maximum rate of five per cent be established in the Interest Act. Perhaps I might read the bill to make this clear. The preamble states:

> Whereas excessive rates of interest are being charged on loans on mortgage, agreements and contracts; and whereas it is advisable under present conditions to fix a maximum rate of interest in Canada, applicable to loans, contracts and agreements of every kind: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

Then the bill proceeds:

> 1. Section two of the Interest Act, chapter one hundred and two of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:—

"2. (1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this or any other act of the parliament of Canada, the rate of interest shall not exceed five per centum per annum, and no person, corporation or company shall stipulate for, allow, exact, reserve or collect a rate of interest or discount greater than five per centum per annum, and in no case shall a higher rate of interest be recoverable.

(2) Every person, corporation or company who or which, directly or indirectly, takes, accepts and receives a higher rate of interest than is authorized by this section shall incur a penalty equal to twice the value of the moneys, wares, merchandise or other commodities lent or bargained for. Such penalty may be sued for and recovered in any court of competent purisdiction by any party injuriously affected, on proof of such excessive interest."

This principle of a maximum rate of interest is not entirely new in Canada; it was in force in the four provinces which originally came into confederation, and I think it remained on the statute books until 1890, when all the acts were repealed by a bill introduced by Sir John Thompson. Under the old act in Ontario and Quebec the maximum rate of interest was fixed at 6 per cent, except for insurance companies and religious, charitable and educational corporations, which might exact a rate not exceeding 8 per cent. Included in that section was a penalty for violation of the act amounting to treble the value of the goods or loan. In Nova Scotia the maximum rate was established at seven per cent, except with regard to loans on personal property or on personal responsibility, when rates up to ten per cent were allowed. In New Brunswick the maximum rate was six per cent, and the penalty imposed for violation was the value of the principal sum or the goods covered by the loan.

The bill I am introducing does not attempt to deal with the rate of interest on existing obligations. That question was raised in a motion introduced by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), and his resolution was referred to the banking and commerce committee for consideration. Apparently there is not very much chance of any action by the committee on that resolution during this session of parliament, but by this act it is hoped to fix a maximum rate of 5 per cent on obligations entered into in the future. According to a definition which I found in the dictionary to-day interest means money paid for the use of money loaned, or money paid for the forbearance of debt, and I am afraid that at present most of the interest that is being paid is for the forbearance of debt rather than for the use of money loaned. In many cases the money loaned has largely disappeared.

Interest is sometimes referred to as the wages of money. Money is a sterile thing; it does not increase of itself. I am not going to enter into a discussion at this time as to whether or not interest is something that can be paid; I know some economists and financial writers differ on that point. I would simply say that if interest is actually paid it must be paid out of production. This was so well stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) in this house last year that I am going to quote his words, which will be found at page 1911 of Hansard for 1932:

—let us get this as clearly as possible—interest is not something that is made by money but something that must be taken out of the productivity of the country and paid upon the money that is lent.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, interest is paid out of production; that production is sold for money and the money thus obtained is turned over to pay the interest. The rate of interest which industry can pay depends upon the price of the product. Because of the fall in price levels during the past three years the payment of interest in some cases has taken two or three times as much of the product of industry as it did three or four years ago. This increase in the general burden of debt can be well illustrated by the fall in the index prices of commodities in Canada. I find that in the wholesale commodity index price level there has been a drop from 100 in 1926 to 63.6 in February of this year, a fall of 36 per cent. In the case of the general range of farm products I find a drop from 100 in 1926 to 43 in February of this year, or 57 per cent. In the case of field products there is a drop from 100 to 36, or 64 per cent. In the case of animal products the drop has been from 100 to 54, or 46 per cent, while in retail prices and cost of services, according to the government's index figures, the drop has been from 100 to 79, or 21 per cent.

In the light of the index figures I have quoted let us look for a moment at farm mortgages. If a farmer paid the interest on his mortgage in field products, in 1926 the interest on $2,000 at 6 per cent would be $160, or 160 bushels of grain, whereas in 1932 the interest would be still $160, but it would require 440 bushels of grain. If the farmer paid in farm products generally it would take two and one-third times as much in 1933 as it did in 1926, and if he paid in animal products it would take practically twice as much. If it took ten steers to pay his interest in 1926 it would take twenty steers to pay

his interest in 1933. If it took one hundred pigs to pay his interest in 1926, it would require two hundred in February, 1933. This will give the house an idea of the increase in actual interest so far as it is measured in terms of production—and it is only with production that the farmers can pay. Precisely the same principle applies to industry generally. I want to quote again from the speech of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because he put the matter briefly and clearly. At page 1911 of Hansard of 1932 the minister is reported on this point as follows:

Precisely the same principle applies to an industry. Take one that has for its basic product copper, lead or zinc, operating in some manufacturing concern. Suppose they borrowed $50,000 three or four years ago. In the payment of interest on that money, where they formerly calculated an output of a given amount would serve to meet that payment, it would to-day take an output of two to three times as much to discharge the obligation.

Surely these illustrations prove that our industries cannot continue to pay rates of interest of six and ten per cent and sometimes as high as twelve per cent. I want to quote another passage from the same speech of the minister:

Let me turn to the third factor, that of interest. I say this advisedly; I say it after a good deal of study and thought, and I ask my hon. friends angularly opposite to accept it in regard to not only agriculturists but industrialists and merchants, because it is only by having some degree of sympathetic contact among the different branches of activity in this country that we are going to make any progress. No agriculturist, no industrialist and no merchant can afford to pay ten per cent interest for the money he uses in his business; it simply cannot be done; normal business will not permit of that rate of interest. Moreover, no bank can afford to take a loan at ten per cent, because it is too risky. When a loan justifies a rate of ten per cent, in my opinion it is too risky a loan for a bank to take at all and ought not to be accepted.

I heartily agree with that.

Whether or not that can be covered by arbitrary statutory legislation is another question. That can be discussed next year at the revision of the Bank Act. I am laying down what I consider to be sound business principles directly affecting our welfare, and the same principles are operating in every corner of the world to-day affecting the business of the world and affecting us along with the other countries. But I lay down the principle that a rate of interest around eight or ten per cent makes successful operation of the ordinary business activities impossible and unprofitable.

I am of the same opinion; I believe that rates of eight and ten per cent make the successful operation of any industry impossible and unprofitable, and it is partly for that reason that I am bringing forward this bill

[Mr. Coote.]

to-night. The fall in commodity prices has reduced the purchasing power of the people engaged in these industries and this in turn has created unemployment. Thousands of workers, factory employees, salaried and professional men have had their income cut to the point where the tax paying ability of the people has been reduced by half. This has made the burden of some municipal and provincial government debts almost intolerable. The ability of large numbers of people to pay the interest on their debts has disappeared, while in many other instances it has been greatly curtailed, and in no industry that I can think of can they afford to pay interest at a greater rate than five per cent per annum.

I would again direct the attention of the house to the question of farm mortgages. According to the recent census in Canada these mortgages amount to over $700,000,000. At the end of 1931, in respect of all mortgages held by insurance companies in the dominion, there were, in arrears of interest for one year or more, in Saskatchewan, forty-six per cent of the mortgages, in Manitoba forty-two per cent and in Alberta twenty-two per cent. It will be freely admitted I think that at the end of 1932 the percentage must have been much higher because of the low prices prevailing then. In many cases interest for three years compounded at eight or nine per cent is now arrears and the borrowers are asked to sign new mortgages in which these arrears have been added to the principal, so that the principal is being increased by from twenty-five to thirty per cent, and the people are being asked to renew these mortgages at rates of eight and even nine per cent.

There is a good reason for these large amounts of unpaid interest. Take the case of wheat producers. There are certain cash costs that must be incurred in the production of wheat and only after these are met can interest be paid. This applies to many other farm products. The selling price very often has not been sufficient to cover the cash cost, and if the interest has been paid the money has come from borrowings on insurance policies or from the sale of equipment or young live stock which should have remained on the farm. In other words, the farmer has been compelled to pay interest out of capital equipment which it has taken him years to accumulate. Very frequently the interest has not been paid because the farmer could not secure it. The fact is that the payment of interest at five per cent is for the most part a greater burden to-day than the payment

of interest at twenty-five or thirty per cent would have been three or four years ago.

I have in my hand an editorial from the High River Times, which I think brings this point out clearly. It tells of a farmer who has been unable to pay interest because of low prices. He bought a section of land in Alberta in 1917, paying for it at the rate of fifty dollars per acre. I quote:

> However, in 1917, prices were good, and the price was paid on the strength of the excellent crop prospects. Unfortunately in August of 1917 the crop was completely hailed, destroying the revenue for that year through no fault of the purchaser. The following year, when wheat was still good in price, the yield was poor owing to drought. And so on, through the ups and downs of succeeding years. In the meantime, as an accommodation to the seller, the farmer got a loan from a loan company, to pay off the large part of the amount owing. He has been struggling to hold on to the land and meet the demands of the loan company. Interest charges and taxes amounted to approximately $1,400, and in recent years it has been impossible to meet this amount. Last year the company foreclosed on him.
>
> In the years since the purchase, this farmer has paid out over $40,000 on the original price of $32,000 (a top price by the way). Yet despite the payment of this $40,000, which represents the effort of the best years of a man's life, he has been foreclosed, and now stands well up in years, stripped of the reward of fifteen years of labour.
>
> He has been industrious and capable, keeping his farm clean and productive. He will probably be replaced by a man much less capable and experienced. The district has lost an excellent farmer. Moreover the man has been financially ruined through the curse of interest. There are many who maintain that under the wheat prices of the last three years, a farmer cannot pay 8 per cent interest, and survive. It is a legalized hold-up, condoned by the government.
>
> Back in the war years, when wheat threatened to soar to $3 the government had no hesitation in stepping in and preventing exploitation of the buyer by forming a wheat board and holding prices to a maximum of $2 a bushel. To-day, conditions are even more glaringly awry, but now it is interest which is soaring far above the ability of the primary producer and normal citizen to pay. Why is there any more difficulty in bringing interest charges under control?
>
> Not only have the inexorable demands of money lenders (demands sanctioned by government) brought financial ruin to thousands of Canada's finest citizens, but worse still, these demands tacitly supported by the government have produced discouraged and embittered citizens who know that under all laws of justice, they have been deprived of the labours of a life time.

I regret to say that according to all accounts a great many farmers have found themselves in the position of the man referred to in this editorial, and it is time that parliament took such action as lies in its power to restrict the rate of interest charged. Farm mortgages are being renewed to-day at eight per cent, and I believe even at nine per cent. Many machine notes carry interest rates of from eight to twelve per cent; buyers of automobile trucks and so forth, purchased on time have to pay interest rates running as high as fifteen per cent. The rate of interest paid on savings accounts has been reduced, so why should not the rates charged by banks and others be reduced. Eight, nine and ten per cent is being charged for bank loans. I received a letter recently from a man in Hamilton complaining of the loan companies in Ontario asking for higher rates of interest on mortgages now maturing than the rates paid some years ago. One case has been brought to my attention where a mortgage made in 1927 at seven per cent with a proviso that six and a half per cent would be accepted if the payments of interest were tendered on the due dates. That mortgage is now due the original principal of $3,400 has been reduced to $2,050. The mortgage company has offered to renew this mortgage but they want a straight rate of seven per cent. In effect, that is an increase of one-half per cent in the rate charged. This man states that this is a general practice on the part of the company he mentions, and he also names another company which is trying to exact higher interest rates from its mortgagors. He says:

> The mortgage and insurance companies are combined in an association to fight for what they want, whereas the average mortgagor has no one to represent his case except where he can bring his position to the notice of parliament.
>
> Rentals, wages and salaries have been reduced up to twenty-five to thirty-five per cent, yet the mortgagees go merrily on charging the same old rates and in some cases demanding higher rates.

Here is a paragraph which I think is very important:

> If it is left to the mortgagees to voluntarily reduce, it may be that some of them will offer a slight reduction, others will give no leaway at all and others will try to get the last nickel out of the people that it is possible to get, and I am convinced that some of the companies are and will be the worst offenders.

It appears to me that the loan companies have not done so badly during the last few years and there is no need for an increase in the rates of interest. A statement presented to the banking committee by the head of the bureau of statistics shows that the following average dividends have been paid by the loan companies of Canada:

	Per cent
1929	11.34
1930	11.64
1931	11.63

The average dividends paid by the trust companies are as follows:

	Per cent
1929	9.63
1930	9.80
1931	10.32

I think this is evidence enough that the loan and trust companies do not need to raise their rates of interest. A few days ago I referred to a return which had been tabled in this house. This return shows the following classifications for loans made by the banks:

Class A—Loans up to $250.
Class B—Loans from $250 to $1,000.
Class C—Loans from $1,000 to $25,000.
Class D—Loans over $25,000.

This return shows that there was one class C loan drawing interest at ten per cent. It shows also that the discount rate charged on a class B loan for one month was nine per cent. It shows that twelve per cent was charged on a class B loan, ten per cent on a class C loan and eight per cent on a class D loan. These were all demand loans.

Mr. YOUNG: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. COOTE: When I have finished I shall be glad to answer my hon. friend. The return shows that the discount rate on a class B loan for ninety days was at the rate of ten per cent, while on a class C loan for ninety-one days it was ten per cent. I do not think any industry in Canada can afford to pay such rates and they should not be charged by the banks. I notice in a return recently brought down that for the three years previous to 1931, the banks of Canada have been paying dividends of nine, ten, twelve, fourteen and sixteen per cent. I know it is argued that part of these dividends is represented by earnings on reserve funds which have been accumulated from the sales of stock, but even making allowance for that, I think the banks could earn sufficient dividends without charging these exorbitant rates of interest. Life insurance companies charge as high as eight per cent for advances to policyholders made under the non-forfeiture clause to cover premiums due. A few years ago one of these companies attempted to charge me ten per cent on a note to take care of the premium on my policy. These companies should be controlled and prevented from charging such rates to their policyholders in order to earn large dividends. I think a limitation of five per cent is very necessary and would be quite fair. Some companies and corporations realize the necessity of reducing rates of interest at this time, but unfortunately all companies do not. The managers of these companies feel that they must make as good a showing as their competitors, and it becomes difficult for any one company acting alone to reduce rates of interest. I think this offers a very good reason for parliament fixing a maximum rate.

I should like to take two or three minutes in order to direct the attention of the house to the debt situation in Canada. The question of interest is always contingent upon debts. The public debt of the dominion, the provinces and the municipalities, including guarantees, is over $6,500,000,000. There are no figures to show the private debts, but I think they mght be fairly estimated at $10,000,000,000. To be conservative we will cut off $1,500,000,000 and put the estimation at $8,500,000,000. The private and public debts would then total $15,000,000,000. The interest upon these debts at different rates would be as follows:

4 per cent	$ 600,000,000
5 per cent	750,000,000
6 per cent	900,000,000
7 per cent	1,050,000,000
8 per cent	1,200,000,000

Surely we can all see the importance of the rate of interest. It is not so much the size of the debt that matters as the rate of interest and the price level of the products with which we must pay the interest. It is just as easy to carry a debt of $2,000 at four per cent as it is to carry a debt of $1,000 at eight per cent. It was much easier for a farmer to pay interest at a rate of twenty-five per cent three years ago than it is for him to pay at the rate of five per cent to-day. There are no figures available to show the value of our total production in 1932, but in 1928 it amounted to $6,000,000,000. We know that the volume was cut down last year and with a reduced value due to lower price levels, I think it could be estimated at $3,000,000,000. That is just one half of the value for 1928. A recent press dispatch contained a statement by one of the senators at Washington that the value of the total production in the United States last year was only half what it was in 1928. I think a comparable reduction would be applicable to Canada. With a rate of five per cent applying to all debts in Canada, it would take one quarter of the value of production to pay the interest charges. Of course, many of these debts are overlapping. A debt owed by a consumer to a retailer might be represented by a debt owed by the retailer to a wholesaler. But making allowance for all the overlapping, I still contend that five per cent is as high as or higher than this country can really afford with present price levels.

There are in Canada to-day certain corporations which have voluntarily reduced interest rates; they have seen the impossibility of producers paying existing rates. I have in my hand an advertisement of the International Harvester Company of Canada in which they say that interest rates are reduced for the following reasons:

As a measure of relief to our customers in all parts of Canada, we have reduced the rates of interest for payments made on both old and new notes. The amount of reduction applicable to your particular note, covering either former purchases or new business, may be learned by inquiry of the McCormick-Deering dealer nearest you or by writing us direct. In all cases the reductions are substantial and will be welcome. As a special arrangement for payments made in 1933, the rate of interest is reduced to 5 per cent on all notes, whether future or past due, from January 1 to date of payment, including notes taken for 1933 purchases.

As I pointed out to the house a few minutes ago, some companies are willing to reduce interest rates and others are not. If a company like the International Harvester voluntarily reduces the rate of interest on notes which it holds from its customers, I think the Dominion parliament should follow that lead and say: We shall establish a maximum rate of interest of five per cent which will apply to all obligations. By the way, the obligations to which the International Harvester Company refers are existing ones. I am not asking that the rate of interest be reduced on existing obligations; that is a matter which is being inquired into by our banking and commerce committee, but I would say that the International Harvester Company is showing us a good example.

The Imperial Oil Company has made somewhat similar arrangements for the reduction of the rate of interest on debts owed to it by its customers. I would like to make this public acknowledgment to both these companies for the reductions they have voluntarily made.

I should like also to draw the attention of the house to the fact that the creditor who is still drawing interest can purchase a good deal more with his money than he could three or four years ago. While this drop in prices has added to the burden of debt and interest and increases the share of his product which the producer must hand over by way of interest, it also increases the share which the creditor receives. The Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) pointed this out in his address to the monetary committee of the imperial conference when he said:

Interest charges represent the most important of the fixed or semi-rigid elements in our cost structure. If prices remain on their present level, such charges will constitute an intolerable or almost intolerable burden in many cases. Even if it can be borne, the fortuitous gain to the creditor of 40 to 48 per cent in general purchasing power above what he contracted for appears to be a grave injustice.

In many cases a rate of five per cent to-day would give to the creditor as much purchasing power as he got out of eight or seven per cent, or whatever the average rate may have been, three or four years ago. With purchasing power as great as it is to-day, a rate of five per cent is, I think, very fair to the creditor. A correspondent in western Canada, who is interested in the bill which I have introduced, wrote me recently. I received his letter to-day. He points out that a bill similar to the one I have introduced has been in force in the Isle of Man for the last 240 years; it was passed in that parliament in 1691 and sets a maximum rate of interest of six per cent. I shall read only the preamble because it seems to me it fits so well present conditions in Canada. It reads:

For as much as interest of money in loan, being at so high a rate as ten pounds for a hundred pounds for a year—

The maximum rate prior to that time had been ten per cent.

—doth not only make men unable to pay their debts and continue the use of merchandise and trade, but their debts daily increasing, are inforced to sell their leases, farms and stocks at low rates, to the great hurt and prejudice of this isle; be it therefore enacted by the Right Honourable Lord of this isle, the governor, officers, deemsters and 24 Keyes.

And so forth; then it goes on to set the maximum rate of six per cent for all interest obligations. That act has remained in force in the Isle of Man to date.

I realize there may be one objection to this bill, and that is that it sets the same maximum rate for small as for large loans. Personally I would be quite willing, if this bill could get second reading, when it is in committee to have an amendment inserted which would allow a charge for small loans which would be in excess of this five per cent as specified in the bill as drafted. I thought it would be much better to allow that amendment to be made in committee than for me to insert it in this bill. I am quite prepared to accept any reasonable amendment in regard to that particular point, because I realize, as the Prime Minister pointed out the other night, in some cases in these small loans a service charge is really justifiable.

As I have only two or three minutes left, may I sum up very briefly a few reasons I am asking for the passage of this bill. First, I ask for it because interest must be paid out

of production and the price level of our commodities has fallen so low as to make payment of interest at present rates impossible in many cases. I ask for it because of the tremendous volume of our debts and the huge burden which debts are upon the business community at this time.

I would like to point out one thing which I did not mention before; that is, that the burden of debt is on the retailers of Canada. In many cases they are unable to collect from their customers. They owe large amounts to the wholesalers and the latter are charging them in many cases eight per cent interest on past due accounts. In addition to that, they are making drafts against the retailers once a month and the latter are forced to pay exchange, stamp tax and a tax on each cheque which goes through the bank. Really, this burden of interest, exchange and taxes is nearly ruining many of the small retailers.

I ask for the passage of this bill because many debtors are being forced to renew obligations at rates that are ruinous, while their ability to pay is greatly reduced because not only have commodities and goods generally been reduced in prices, but salaries and wages have also been reduced, the reductions in many cases ranging from twenty to as much as fifty per cent.

I ask for the passage of this bill because of the increased purchasing power of the money which the creditor receives as interest, and finally, because I think the maintenance of the present high rates is retarding the business recovery which we are all so anxious to see in Canada. I would ask therefore that this bill receive the fair and earnest consideration of the house.

Mr. YOUNG: Before the hon. member takes his seat, I wonder if he could tell us what portion of the interest charged is being used to pay the running expenses of the lending institutions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken for forty minutes and he cannot speak longer unless by general consent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Consent.

Mr. COOTE: The answer I would give to that is that the average dividends declared during the past three years by all loan companies in Canada have been over 11½ per cent, so while I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the amount that goes for actual running expenses, the dividends which they have been earning, are, I think, sufficiently large to indicate that they have a very good surplus over their running expenses.

[Mr. Coote.]

Mr. BOWMAN: Do I understand the hon. member to say that this bill does not affect contracts, mortgages and so forth at present in existence?

Mr. COOTE: I want to make it clear that this bill will not affect existing contracts. It will affect only contracts that may be entered into after the passing of this bill.

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): With the object that the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) has in mind I am sure that every hon. member of this house is in cordial sympathy. But there is an old adage which we must bear in mind: You may lead a horse to water but you cannot make him drink. You may pass a law that no more than a certain sum may be charged by way of interest, but I know of no method whereby you can compel an individual who has money to lend it unless the interest rate is satisfactory to him. I submit in all deference to my hon. friend that excellent though his object is, if this bill were to pass it would defeat the very object he has in mind.

We sympathize, everybody sympathizes with the person who to-day, with commodity prices so low, has to pay interest rates of any size; but it is one thing to point to the difficulties under which the people labour with respect to interest, and it is quite another thing to suggest that a rigid law of the kind proposed will supply the remedy.

Interest rates have materially lowered in recent months. It is not so long since that the Dominion government itself could not borrow money at five per cent, and even to-day in the open market many of our provinces cannot secure money at that rate. I think it is fair to say that the collective credit of all the people of a province, backed by all the assets of the province, constitute an asset by way of security for a loan of far greater value in the eyes of the lender than would be the case with numerous individuals within the province; and yet the securities of Alberta, with all its great resources, are selling in the open market on a basis of yield of 6.6 per cent. If we pass a law declaring that no more than five per cent interest may be charged it would mean that Alberta would be unable to borrow, because capital is fluid and if it cannot secure the rate of return it desires within the Dominion of Canada it will go elsewhere where it can secure it. British Columbia has its six per cent issue of 1947 selling on the market to-day on a basis of yield of 6.45 per cent. Should we adopt my hon. friend's proposal we would shut out that great province from the opportunity not only of securing

fresh money but of refunding its maturing issues under present conditions. Manitoba, with a six per cent issue outstanding for the year 1947, has that issue selling upon the public market to-day at a price yielding 6.76 per cent. Saskatchewan finds its issue of 1952, a six per cent issue, bearing a yield on the market of 6.79 per cent. Prince Edward Island is to-day paying 5¼ per cent for its money.

The rates I have cited indicate the price that the provinces must pay for money in the open market. If this bill were to pass, my hon. friend would deny credit to any of those provinces, and a few months ago he would have denied the opportunity to the dominion itself to borrow money. He would shut out scores of municipalities in this country if the bill were passed, and he would shut out hundreds if not thousands of industries. We have old established industries with a fine record of achievement behind them, and possessing great assets, whose securities are yielding interest returns up to as high as nine per cent. I could give a list of them. Some of the securities of our great public utility companies are selling in the open market at a price which indicates the cost of money to them, and in many cases their credit with respect to their senior securities is such that they must pay as high as nine per cent for their money. If by establishing the rate suggested credit is denied to provinces which have the opportunity of placing behind their securities all of their collective assets; if important industries with fixed and tangible assets of great mangitude have to pay these high rates of interest, how much greater will be the difficulty of the individual whose assets are slender and who seeks to borrow money?

My hon. friend, unconsciously I think, weakened his argument when he said that he was prepared to admit that the principle of his bill was subject to one objection. I may say that my hon. friend did not assert his views with that one hundred per cent assurance which so often characterizes his advocacy of his proposals when he was prepared to admit that this proposal was subject to one limitation. The one objection which he was prepared to admit had to do with small loans. He said that he was willing to consider an amendment which, by providing a service charge for the small loan, would have the effect of raising the interest rate above five per cent. In making that admission he stated a cardinal objection to the principal of the bill itself, inasmuch as he recognized the fact that there is a distinction between different kinds of loans: there is the high-class loan and there is the lower-class loan, and the rates which they must pay are in proportion to the kind of security behind them and the integrity of the people who borrow.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister permit me an interjection just there? All I said was that on small loans I thought there was justification for a service charge. I do not think the interpretation which the minister is now putting on my statement is quite fair in connection with what I said.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Speaker I stated precisely what my hon. friend has said, and I am entitled to put my own interpretation upon what would follow if what he admits can be done is done. In other words, he admits that there is a distinction between loans, and in that he is right.

Mr. COOTE: A loan might be made on exactly the same security but it might be for a very small amount, in which case a service charge would be justified.

Mr. RHODES: There is one phase of this question which I am sure my hon. friend has overlooked, and it is one of numerous considerations which have a bearing upon the principle of the bill. My hon. friend has been an advocate of a central bank. One of the strongest arguments that can be adduced in favour of the establishment of a central bank is that it could control the flow of credit. My hon. friend knows full well that there is just as much danger in a policy of too easy money as there is in a policy which makes for dear money. The banks in the United States saw the danger of that great inflation movement, the stock market boom of 1928 and the early part of 1929, and they tried to stop it, the bank rate being raised to as high as ten per cent, if not indeed higher. I think perhaps a major feature which the advocates of a central bank claim for it is that, through its control of open market operations on the one hand and of rediscount rates on the other, it can make for a reasonable equilibrium of the ebb and flow of credit, and for a fair interest rate. If my hon. friend should fix a maximum interest rate of five per cent he would take out of the hands of a central bank the greatest lever it would have to prevent just such an inflationary movement as occurred in the New York stock market in 1928 and the early part of 1929. If there were no other objections to this bill, I think that of itself would be sufficient to condemn it in the eyes of this house.

I am satisfied that my hon. friend could do no greater injury to those whom I know

he earnestly desires to serve than to have his bill passed in the terms in which it is drafted, because the effect would be to deny credit altogether to those who should have it. If they could secure any capital at all they could do so only through what I might call underground or bootleg channels, and if they got it under those conditions they would rate far higher than the open market going rate. It is idle to suggest, even with all the "isms" that are afloat to-day, that there is any other method whereby the rate of interest can be determined than the age old law of supply and demand. If this bill were to pass, apart from surreptitious methods which I have indicated the effect would be to deny credit to all others in Canada except the dominion itself, one or two provinces, and a few select municipalities and borrowers having the very highest class of security. I hope, therefore, that this house in its wisdom, having in mind the very objects which I know my hon. friend seeks to achieve and which he so earnestly believes in, will vote against the motion for the second reading of this bill.

Mr. DUFF: Is it not a fact that if there is no specific arrangement made between debtor and creditor the legal rate of interest is five per cent?

Mr. RHODES: Quite so.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): The minister spoke of denying credit. I should like to ask him if his argument is that capital, instead of adjusting itself to changed conditions brought about by this bill, would seek investment in other countries? Or what is his argument?

Mr. RHODES: It would either seek investment in other countries or would restrict itself to the very highest class of investment in this, which as I said would be the dominion, one or two provinces and a few municipalities. I was speaking with only some haphazard notes before me; but may I emphasize again the fact that we agree entirely as to the desirability of having a lower rate of interest. This is especially desirable in a young country where large volumes of capital are required, and in times like the present when commodity prices are low—although I am glad to say that apparently the corner has definitely been turned and the movement now is towards increased commodity prices.

An hon. MEMBER: We have been told that before.

Mr. RHODES: As an evidence that the government desires that there should be an improvement by way of lower interest rates, we have for some time, as my hon. friend knows, in cooperation with the banks endeavoured to have a lower interest rate made effective on deposits. That lower rate has been put in force since the first of May. Its value will be reflected in lower interest charges. I can only repeat that the experience of the past, and I think cold logic as well, teach us that there is no sovereign remedy to compel a man to lend money at any other rate of interest than that which he chooses to demand for it. The best method is to aim for a lower interest rate through recognized and time-honoured methods.

Mr. COOTE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks it will close the debate.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I think, Mr. Speaker, it being only half a minute before nine o'clock, it would be well to call it nine o'clock.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

The house in committee of ways and means, Mr. MacDonald (Cape Breton) in the chair.

Customs tariff—568. Knitted garments, knitted underwear and knitted goods, n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, 25 per cent; intermediate tariff, 35 per cent and 25 cents per pound; general tariff, 45 per cent and 30 cents per pound.

Mr. BROWN: There is a seeming discrepancy between what the minister has said and the rates as they appear in the tariff schedule. Perhaps that can be explained; if so I should be glad to hear it. I think the minister said the duty on this item would have been increased at the time there was a general revision of the tariff had it not been for certain provisions of the French treaty. I have here the customs tariff and amendments with index to September 8, 1930, and also the one for October 1, 1931. In the older tariff schedule we have this item which now seems to be included under 568, covering three items. For instance we have 568, knitted garments, knitted underwear and knitted goods, n.o.p., all valued at more than ninety cents per pound, and the tariff rates are given, 20, 30 and 35 per cent. Then, if I understand it correctly, we had an "ex" item, which would have to do with the most favoured nations. Then there was also item 568a:

Knitted garments, knitted underwear and knitted goods, n.o.p., all valued at 90 cents per pound or less.

Those three items were included under the one item 568 when the tariff was revised during the short session of 1930, and it will be noticed that the tariff rates are higher than in the earlier schedule. At present they are 25 per cent, 25 per cent and 45 per cent, so it would seem that the government has already raised the tariff on this particular class of goods. I want to point out further that in the new tariff schedules the different valuations are omitted; that is, in the one case the value was fixed at more than 90 cents per pound while in the other it was fixed at less than 90 cents. Those words have been omitted in the new schedule, but we notice that in the proposed change, to the rates of 25 per cent, 35 per cent and 45 per cent are to be added 25 cents per pound under the intermediate tariff and 30 cents per pound under the general tariff. If that 30 cents per pound is applied to goods averaging 90 cents per pound it would mean an additional tariff of 33⅓ per cent which, added to the 45 per cent, would make the general tariff rate 78⅓ per cent. If that tax were levied at the 35 per cent rate given in the older schedule it would mean a rate of 68⅓ per cent.

When this matter first came up I know the minister said the government had made substantial increases in the tariff on woven goods, and certainly this is a very substantial increase in this item. On one occasion the minister said he did not concede that this was a high tariff government, and I know hon. gentlemen opposite from the prairies are very fond of asserting that they are not high tariff men. If 68⅓ per cent and 78⅓ per cent do not represent a high tariff I should like to know what does. If the minister can explain what seems to be the discrepancy in the statement he made with regard to the French treaty I should like to have the explanation, because it seems to me the government has already raised the tariff on this line of goods.

Mr. RHODES: This afternoon my hon. friend from Lisgar said that he was of a mathematical turn of mind, and I was grateful for his support of the argument I was then making, dealing with the question of percentages. May I say to him that in some circumstances 78 per cent would be a very high tariff while in others it might be a comparatively low tariff. Certainly, with the conditions that have existed for the last two or three years, a tariff of 100 per cent would not necessarily be high in some cases. That may sound rather strange to my hon. friend, but with world exchanges on a parity a much lower tariff would afford a considerably greater degree of protection than obtains to-day when we may have a tariff of 78 per cent.

The previous statement I made to the committee I think was true both in substance and in fact; at all events it was according to the advice given me by the experts of the department and I believed then as I believe now that the statement was correct. What we did in 1930 was to group together some five items, which carried different rates, under one classification with the rates as follows: British preferential rate, 25 per cent; intermediate rate, 25 per cent; and general rate, 45 per cent.

Mr. BROWN: Where did you get those figures?

Mr. RHODES: Item 568 of the existing tariff shows these rates as 25 per cent, 25 per cent and 45 per cent. This item, covering knitted garments, knitted underwear and knitted goods, n.o.p., displaced five former items. The change we propose now, as my hon. friend knows, is to add a specific rate of duty of 25 cents per pound under the intermediate tariff and 30 cents per pound under the general tariff.

Mr. BROWN: Would the minister give us the five items that were grouped together?

Mr. RHODES: The first item was 542 in the schedule prior to September, 1930. It reads as follows:

Woven or knitted fabrics, wholly or in part of vegetable fibres, and all such fabrics with cut pile, n.o.p., not containing silk, artificial silk nor wool: British preferential tariff, 20 per cent; intermediate tariff, 27½ per cent; general tariff, 30 per cent.

Then there are these items:

Customs tariff—554b. Woven or knitted fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat or other like animal, not exceeding in weight five ounces to the square yard, n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, 22½ per cent; intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; general tariff, 35 per cent.

Customs tariff—554c. Woven or knitted fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, the hair of the camel, alpaca, goat or other like animal, n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, 27½ per cent; intermediate tariff, 35 per cent; general tariff, 35 per cent.

Customs tariff—568. Knitted garments, knitted underwear and knitted goods, n.o.p., all valued at more than ninety cents per pound: British preferential tariff, 20 per cent; intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; general tariff, 35 per cent.

Customs tariff—568a. Knitted garments, knitted underwear and knitted goods, n.o.p., all

valued at ninety cents per pound or less: British preferential tariff, 15 per cent; intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; general tariff, 35 per cent.

In the short session of September, 1930, these items were all united in the one item 568 which I read.

Mr. BROWN: That simply proves what I have said, that this government has already raised the tariff on all these different items now included in item 568, because the highest rate in any case in the old tariff was thirty-five per cent, the general rate. I do not think it takes a mathematician to understand that you cannot group together a number of items in which the highest rate is thirty-five per cent and get an average of forty-five per cent. And that is what has happened. The government, in the short session of 1930, did raise the general tariff—because that is what I am speaking of—on all these items that are grouped under 568, the increase being from thirty-five to forty-five per cent.

Mr. RHODES: I never suggested that we did not raise the general tariff. What I did say was that we could not raise the tariff, under the intermediate at any rate, above twenty-five per cent, owing to the French treaty. But if it is any comfort to my hon. friend to have it on the record I may say that but for the French treaty we would have increased it at that time. To-day we are only doing what we would have done then but for that treaty.

Mr. BROWN: We will accept that as regards the treaty, because I see that under the old schedules the intermediate tariff was thirty per cent on some of these articles. But this increase on this particular class of goods is an increase on top of the increase which was made in 1930. I want the public to understand that.

Mr. RHODES: That is true so far as the general tariff is concerned.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, and that is the one that principally concerns us in this matter, since the great bulk of these goods in which it is proposed to increase trade comes from the United States, under the general tariff. That is of prime importance to the consumer.

Mr. RHODES: I must correct my hon. friend in one particular. The bulk of them does not come from the United States but from the United Kingdom.

Mr. BROWN: No.

[Mr. Rhodes.]

Mr. RHODES: The statistics are available. We are not increasing the rate under the British preference at all.

Mr. BROWN: That point has been made clear, that these increases do not apply to the United Kingdom. If I remember the figures rightly, approximately $900,000 comes from the United Kingdom and $600,000 from other sources. It is only the $600,000 we are dealing with now, the bulk of which is from the United States, and the duty has already been increased by the government. It was increased in 1930 on goods coming from that country, and now on top of that there is to be the increase proposed by the minister.

Mr. RHODES: Let me give the figures for last year, putting them in parallel columns with the statement of my hon. friend, that the bulk of these goods comes from the United States.

Mr. BROWN: I am referring to the $600,000.

Mr. RHODES: Of knitted goods, we imported last year $155,000 worth, of which $145,000 came from the United Kingdom and $5,000 from the United States. Of woollen underwear we imported $235,000 worth, the United Kingdom supplying $216,000 and Switzerland $11,000. Of knitted garments we imported from the United Kingdom $647,000 and from the United States $140,000, and as regards unspecified garments, that is, in addition to the ones I have cited, we imported from the United Kingdom $105,000 worth and from the United States $95,000. With regard to these figures it must be remembered that even under these proposals to-day we are not disturbing the British preference; we are not raising the duty one cent.

Mr. BROWN: That does not agree with the figures given the other night. We were told that of this particular item, knitted goods, $48,000,000 worth was manufactured in Canada. We were told that approximately $1,500,000 was imported from outside countries, $900,000 of this coming from the British Empire and $600,000 from elsewhere. I may have been wrong in asserting that the bulk came from the United States but that was the statement made and I accepted it as correct. We are dealing only with knitted goods, and my contention is that the duty on that class of goods was already increased by the tariff of 1930 by combining it along with others in this present item 568.

Mr. RHODES: I do not think that iteration and reiteration will help us at all, but the

figures I have given to-night are the figures I gave the other night. The only figure I have not given has no bearing on the statement made by my hon. friend, which was so wildly at variance with the facts, namely, that we imported the bulk of these goods from the United States. Let me give the figures from the United Kingdom as compared with the United States. I cited all the figures in three ranges, and the only additional figures that can be given will not vary my statement to any appreciable degree. In addition to the knitted garments which we imported to the extent of $1,220,000—knitted garments alone—we imported from the United Kingdom to the value of $647,000 and from the United States $140,000. I cite these two figures only because of the statement made by my hon. friend. But let us take all the importations: Czechoslovakia, $93,000; Belgium, $66,000; Switzerland, $65,000; Japan, $47,000; Austria, $45,000; and Germany, $38,000. In other words, we imported more from the United Kingdom, of that class of goods alone, than we did from the United States and all the rest of the world.

Mr. BROWN: That is perfectly in harmony with what I said. There does not seem to be anything that the minister has said that contradicts my statement that the government in the short session of 1930 raised the tariff on goods on which it is now proposed to make an additional increase. That is the essential point that I want to bring out.

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps I might emphasize what I consider to be the essential point. The great bulk of these goods comes from the United Kingdom and we are not disturbing the British preferential rate. In order to keep the record straight and to keep my hon. friend wholly on the rails, I may say that even in 1930 we made one reduction with respect to item 554c, covering woven fabrics. Under the previous administration this item bore a rate of twenty seven and a half per cent, and even in that shocking session of 1930 it was reduced to twenty-five per cent.

Mr. YOUNG: The hon. member for Lisgar is quite right. The other evening the minister told us quite distinctly that the importations last year under this item totalled $1,500,000, of which $900,000 came from the United Kingdom and $600,000 from other places. He now tells us that the importations from other than the United Kingdom were valued at only $250,000. If that is true he is raising the tariff in order to divert one half of one per cent of the value of the production. All he hopes to get by this item is an additional market of one half of one per cent. The only benefit to be derived by the Canadian manufacturers will be an increased production of one half of one per cent. A moment ago the minister told the hon. member for Lisgar that a rate of 78 per cent might be high under some conditions but not under others. He said that where a country had a depreciated currency a rate of 78 per cent would not be considered high. I have before me the Commercial Intelligence Journal issued to-day, and I find that the countries at which this increase of tariff is directed are countries whose currency is not depreciated, but rather at a premium as compared with Canadian currency.

Mr. RHODES: What about Japan, Austria and Czechoslovakia?

Mr. YOUNG: My hon. friend did not mention any importations from Japan. Most of this quarter of a million dollars which he wants to shut out comes from the United States, whose currency is at a premium as compared with ours. If the minister considers a rate of 78 per cent as high when another country's currency is on a parity with ours, it must be abnormally high when another country's currency is worth more than ours. The exchange itself constitutes a considerable tariff. This afternoon when I was pleading with my hon. friend not to put through this item because it would divert $270,000 from the revenues of this country and provide only $180,000 in additional wages he replied that if he was wrong it was only in keeping with his general policy. He wanted to be consistently wrong.

Mr. RHODES: I have the greatest respect for my hon. friend and I always listen with interest to his remarks, but he must make his own speech. He must not make speeches for me or put an interpretation like that upon what I said. I said that if we were wrong with respect to the duties we imposed upon woven fabrics, then we were wrong in what we were doing now in connection with knitted fabrics.

Mr. YOUNG: That is just what I said; you want to be consistently wrong. My hon. friend knows that he is confronted with a deficit amounting to something over $150,000,000, and he is turning greyheaded wondering how he can meet it. He does not know how to balance his budget, and yet, without the least concern, he now proposes to divert another $270,000 from the revenues of this country to an industry which will pay out only an additional $180,000 in wages. The people of Canada will have to be taxed another $270,000 next year. He has asked

the people to make all sorts of sacrifices; he asked us to make a sacrifice of ten per cent in our indemnities and he asked the civil service to sacrifice ten per cent of their salaries. He is doing everything he can to raise revenue, and yet he now proposes to divert money to the pockets of private individuals. I wonder if he has any idea what this industry is costing the country. Its total production is valued at $48,000,000. The lowest tariff rate of twenty five per cent is under the British preferential. Taking that as the prevailing rate, this industry is costing us $12,000,000 per year, and it pays out only $14,000,000 in wages. Does my hon. friend consider that such an industry is a profitable one to maintain? The only way this industry can be helped is by an increase in sales. Sales abroad cannot be increased so long as they maintain high production costs; the only way that sales in Canada can be increased is by reduced prices. By this proposal the government is inviting the manufacturers to increase their prices, and increased prices will mean decreased sales because the people have no money to spend. In replying to the hon. member for Macleod a moment ago in connection with another matter, the minister said the age old law of supply and demand was the only way of proving the true value of money. I contend that the age old law of supply and demand is the only way to fix the true value of knitted goods. Let the law of supply and demand operate and it will be found that the price of these woollen goods will reach a point where the people can buy them. The manufacturers will be forced to do what the knitting mill to which I referred this afternoon did, that is, increase their efficiency, eliminate expensive equipment, and cut down expenses. If they did that they would be able to put these goods on the market at a price the people could afford to pay. With reduced prices there would be increased sales. I would get down on my knees to the minister if I thought it would do any good and beg him not to throw away this money. The country will be bankrupt unless something is done, and I beg the minister not to waste this money.

Mr. RHODES: I know that my hon. friend is a consistent believer in what he believes. I would not for one moment attempt to influence his judgment, but I do not propose to go over and over the same old ground we covered in connection with the exchange and duties upon woven fabrics. I think the safest thing for me to say is that I disagree not only with what he has said just now, but with what he said last session, and that I shall disagree with anything he is going to say. I think I can let it go at that. Let me say to my hon. friend that the worst thing that could happen under these proposals would be that more business would be deflected to the mother country. The duties in that regard have not been increased, in fact they are lower than they were when my hon. friend supported the last government. To the extent that we increase the flow of goods over the British preferential—that is the lowest rate and the one which obtained when the friends of my hon. friend were in power,—it follows that we are taking the course which will give us the most revenue. I must say that I do not agree with my hon. friend when he says that we are shutting out $270,000 of revenue.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I ask my hon. friend the reason for this increase when on his own statement Great Britain is getting as much business as is coming into Canada? Of course the bulk of business is in Canadian mills, but when they are already getting the business except to the very limited extent which my hon. friend has just announced, what is the necessity for the increase?

Mr. RHODES: The increase in the general tariff is not so important; the increase of greater importance is that in the intermediate, because we are being subjected at the moment to a type of competition which is very serious.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): But, according to the minister's statement, it has not been so.

Mr. RHODES: It has been.

Mr. YOUNG: One half of one per cent.

Mr. RHODES: The intermediate tariff is where, in our minds, the importance of the provision rests.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My fear is that this affords an opportunity for an increase all along the line for both the Canadian manufacturer and the importer who will take advantage of the increase.

Mr. RHODES: How can he do it when we have not touched the British preference?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): My hon. friend has just stated that every advantage you give the British manufacturer along with the Canadian, just gives the latter a greater opportunity to take a little bit more. That is the advantage the minister gives him, particularly when the minister has just announced the fact that all the importation comes from Great Britain.

Mr. RHODES: That will not be affected.

Mr. MALCOLM: I would like to call the attention of the minister to the remark he made about the rate being the same as it was when the late government was in power. When the former government was in office the rates were: British preferential, 20 per cent; intermediate, 30 per cent and general, 35 per cent.

Mr. RHODES: I was speaking of the British preference only.

Mr. MALCOLM: The British preferential rate was only 20 per cent at that time.

Mr. RHODES: There were five items; I called off only one.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Was there only one 27½ per cent?

Mr. RHODES: Yes, and I referred to that item.

Mr. BROWN: I have just been looking up the matter. The minister says that the rates which the hon. member for Weyburn supported under the former government were higher than those prevailing to-day. I take the five items he gave.

Mr. RHODES: One item, I said.

Mr. BROWN: Number 542 was 20 per cent British preference.

Mr. RHODES: I quoted all that.

Mr. BROWN: Number 544b was 22½ per cent; number 568, 20 per cent; number 568a, 15 per cent and number 554c alone, 27½ per cent.

Mr. RHODES: That is the one.

Mr. BROWN: It is very easy to fix upon one item. Perhaps, to arrive at an accurate conclusion, we would have to figure out the amounts imported under different tariffs before we reached an average, but it is not fair for the minister, in view of these figures, to make the statement that the rates were higher then than they are now.

Mr. RHODES: It all depends upon the point of view. The hon. member says that it is not fair to pick upon one item, yet as a matter of fact, while sixty-seven items are referred to under the proposals of the last budget, only five of them involve an increase in tariff.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): On the British preference.

Mr. RHODES: No, under any tariff. Numbers of them lowered the tariff and numbers of them took the duty off altogether. At the moment I am merely reminding the hon. member for Lisgar of his argument that it was not fair to pick on one item. He has picked out this item we are now considering, and his friends have done so also. I have no objection to that. More time has been taken on this one item than on all the rest of them put together.

Mr. BROWN: The minister is very astute in trying to get away from the real point at issue. He made the distinct statement on this item we are now considering, that the British preferential rate was higher under the former government than it is now.

Mr. RHODES: Only on one item. I am in the judgment of Hansard; I take the record as it now appears in Hansard. I cited every one of those items and I referred specifically to only one; I said the words I say now and I am prepared to abide by Hansard that it will be found there that is what I said.

Mr. BROWN: I understood we were discussing the five items under the old tariff that are now grouped under one on which the rate is now 25 per cent, whereas the former rate on only one of the five exceeded 22½ per cent.

Mr. RHODES: I would not ask my hon. friend to break the Sabbath, but I would suggest quietly that to-morrow morning he take Hansard and read what I said to-night with respect to this item and I would be prepared to accept his judgment as to whether what I said is not precisely what I have just now said I said.

Mr. YOUNG: The minister has not changed his course, but he has changed his objective. The other night he was doing this in order that the Canadian manufacturers might capture the $600,000 worth of importations which are coming from other countries; now he wants to divert that trade to Great Britain. I would suggest to him that if he wants to divert that trade to Great Britain, he does not need to raise the general or intermediate rate; all he has to do is to lower the preferential rate and let goods come in from Great Britain.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): And thus get revenue.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes.

Mr. RHODES: Then my hon. friend suggests that we would get more revenue?

Mr. YOUNG: Yes, and cheaper goods.

Mr. MULLINS: I have been listening to the apostles of free trade so long that I have become somewhat tired. They are free traders when they are on the hustings and protectionists when they are in power. I wonder why they cannot be consistent. They have maintained a higher tariff than hon. gentlemen on this side of the house ever did. I should like the hon. member for Lisgar to listen to the words of a gentleman who was one of his own allies when he sat in the far corner of the house. I was a member of the house in 1925 and 1926. I am going to read what this gentleman says in his book and it will bear me out so far as the Liberal party and their tariffs are concerned. The whole thing is a joke. The Liberals are no more free traders and they do not practise free trade more than we do on this side of the house. This gentleman says:

> The Liberal party was first elected to power in 1873. The issue was lower tariff with a view to ultimate free trade; it held power for four years. No alteration in the tariff policy resulted. It was elected again in 1896. The issue was still lower tariff, with a view to free trade; it was in office for five years: result, tariff unaltered. It was in power again in 1900. The issue was once more tariff reduction with a view to free trade; it held power for four years,—result, tariff practically unchanged. Reelected in 1904, held office four years, the tariff still unchanged. Again in 1908 the Liberal party was returned to office on a policy of tariff reduction; it held power another three years without results as to low tariffs. In 1921, the Liberals once more came to power; policy, a gradual downward revision of the tariff; it held power until 1925—the result was that the tariff stood as before.

Mr. YOUNG: What is the name of the book?

Mr. MULLINS: I was in the house in 1925 when I saw the parade in front of this building and I heard the statement made from this side of the house when you occupied these seats, as to what you were going to do, and when you got those men nicely home, what did you do? You know very well what you did. You took the duties off parts for the automobile manufacturer and you gave them more protection than before. One of the manufacturers told me so in Oshawa. The ex-Minister of Trade and Commerce knows that just as well as I do.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, I do not.

Mr. MULLINS: I heard the statement made from the platform of a theatre in Ottawa that you were going to stay right where you were; you had made your stand. Then when you got everything nicely quiet, what did you do? You know what you did.

What is the use of being inconsistent? Why not be honest and play the game squarely? You know you are protectionists, even more so than we are. The hon. member for Lisgar sat with the Progressives.

Mr. YOUNG: What is the name of the book?

Mr. MULLINS: This is a book by William Irvine, M.P.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MULLINS: Don't laugh at that, because when they get a fair sized group you will want them. You will be running around after them as you were in this house a few years ago. I look into the faces of many of you over there, and I remember your activities very well. The hon. gentleman who sits as an independent knows how persistent you were to throw your arms around them and try to hold them. You do not want them just now, but Mr. Massey says that the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation ought to join up with the Liberals, and you will want them if they become a large sized group. You know that, and you know you will then begin your activities again. I remember a gentleman coming into the office that I occupied on the sixth floor on the same corridor with these gentlemen in the far corner, and seeing my door wide open he said: "If you do not close that door you will get what is coming to you." He told me I would be bumped off. "Well," I said, "go to it." Protectionists, yes; that is what you are. The hon. member for Labelle was right when he said that you were free traders when not in power and protectionists when in power. The right hon. leader of the opposition, speaking at Kingston, Ontario, on October 20, 1925, as reported in the Winnipeg Free Press, said:

> We realize that our industries here have to have safeguards with respect to competition from other parts of the world, competition from the country to the south of us—

The country that you think so much about. He went on:

> . . . competition from conditions as they are in England, and we think that is all the more reason why in these days of depreciated currency and the like we should have the benefit of expert advice and information on all these great questions of the tariff.

Now I want you hon. gentlemen opposite to be consistent. I do not want you to be using the tariff and making out when you are in opposition that you are apostles of free trade just to get it on Hansard and then go out on the hustings and use it. You have done that long enough. I am a lower tariff

believer than any of you sitting opposite Not one on the opposite side believes in a lower tariff more than I do. You know very well the position of this old ship of state. You know she is struggling, and you are just talking politics. There is only one faithful free trader on the other side, and that is the hon. member for Weyburn. I give him credit. The others are just as much protectionists, and more so, than we on this side of the house.

I did not intend to speak, but I know that the man out west is struggling hard, and I know that on this side of the house nothing will be done to make his lot more burdensome. We are doing our best to save the ship and to save the mess you left to us. You know what we inherited. Oh yes, we went out after it and we got it, and now we are struggling to save this old ship from swamping. I believe the hon. Minister of Finance is doing everything that is honest and faithful, and why do hon. gentlemen opposite hold up the house and keep us sitting here when we ought to be home? They are doing it for politics and nothing else, and the gentlemen in the southeast corner know it just as well as I do. They know that the Liberals are not consistent.

Mr. BROWN: I want to correct my hon. friend in one particular, and that is in his statement that the hon. member for Wetaskiwin and I were allies. I have never on any occasion sat in a caucus room or had any intercourse with the hon. member for Wetaskiwin, and I have no doubt that he is just as ready to repudiate the suggestion as I am.

Mr. MULLINS: Hon. gentlemen were with him. They had him in the group. I do know you ran as a Liberal-Progressive, but I would rather have a man that comes out as a straight United Farmer than with a hyphenated name such as you have. There are only two of you left. But you are in your right place, and why don't you be honest and say, "I am a Liberal."

Item agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: There is only one other item on the tariff list, Mr. Chairman, and that is item 682a, to which I have an amendment to move.

Customs tariff—682a. Net floats of aluminum, glass or cork, for use only in deep-sea or lake fishing, not to include floats for sportmen's use: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

In the budget provisions we included among the free items, floats of glass or aluminum. The amendment I have is to widen that to include canvas floats as well. My hon. friend from Comox-Alberni made a plea that we ought to include trawl kegs and sinkers. May I say with respect to trawl kegs that I find they are made almost entirely by the fishermen themselves. They are a home-made product, and to the extent that they are purchased it is of advantage to the fishermen that they should be purchased from themselves. With respect to sinkers, they are made of lead and they are a home-made product also. Certainly they are to a large extent in the east. At all events, I am advised that on balance there would be no advantage to the industry as a whole to amend the item to include sinkers, and for that reason I have thought it wise not to do so. I therefore move:

That tariff item 682a as amended by resolution No. 2 of March 21, 1933, be further amended by inserting therein after the word "glass" the word "canvas."

Mr. NEILL: The desire to include sinkers arises from the fact that it militates against both fishermen and manufacturers in this way. I have not the tariff item before me, but when these sinkers are attached to nets brought in in one complete entity, so to speak, they come in free. But many sinkers are used on the same net later on in the ordinary course, as the sinkers often get lost, and if the minister does not put the word "sinkers" in here he is hurting the Canadian manufacturer, which is not supposed to be his object. It is an inducement to the fisherman to buy his net from the United States complete with all the sinkers and lines and floats, because then they come in free. But a great many fishermen do not want to do that. They prefer to buy just their web and the lines and sinkers, and then put them together themselves. The people who are in the business of manufacturing these articles are handicapped because they have to pay a duty on sinkers coming in individually and which they sell retail, or wholesale and then retail and the extra cost is of course paid by the fishermen, whereas when the sinkers come in with the net they come in free. While it may be true that in the maritimes, and possibly to a limited extent in British Columbia, the sinkers are made out of lead by the fishermen themselves, there is a regular standard sinker manufactured for the purpose, of a certain shape and with a hole in it to run the line through, which is quite distinct from the home-made article which the fisherman cuts out of a piece of lead. I cannot

see that it would do any harm to the revenue by inserting the word "sinkers." I was given to understand that we had a fair prospect of getting this inserted, and I so advised the fishermen. I am sorry to find it is not going to be accepted now. I have a letter here from a manufacturer quoting a letter from the department as follows:

Concerning the leads referred to in paragraph three of your letter, when attached to nets et cetera, provision is made in the act for exemption from sales tax on goods enumerated in customs tariff item No. 682, when under a class or kind and for the purpose stated therein. The exemption applying equally to similar goods manufactured or produced in Canada.

That is dealing with the sales tax, but the same principle applies. Last year the minister was good enough to exempt the sinkers from sales tax and I thought the same argument would have applied in regard to duty. I remember a delegation waiting on him, and I formed the opinion that we might have got a favourable decision then if it had not been for his desire not to open the tariff act last year. Is it not possible that the minister might leave this over for further consideration?

Mr. RHODES: I assure my hon. friend I have given careful consideration to this matter. If he was under the impression that I said this amendment would be made, I must say he had no warrant for such an impression. In that regard I am not depending only on my memory, which may not be of the best at this stage of the session, as I have full occasion to know, but if he will refer to page 4296 of Hansard he will see that I made it abundantly clear that while I allowed the item to stand there was no understanding with respect to what action would be taken. It is true that last year an amendment was made freeing these sinkers from sales tax, but it by no means follows that the same reasoning applies in relation to customs duty. I cannot speak with the knowledge my hon. friend has as to conditions in the west, but in the east there is no demand for this exemption. The fishermen there make their own sinkers, and there is no reason they should not do it in the west. It is a simple piece of lead; the crudest apparatus would enable them to make it, so I do not think it is a matter which requires much time and thought. I should like to be courteous to my hon. friend, but I think the item ought to carry.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Neill.]

1. Resolved,—That the customs tariff, being chapter forty-four of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, as amended by chapter thirty-nine of the acts of 1929, chapter thirteen of the acts of 1930 (first session), chapter three of the acts of 1930 (second session), and chapter thirty of the acts of 1931, be further amended by adding to section six thereof the following subsection:—

(9) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the governor in council may from time to time and as occasion requires order and direct, subject to such exceptions as may be made, what shall be the rate of exchange fixed for any currency in computing the value for duty of goods imported into Canada from any place or country the currency of which is depreciated, and in case a sum in Canadian currency less than the invoice value of the goods in the currency of the place or country of export, computed at the rate of exchange so ordered, be paid for the goods, the actual selling price of the goods to the importer shall be regarded as less than the fair market value of the goods when sold for home consumption, and the provisions of this section shall apply and special or dumping duty shall apply equal to the difference between the value of the invoice computed at the current rate of exchange or at the average current rate from time to time fixed by order of the governor in council, and the value of such invoice, computed at the rate of exchange for duty so ordered as aforesaid, or may be less than such difference as the governor in council may from time to time order and direct; and the governor in council may order and direct that in all cases of sales or consignments of goods imported into Canada, where the importer owns, controls or is interested in the business of the exporter, or the exporter owns, controls or is interested in the business of the importer, or the importer and exporter operate under a controlling or holding company, notwithstanding the expressed terms of the sale or consignment, the transaction shall be regarded as a sale and the actual selling price to the purchaser in Canada shall be taken to be the value of the goods in the currency of the place or country of export converted into Canadian currency at the current rate of exchange, or at the average current rate from time to time fixed by order of the governor in council, and shall be regarded as less than the fair market value of the goods when sold for home consumption and the provisions of this section shall apply and special or dumping duty shall be deemed to apply equal to the difference between the value of the invoice computed at the current rate of exchange or at the average current rate from time to time fixed by order of the governor in council, and the value of such invoice computed at the rate of exchange for duty so ordered as aforesaid, or may be less than such difference as the governor in council may from time to time order and direct.

Any order in council made hereunder may be varied, extended or revoked at any time by the governor in council.

This subsection shall be deemed to have had effect from and after the first day of September, 1931.

Resolution agreed to.

STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, did not the minister promise to allow a debate on the stabilization fund proposal after we passed this?

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend is quite right. The understanding was that by unanimous consent discussion would take place in committee prior to report. The understanding the other day when we were in committee will be found at page 4560 of Hansard:

> After we have concluded our several items in committee, and just before reporting, I should be perfectly content if by unanimous consent there should be a discussion in committee of the stabilization fund.

That was the understanding arrived at then, as against consideration that we would discuss it on a motion to go into supply, which would confine hon. members to one speech.

Mr. NEILL: I will not detain the committee long; at any rate I will not go as far afield as did the hon. member for Marquette. I just want to reiterate a plea for the inclusion in the stabilization items of pilchard meal and pilchard oil. I brought this up before in a general way, but I lacked full information, and the Prime Minister said the door was left open for further details. I just want to put a few additional facts on the record.

The request is that pilchard manufacturers of British Columbia, which is the only place in Canada where they manufacture pilchard oil and meal, should have their products included in the stabilization scheme. In speaking of it the other day I made a mistake about the valuation of the plants. Thinking of the buildings only I said they would probably be worth $5,000 to $8,000 apiece, but I am advised I was wrong in that regard; I had forgotten the expensive machinery and boats. I am told that the investment will run in each case from $50,000 to $400,000. There are twenty-seven plants, and if you multiply that number by $150,000 as a mean, it gives an investment of over $4,000,000. The industry employs some 2,000 men. I would like to state one or two facts to show the desperate condition this once prosperous industry is in. Four years ago there were twenty-four plants running; last year there were seven. Four years ago eighty-six seines were operating, that would employ at least 600 men; last year there were only twenty-two. Four years ago the selling price per gallon for the oil was thirty-seven cents; last year it was eleven cents, a fall of two-thirds. Wages of fishermen per ton four years ago were $4; last year they were $1.60.

In addition to the troubles they had at that time the government made conditions a little more onerous by putting a sales tax on fuel oil, which while it may be of benefit to the coal mines or to the revenue is going to make it more expensive to operate these plants. Hitherto the great market for pilchard oil has been in the United States, where they have a tariff against it of five cents a gallon. When the price is thirty-seven cents that is one thing, but when the price is ten or eleven cents it is a much greater thing, it amounts to fifty per cent. They state that there is no expectation of any sale in the United States this year; the only inquiries for pilchard oil now in hand are from Great Britain. The British market is an enormous one if they can get into it. Japanese shipments of fish oil to Britain last year were 4,000,000 gallons. They state that under present conditions unless something is done the industry is practically wiped out. You can imagine that if it drops from twenty-four plants down to seven it is nearly wiped out. It is impossible to reduce further the charter rates for fishing vessels; they are already so low that they pay only operating expenses. The pay of fishermen and plant workers is also so low that a further reduction would result in their going on relief. The operators suggest that the only possibility is the inclusion of these products in the stabilization fund, and they say the cost would not be excessive. On last year's products it would amount to someting like $16,500, and probably would be much less now owing to the increase in the value of the pound. They ask also that pilchard meal should be included as well. That is part of the business. The price dropped from $54 a ton four years ago to $20 a ton. The United Kingdom is a market for that also.

I might also suggest as an argument in favour of it that the usual expression used concerning these things is "fish and fish products," and I think that was at one time in the mind of the right hon. Prime Minister, because my recollection is that he used it. But it has not been so expressed; it is only "fresh and canned fish." It is a question of these people having to go entirely out of business, in which case 2,000 white people will be thrown out of work and an investment of $4,000,000 will be almost thrown into the discard. The possibility of selling in the United States is negligible because, as I was saying before the right hon. Prime Minister came in, the duty in that country now amounts to about fifty per cent of the value. Formerly it was very much lower, but it is

a fixed duty and now it amounts to practically fifty per cent of the value. There is an enormous market in Great Britain, and under present conditions the expense to the government would not be very heavy. It is indicated that $16,500 would at least keep these remaining plants operating for another year, and I earnestly hope the government will give this question its serious consideration.

Mr. DUFF: For a few moments I should like to discuss the items coming under this so-called stabilization fund as well as some other items which are not included. Let me say that as a matter of principle I am opposed to this idea of bonusing the thirteen articles mentioned, but if the government are going to pay the exporters of these articles a certain amount of money, according to the value of the goods and the value of the pound, then I say that other articles should be included as well.

For instance, in regard to the fishing industry, only lobster and canned salmon shipped to Great Britain will receive any benefit. Last year we shipped 68,176 hundredweight of canned lobster to various countries, and since there are about two cases to a hundredweight that would mean about 136,000 cases. Of that quantity only 58,000 cases went to Great Britain. Large quantities went to countries whose currency is depreciated as compared with our dollar, so it seems to me that if this measure is designed to help the fishermen who catch and can lobsters the fund should apply to goods shipped to other countries. We shipped 1,229 hundredweight, or about 2,500 cases, to Belgium; about 4,800 cases to Denmark; about 17,200 cases to France and about 14,000 cases to Sweden. May I also say that a large part of the 58,000 cases shipped to Great Britain was reshipped to various European countries, and if this stabilization fund is to apply to these lobsters which are shipped first to Great Britain and later to the continent I think it should apply also to the lobsters which go directly to France, Belgium, Sweden and other European countries.

We are an integral part of the British Empire, and if the government desire to help our fisheries there are other kinds of fish which should be included under this fund, and it should be extended to exports to British Empire countries as well as those to Great Britain. While the lobster fisheries are important they constitute one of the smallest industries in the maritimes provinces, and if the government want to help the fishermen of those provinces they should include under this fund fish shipped to British Empire countries. In the British West Indies our dollar is worth only about 75 cents; people who ship goods there must accept a depreciation of from 20 per cent to 30 per cent, say an average of 25 per cent. In my opinion there should be no discrimination between goods shipped to Great Britain and those shipped to other parts of the British Empire. Last year we exported to the British West Indies 70,307 hundredweight of pickled mackerel; 32,313 hundredweight of pickled herring; 68,349 hundredweight of dried codfish and other fish as well. These exports went to Trinidad, Demerara, Barbados, Jamaica and other parts of the West Indies. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that the dried and pickled fish business is just as important, if not more so, than either the lobster business in the maritimes or the salmon business in British Columbia. In view of the fact that these countries have depreciated currencies it seems to me that before this matter is finally settled the stabilization fund should be extended to include dried and pickled fish of all kinds exported to the West Indies as well as the comparatively small amount of lobsters and canned salmon going to Great Britain

There is still another matter to which I should like to refer, Mr. Chairman; that is the matter of lumber. The lumbering industry in the maritime provinces and British Columbia is just as badly off as any other industry, and it seems to me that lumber also should be included under this fund. Lumber prices are fixed in Great Britain; they are paid in British funds, and consequently shippers of lumber must accept the currency of that country, with the result that they must take a depreciated pound. If it is fair and reasonable to give special consideration to these thirteen items by means of this fund I strongly urge that lumber and pickled and dried fish should be included as well. As I said a moment ago, I think the whole thing is a mistake; I think it is a bad principle and I do not think there was any need to establish this fund. If, when they came into power, this government had not forced people who import goods from Great Britain and other countries having depreciated currencies, and then imposed what is known as a dumping duty, there would have been no need to give special consideration to these few items. The very fact that in the first resolution, which we passed a few moments ago, this dumping duty on goods coming from Great Britain is done away with proves that it was a wrong policy.

In addition to lumber and fish going to Great Britain and British Empire countries I

am going to mention the subject of apples. When the agreements were under consideration last year a great deal was said with regard to the great benefit that those agreements would be to the apple industry. I notice, however, that apples are not included among the thirteen items to which the stabilization fund is to apply. At that time I contended that the so called preference on apples from Canada was in reality not a preference at all but was a duty on foreign apples entering Great Britain, in other words that the Canadian apple was in exactly the same position after the agreements were passed that it was in before. There was never any duty on Canadian apples going into Great Britain and they are in no better position now than previously, because the price of apples, whether they are foreign or Canadian, is fixed on the London market and the Canadian shipper must take the price which the London buyer offers for the product. One of my arguments, therefore, was this. The suggestion was made that because of the so-called preference, in other words a duty on foreign apples, the Canadian producer would benefit, and I pointed out that if British goods coming into this country were not subject to the dumping duty as well as the special tax, that is to say, the difference between the pound sterling and the rate at which the pound was valued by the Department of National Revenue, the Canadian shipper would not suffer in consequence of having to accept a depreciated dollar for his apples. In other words, if we ship $1,000,000 worth of goods to Great Britain and have to take $3.80 to the pound for them, and if we buy $1,000,000 worth of goods from Great Britain at the rate of $3.80 to the pound, no one suffers by the transaction. The only trouble in connection with depreciated currency in the past has been the policy of this government. Besides putting on a dumping duty they have also made us pay the difference between the pound sterling and the rate at which they have valued the pound. There was a good deal of criticism on this score and that I presume is the reason for their doing two things in this budget. One of these was to introduce the stabilization fund to compensate shippers of certain goods exported from this country to Great Britain for the large sums of money taken from them during the last two or three years. Let me show what I mean.

Suppose you shipped £100 worth of canned lobster to Great Britain, selling them on the basis of $4.10 to the pound. You receive $4.10 to the pound for them. The pound, say, is worth $4.60, and if you receive £100 at the rate of $4.60 you get $4.60, so that you lose $50 on that transaction, and that $50 under the stabilization fund the government proposes to make good. As I said a moment ago, if business were let alone, if there were not so much paternalism and interference, there would be no need to pay that $50 to the shipper of £100 worth of lobsters. If the shipper of that £100 worth of lobsters were left alone he or someone else would buy from Great Britain £100 worth of goods, woollen or cotton or some other kind. The government, however, instead of allowing him to import these goods at the rate he would pay, namely, $4.10, compel him to pay duty on a valuation of $4.86. That is to say, if on the £100 worth of goods the duty were at the rate of thirty per cent, instead of paying thirty per cent on $4.10 he is compelled to pay thirty per cent on $4.86. Thirty per cent on $4.86 is $1.46, and on $4.10, which is what he really paid for the goods, it is $1.23, or a difference of 23 cents on every pound's worth of goods he buys. In addition to that, under the old arrangement up to the time the budget was brought down, the government fixed an arbitrary value of the pound sterling at $4.40, although the real value was only $4.10. There is a difference of 30 cents; add that 30 to the 23, the difference in the duty, and it means that the importer, on every $4.10 worth of goods, pays 53 cents more than he should pay were it not for the policy of this government. In other words, he loses $53 on every £100 and the government now propose to pay him $50.

The reason for the introduction of the stabilization fund must be the realization on the part of the government of the unsoundness of their policy in fixing the pound at a certain rate and also in making the importer pay duty on a valuation of $4.86. Now that they practically agree to take off the dumping duty and to allow goods to come in at the price people pay, there is no reason for the stabilization fund. If however the government decide to apply the stabilization fund to articles going into Great Britain and nowhere else, I say that in the interests of the Canadian exporter to British Empire countries they should extend it to goods shipped to the West Indies or New Zealand or Australia. Further, so far as apples, lumber, wheat and fish are concerned, as well as a list of other articles too numerous to mention, I submit that the stabilization fund should be made to apply to all these. If the stabilization fund is a good thing it should include them all.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member (Mr. Duff) speaks of including lumber, and as there are large lumber interests in my district I might

be expected to endorse his remarks. I understand however, at least I heard the Prime Minister say some weeks ago, that it was not intended to apply the stabilization fund to lumber because he had in view other methods whereby he hoped to benefit the lumber industry. I take it I am at liberty to guess or to suggest that that means some negotiations with the United States, and that is where we in British Columbia want the market. The stabilization fund might help us to get into the British market, but that would be like trying to make water run uphill. Our natural market for the second and third grade of goods we want to sell is right at hand in the United States; we cut the product the way they want it and they are accustomed to our standards. Putting the duty back as it was last year in the United States would do us infinitely more good, so far as the lumber business in British Columbia is concerned, than including that product in the provisions of the stabilization fund. That at any rate is my individual opinion. What I do want is to have pilchard products included in the stabilization fund. That would do us as much good as applying the fund to salmon. I do not hesitate to say that the stabilization scheme will be of material advantage to the canned salmon industry of the country, and I am glad to express my appreciation of it; but the including of pilchards would do us as much good. A couple of thousand men are engaged in the industry. I have hopes in this matter, because the Prime Minister, speaking on March 24, said that the door was not closed against other agricultural and fish products. I hope therefore that consideration will be given pilchards later on.

How will this stabilization fund be put into effect? It does not appear that the Minister of Finance intends to bring in an act to carry it out. The money comes out of the general relief vote and I presume that an order in council will be passed. If it is done in that way will the minister publish the order in council so that everyone will know what is included and what the conditions are?

Mr. RHODES: It is proposed to bring the stabilization fund into effect by order in council, and it is intended that the widest possible publicity shall be given as soon as it is announced.

Mr. NEILL: Is there any limit to the fund in dollars, in amount?

Mr. RHODES: No.

Mr. DUFF: Is the door still open for other items to be included?

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. RHODES: I am sure the Prime Minister will carry out his undertaking in that respect.

Mr. MacLEAN: I desire to support the plea made by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough on behalf of the people in his section of the country in connection with fish products. As hon. members well know, the largest item of export from Prince Edward Island is potatoes, but because of the embargo against this commodity by the British government, very little benefit will be derived by the producers from the stabilization fund if it does come into effect as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. Some little benefit may be derived by the producers of cheese and meat products, but that is all. Strong representations have been made to the minister, not only from Prince Edward Island but from other parts of the country, on behalf of the silver fox industry. If any industry lends itself to the application of this stabilization fund it is the silver fox industry. Many people think that as this industry has been in operation for a great number of years it does not need any assistance, but many of the large ranches are not making a profit to-day. They are carrying on in the hope that they may get a break in later years. Shippers of silver fox pelts ship direct to the British market and separate accounts are kept, so that any money which might accrue through this fund would go direct to the shipper and not be absorbed by other interests. If the pound keeps on improving it may be that the government will not have to pay out anything through the stabilization fund. I suppose everyone would welcome that happening.

Mr. DUFF: They should make it retroactive.

Mr. MacLEAN: There is another factor to be considered in connection with this industry. It is quite possible that the operation of the stabilization fund will increase the price of meats. As everyone knows, carload after carload of meat products are sent down to the maritimes from the abattoirs in this part of the country. If the price of meat products is increased, there will be an increase in the cost of producing silver fox pelts. If this industry is not included in this fund, its operations would react against it. I hope the Minister of Finance will give this matter his special attention.

Mr. MALCOLM: Any cost that might arise from the payment by the government of the difference between the existing rate of

exchange and $4.60 has now been transferred in large measure from the taxpayers of Canada to the ordinary buyer of the pound when sold on the market. It would almost appear as though the action of the American government in abandoning the redemption of her currency in gold is putting the relationship of the pound to the dollar back to the position occupied when both the pound and the dollar were on a gold basis. Nor personally do I imagine that when the market settles the relationship between the pound and the dollar will differ very greatly from the relationship that existed at the time both currencies were on a gold redemption basis. Inasmuch as the margin between the present rate of exchange and $4.60 mentioned by the government is so narrow, I submit that in order to benefit alike all products, the government might without very heavy expense to the treasury apply the stabilization to all products shipped to Great Britain.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has touched upon one phase of this matter which was in my mind some weeks ago when I spoke in the house and indicated that the door was not absolutely closed. We had some reason to believe that there would be an increase in the value of the pound in terms of dollars. Perhaps that increase has come about more rapidly than was expected by most people, and speaking to-night I should not care to indicate that I was of the opinion that it is at all stabilized. I suppose I should not say more than that the figure at which sterling exchange is selling to-day is not in my judgment the true measure of what the ultimate value of the pound, as stabilized, will be. However, that is only an individual opinion and has no particular value beyond being my own view of the matter. The circumstances which have brought about the rise during the last few days are perhaps not unknown to hon. gentlemen. All I can say is that if one were certain and could predicate with some degree of authority a fixed value, I believe my colleagues would agree, as I agree, with what has been said by the hon. gentleman. It was for that reason that we did not desire to express with too much certainty a limitation upon the articles which might enjoy the benefit of this fund, and that thought is still in the mind of the government. In particular is that so of the commodities which cannot in any sense be affected at this moment, that is, commodities which will not be in condition for export until much later on in the year. I ask the committee to appreciate our position in the matter. We determined that this was the proper step to take at this particular time and we did this for reasons which I think most hon. members who have followed the trend of economic conditions will agree were apparent to every observer. Having done so, we contented ourselves for the moment with stating the articles to which it would apply. Those articles have been referred to to-night.

There are such items as apples, which has been pressed so strongly, about which we might be compelled to arrive at another conclusion in the light of crop conditions which may prevail this fall. The same is true with respect to pears, plums, and other fresh fruits which have been finding a market under very considerable difficulties in Great Britain. Apparently the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough has misunderstood the effect of the preference upon apples. I think the hon. member for Hants-Kings could represent more authoritatively the views of the apple growers of Nova Scotia. I think this was indicated by his vote upon the United Kingdom agreement. The fact is that to-day apples enjoy a larger preference in the British market than they ever have before. At the moment that preference amounts to $1.25 per barrel as against apples coming from outside the empire. The strongest pressure was exercized by Australia and New Zealand with respect to apples and only last week I was told in Washington that the Argentine is capable of supplying apples which because of seasonal conditions would not conflict with those from Canada. I fancy the former Minister of Trade and Commerce is familiar with the details of the Argentine production of apples. I can only say this: I desire to make it quite clear that the movement in the value of the pound sterling has made the amount payable on the limited number of items mentioned rather small, and contemplating as we did an expenditure much larger than would be involved under existing rates, if there is a stabilized value approximating one around the figures that we have had during the last few days, I will say it might be possible to extend the list, and substantially too. The Minister of Finance and various other members of the government have received applications with respect to a very considerable number of products. I do not suppose it would greatly interest the committee but as a matter of curiosity, the committee might like to learn the views of various Canadians as to the items that might be placed upon that list. They are, for instance:

Macaroni products.
Fresh apples.
Fresh and frozen fish and fish meal industries.

Lumber.
Soft drinks.
Evaporated apples.
Dehydrated apples.
Fresh fruits.
Fresh vegetables.
Pilchard oil.
British Columbia fish oil and fish meal.
Black fox pelts.
Silver fox pelts.
Alfalfa meal.
Farm furs.
All furs.
Mining industry.
Ice cream mix.
Cattle sales made after budget speech.
Ranch raised furs.
Frozen salmon.
Raw fruits.
Canned meats.
Fresh plums.
Fresh peaches.
Fresh pears.
Fruit pulps.
Cider.
Concentrated cider.
Butter.
Pulpwood and pitwood.
Fish oils.
Dry salted fish.
Fruit preserved in sulphur dioxide for English market.
Lobsters.
Cattle exported.
Salt fish.
Wool exported to United Kingdom.
Eggs.
Cheese.

That is a list just recorded as the applications were received in letters sent to various members of the administration. I mention it because it is not as comprehensive a list as at one time I thought the application would indicate.

I do not think I can usefully say more than I have said, except with respect to the matter mentioned by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. Similar representations containing the figures he has given the committee to-night were embodied in a communication received, I think, by the hon. member for East Kootenay as well as by myself and the Minister of Finance. With respect to that there is just one difficulty which the committee, I am sure, will appreciate, and it is this: This relief or assistance does not extend beyond March 31, 1934, which is the date of the expiration of the Relief Act. The pilchard oil industry, in which considerable numbers of men are engaged and substantial capital invested, has been one of recent growth in British Columbia. One of the difficulties that we fear from the investigations that thus far we have been able to make—and they have not been exhaustive under the conditions in which life is carried on from day to day here—is this: that this might stimulate the industry merely for a few months inasmuch as the power which is conferred expires on March 31 next and the reaction might be so injurious to the new industry as to counteract any benefits that would accrue by the action suggested.

Mr. DUFF: I agree with that.

Mr. BENNETT: The fact that the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough agrees with it, puts the imprimatur of high authority upon the matter of fish.

Mr. BROWN: Extend the argument to artificial stimulus of trade.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sorry the hon. member for Lisgar has lived so long on the prairies that he is not able to understand the fish argument made by the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth and the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. But the only point I desire to make is that the matter has been considered and the question of determining the extent to which the reaction might be injurious rather than helpful has not been determined. It has not been settled that some assistance along the line suggested may not be given to the industry.

The hon. member for Lisgar suggests an artificial stimulus to industry. I can safely say that the cattle growers on the prairies do not look upon the matter in that way; they, represented at least in the other house by one of the ranchers from Alberta, do not hold any such idea as that. At a meeting of the Western Cattle Growers' Association, they passed a resolution stating that the action taken at the time it was, meant the salvation of the cattle industry on the plains. But if, as the former Minister of Trade and Commerce says, ordinary conditions bring about a value of the pound of $4.60 or any value approximating that, we shall rejoice that the necessity for relying upon the fund will have passed and that the conditions of trade in the world, world price levels and commodity prices generally will have ensured a return to some measure of prosperity that will enable the businesses to which I have referred to carry on at a profit and not under conditions that now exist.

I should have said that in regard to the pilchard oil industry there are special difficulties of which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is no doubt aware. The experimental stage has undoubtedly been passed in connection with the use of pilchard oil, but the competition is such as to make it extremely

difficult to predict with any degree of certainty what conditions may be within the not distant future. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows to what I refer.

With respect to lumber, the imposition of a revenue tax upon lumber by the United States was, as will be recalled by the committee, for a limited time only, and, if my memory serves me aright, it expires next year. It was not a tariff; it was included in the revenue bill, and I think it is only fair to say that with the entire disapproval of the administration it was written in for very special reasons through the efforts of those who live in states contiguous to British Columbia and who are also engaged in the lumber industry. Undoubtedly the embargo placed by Great Britain upon the importation of Russian lumber during the last few weeks has had some effect upon the lumber industry in the eastern part of Canada. The distances are so great that the same benefit has not accrued with respect to British Columbia lumber, but some benefits have arisen by reason of that in regard to the finer qualities of fir and lumber that, as I understand the matter, are used for finishing purposes in Great Britain.

The list that was submitted to the house of course embraces a larger number than thirteen items because, for instance, meats include a large number of items, such as:

Bacon and hams, shoulders and sides.
Beef and veal, fresh, chilled or frozen.
Beef and veal, pickled in barrels.
Mutton and lamb, fresh, chilled or frozen.
Pork, dry salted.
Pork, fresh, chilled or frozen.
Pork, pickled in barrels.
Poultry, dressed.
Other edible meats.

That would be the classification involved in the use of the word "meats" with respect to the fund. The item of eggs involves three classifications:

Eggs in shell.
Eggs, dried.
Eggs, frozen.

The item of milk products embraces several classifications. I am afraid I have been very discursive in what I have had to say to the committee, but I desired only to make it clear that in the light of improving conditions with respect to the medium of exchange between the two countries we may be able substantially to broaden the list without increasing the expenditure.

Mr. MALCOLM: My observation directed to the Minister of Finance with respect to the narrowness of the spread between the existing rate of exchange and $4.60 was not based particularly on the belief that it is a wise plan to bonus all commodities exported to Great Britain, but rather on the fact that the amount of money involved being very much less with the narrower spread on account of present exchange rates, as mentioned by the Prime Minister, made it possible to extend this list to include all commodities. It is, of course, natural for everyone to have a desire to sell his commodities, whether abroad or at home, in terms of dollars with which he is accustomed to deal, and it is indeed desirable that our exporters should know how many dollars they will receive for any given quantity of their exports. It is dangerous for anyone to make any prophecy on the fluctuations of the money market, but I do feel that the rate of exchange in Canada to-day, being practically the same as it was when both England and the United States were on the gold standard, only indicates that so long as they both stay off the gold standard, or if they both come back on, the parity of exchange will not fluctuate violently from the present level of $3.90 to $4. Inasmuch as the benefits of this stabilization fund expire in March, 1934, and as between now and then the Prime Minister will have attended the world economic conference in London, I hope for the sake of the trade of the world that before next March some definite relationship will have been established between the various currencies of the trading nations. I do not estimate that the spread between the current rate of the pound and $4.60 will be very much greater than twenty or thirty cents at any time. I doubt if it will be that. To-day there is only the matter of a very few cents difference.

I do submit again that the government would be well advised to adopt the principle of giving this assistance to all exports so that the exporters may realize from the stabilization fund on their commodities, whether they be lumber, fish or any other commodity, unless through some drastic drop in the value of the pound the assistance could no longer be continued. The government, of course, has the right under the legislation giving them power to deal with emergencies to withdraw this assistance if they are not able to continue it.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the hon. gentleman must be in error when he says that the relationship of the pound to the dollar, and the dollar to the pound, is substantially the

same as it was when both Great Britain and the United States were on the gold standard. The English pound before Great Britain went off the gold standard was quoted at $4.80 to $4.90.

Mr. MALCOLM: In Canada, yes.

Mr. BENNETT: In Canada it was usually at par before Great Britain went off the gold standard. I think my hon. friend is confusing the $3.90. Par was $4.86, and the value in the United States, whether it be by cable transfer or on demand or thirty days, was usually somewhere between $4.80 and $4.90, par then being $4.86, while to-day it is only slightly over $4.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is not quite $4.

Mr. BENNETT: It ran to $4 at the close for a little while. So there is a discount of 86 cents on the American side. Here in Canada we ran to-day up to $4.52 as a maximum, I think, reflecting to a very large extent the difference between Canada and New York with respect to currency generally. I just correct my hon. friend because I think his observations were directed to the time when Great Britain was off the gold standard and America was still on.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is so.

Mr. BENNETT: What he said was when both countries were on the gold standard. It was just that, that I desired to correct.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Ever since this stabilization fund was announced by the Minister of Finance I have been in somewhat of a dilemma to know upon what basis these thirteen commodities have been selected. When the matter was under discussion shortly after the announcement was made I endeavoured then to find out the basis and failed. I will be more particular now with regard to what I have in mind.

Why were animals, for instance, chosen as one of the commodities, when we all know that anything paid out of the stabilization fund will be less likely to get back to the producer in respect of this commodity than of almost any other commodity of the thirteen you could mention? I do not need to mention the reasons. I might indicate, however, that the packing industry is pretty much one entity in Canada, and you have not the ordinary competition that you would get if there were a number of independent packers, although there are a few, of course. This exchange stabilization will not therefore reflect itself back as freely on animals as it would on many other commodities I might mention.

Again, why is cheese put on this preferred list and not butter? An attempt was made to explain that, but I certainly could not understand it. Cheese has been included among milk products but not butter. If cheese is made from a different kind of milk or a different kind of cow than butter I did not know that before. Milk products, of course, include both these commodities, and yet one gets the preference and the other does not. One is taken and the other is left for no apparent reason.

Then why should honey and maple sugar products be given this preference when both these commodities have already been given a substantial hoist because of the duty on sugar? All these saccharine products are affected by the sugar duty, consequently the tiny bee and the maple tree are very much in on this deal. There is only $16,000 worth of honey exported and $180,000 worth of maple products. A number of articles are mentioned in the return which I got from my hon. friend the minister, particularly on representations from the west, but those people had no idea under the sun when they were asking for these things that the government was going to make a selection of thirteen articles and never include one of the cereals on the selected list or butter or many other articles I could mention. I could not imagine any more teeny-weeny pinhead way of dealing with a big national question than that which the government has adopted, waiting and waiting, dilly-dallying and shilly-shallying until almost there was no occasion for the stabilization fund, and then at last under the reflected glory of the president of the United States the government emerges with some tiny degree of credit in the matter.

May I ask one or two other questions for information which will enable us to talk a little more intelligently and a little more comprehensively on Monday if this matter again comes up then? I wonder what was the lowest figure to which the pound dropped since September, 1931? Could the minister tell us?

Mr. RHODES: I would not like to give a figure offhand, but I could get it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would be interested in having that. Then another question; why should canned fruit and canned vegetables be given the benefit of this stabilization fund while the raw products are not? It is true that some of these raw products would be too perishable to export, but the fact remains that when they are manufactured they come on the preferred list. That requires some justification, I think. Then in estimating the losses we must consider not only the enormous losses that have been sustained on farm products, but also those on factory, forest and everything since September, 1931. Now when there is nothing much to be done the government comes along courageously to do something already done by nature. Let nature take her course! The law of the survival of the fittest always works, but it is a ghastly and costly process, leaving wreckage in its trail all over the country. The same with the law of supply and demand; it is sure to work, but what happens to our people in the meantime?

These are some of the cogitations I engage in on this quiet Friday night, I do not know if I can continue in the same vein on Monday. Just now the government is pretty quiescent; it knows it is vulnerable to attack on front and rear and on both flanks. If any flank is more exposed than another it is the rear, I think. I am not saying this threateningly, but if my hon. friends knew the condition of the country, especially of agriculture, the despair and distress that exist while they are dilly-dallying with this thing, I do not believe they would be able to muster a smile at all. I find great difficulty in being able to smile about it myself. If you notice, Mr. Chairman, I have been keeping distressingly quiet. You know what is said about the weather when it is very quiet; it indicates a storm brewing. I do not think there is anything like that in my case, but I feel terribly serious to think the government has waited so long to throw us even a wee lifeline. I have heard some supporters of the government telling each other what a lucky fellow that man Bennett is—

Mr. BENNETT: They don't know!

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Possibly. Here he is holding on to his wheat with the backing of the Dominion government, while the rest of us, with no backing behind us, had to sell ours during last December at five bushels for a dollar. He hung on to his, but at the expense of those who had to sell. The cheaper it was the more we had to sell to get a bit of money to pay our taxes. All those things are still fresh in our minds, and will keep until Monday as far as I am concerned. I think if the minister would give us that exchange information by months from the time the pound went off gold, and maybe a month before, it would be of interest.

As to the canned vegetables, some of these of course could not be exported in the raw state, but somehow the manufacturers get in on these things pretty frequently. Of course if they passed the stabilization fund proceeds back to the growers it would not be so bad, but how much would be passed back? A great many of these products are controlled under a complete merger. A merger is not always a bad thing, but if they want to use it for bad purposes they can do so.

Another thing; will the minister provide us with an estimate of the number of commodities that we export to Great Britain? Thirteen are mentioned; I wonder if there are a thousand altogether. If there are thirteen hundred then at the rate of thirteen a year it would take one hundred years to get around to them. I do not think there are thirteen hundred, but there may be half that number, in which case it would take fifty years to cover the lot at thirteen per year.

Mr. RHODES: Would there be any objection to reporting the resolutions for the purpose of bringing in a bill, it being understood that this discussion can continue when we are next in ways and means?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, that will be satisfactory.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, there is one resolution which has not been dealt with.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 93, to amend the Customs Tariff.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

EXCISE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 94, to amend the Excise Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 95, to amend the Special War Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 96, to amend the Income War Tax Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Monday, May 8, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): I beg to lay on the table of the house a number of orders in council passed pursuant to relief legislation.

CANADA-NEW ZEALAND TRADE AGREEMENT

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 97, to authorize the governor in council to agree to extend by proclamation the duration of the trade agreements made between Canada and New Zealand, dated the 23rd day of April, 1932, as approved by chapter 34 of the statutes of 1932, entitled an Act respecting a certain Trade Agreement between Canada and New Zealand.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PETITION

Mr. W. J. LOUCKS (Rosetown): Mr. Speaker, I desire to present to the house a petition signed by a number of persons in my constituency and largely signed also by other citizens of Canada, to the extent of over four hundred thousand names. It relates to the banning of Judge Rutherford's lectures from broadcast over Canadian radio stations.

Mr. McINTOSH: There ought to be a lot of votes in that. Why not protest?

Mr. BENNETT: He is not reading them into Hansard.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUREAU

Mr. FAFARD:

1. Is the government contemplating the transfer of the National Development Bureau, of the Department of the Interior, into another department?
2. If so, what department is in mind?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

TUBERCULOSIS RESTRICTED AREA

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Department of Agriculture accepted the county of Saguenay as being part of the counties of Chicoutimi and Lake St. John in connection with the restricted area for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis?
2. If so, when was such a decision taken?
3. Who made this request?
4. Was a restricted area for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis established for the county of Saguenay?
5. If so, when?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort):

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. No request made.
4. No.
5. Answered by No. 4.

POWELL RIVER, B.C., MAIL CONTRACTOR

Mr. MUNN:

1. What is the name of the mail contractor at Powell River, British Columbia?
2. When was he appointed?
3. Were tenders called for?
4. What amount does he receive per year?
5. What was the name of the contractor employed previously to the present appointee?
6. What amount was paid the previous contractor during the years 1930, 1931 and 1932?

Mr. SAUVE:

1. F. J. Radford.
2. May 1, 1933.
3. Yes.
4. $720.
5. J. A. Dykes.
6. 1930—$300; 1931—$300; 1932—$660: (at rate $300 to April 1; rate $780 from April 1).

NORTH WOLFESTOWN, QUE., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. LAFLECHE:

1. What is the name of the postmaster at North Wolfestown, Quebec?
2. What salary does he receive?
3. What is the annual revenue of the post office?

Mr. SAUVE:

1. Denis Larkin.
2. $90 per annum.
3. $18 for fiscal year ended March 31, 1933. Instructions given for closing of office.

BELMINA, QUE., POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. LAFLECHE:

1. Who is the postmaster at Belmina, Quebec?
2. What salary does he receive?
3. What is the annual revenue of this post office?

Mr. SAUVE:

1. Napoleon Croteau.
2. $90 per annum.
3. $5.50 for fiscal year ended March 31, 1933. Instructions given for closing of office.

STATUTORY INCREASES TO CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. MacLEAN:

What is the estimated amount of money which will be required to pay the statutory increase to the civil servants under the Civil Service Act, that will have accumulated for the three years ending March 31, next, and which is now a liability against the revenues of the dominion?

Mr. CAHAN: I suggest that this question be withdrawn for revision, because, in the first place, the stoppage of increases in the salaries of civil servants has continued only one year, up to March 31 last, and not three years as suggested, and secondly, because the question assumes that these reductions or stoppages of increases accumulate from year to year as a liability against the revenues of Canada. That, I think, is an assumption of fact which has never yet been accepted. The question should be revised. It is impossible for us to make estimates for the next two years as to what these increases would amount to, having regard to deaths, retirements and other changes in the civil service.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped for revision.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

GOVERNMENT OWNED MOTOR CARS

Mr. DONNELLY:

1. What was the total number of government owned motor cars used for the convenience of the cabinet ministers from July 31, 1930, to March 31, 1931?
2. What was the total number of government owned motor cars used for the convenience of deputy ministers from July 31, 1930, to March 31, 1931?
3. When was each of the cars mentioned in questions 1 and 2 bought by the government and at what price?
4. How many of these cars have been sold and how many are still in the possession of the government?
5. Of those cars that have been sold, to whom was each sold and at what price?

JARKA COMPANY

Mr. QUINN:

1. Is the Jarka Company incorporated under the laws of the Dominion of Canada?
2. What is the capital of this company?
3. Is their floating equipment registered in Canada?
4. If not, was full duty paid on both floating equipment and unloading equipment?
5. Has this company made any application for any refund of duties on equipment brought into Canada during the last three years?
6. Is the government aware that this company, operating in the harbour of Montreal is not employing members of the Longshoremen's Union?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

APPOINTMENT OF NEW JUDGES

Mr. GAGNON:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Attorney-General for the province of Quebec or his assistant and the Minister of Justice, and the Chief Justice in Quebec and other persons, with respect to the appointment of new judges of the superior court in the province of Quebec.

GRONDINES, QUE., POST OFFICE

Mr. POULIOT (for Mr. Desrochers):

For a copy of all documents, letters, telegrams and reports of inquiries in the possession of the government, respecting the dismissal of Mrs. Arthur Perron, postmistress at Grondines, county of Portneuf, during the years 1930, 1931, 1932.

IMPORTATION OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents received by the government or any minister thereof with reference to the prohibition of the importation of second hand or used aircraft into Canada since January 1, 1932, to date.

DUTY ON TIMOTHY SEED

Mr. ELLIOTT (for Mr. Taylor):

For a copy of all correspondence, orders in council and instructions to customs officers, respecting value for duty purposes on timothy seed and the rescinding of same.

Mr. BENNETT: There should be a date—"since" a given time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What date?

Mr. BENNETT: Any date the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Since August 1930.

Mr. SPEAKER: With that revision shall the motion carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MORNING AND WEDNESDAY EVENING SITTINGS

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved:

That on and after Tuesday, the 9th May, next, until the end of the present session, the house shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning of each sitting day, and that, in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock, p.m., there shall also be an intermission every day from one to three o'clock, p.m., and that on Wednesday, the 10th May, next, and all subsequent Wednesdays, the sittings shall in every respect be under the same rules provided for other days.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, this motion is generally submitted when the full legislative program is before the house. Do we understand that apart from the redistribution bill and possibly another bill with relation to the French treaty, there will be nothing else to be presented?

Mr. BENNETT: I told the house the other day that that was my understanding of the situation. I think there is an amendment to the Excise Act which was prepared in April and which was awaiting the passage of the budget, but outside of the bills in the Senate, I know of no others.

Motion agreed to.

TARIFF BOARD ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Tariff Board Act, chapter 55 of the statutes of 1931,

[Mr. W. G. Weir.]

to provide that the salary of the chairman shall be $15,000 per annum; and that any member of the board who has served for a period of ten years, and is, on completion of such period, of the age of sixty years or over, may be granted an annuity equal to one-half of the annual salary of such member.

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

Motion agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DOMINION AND BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVERNMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. IAN MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gordon), concerning certain dispatches which appeared in the press this morning concerning an agreement which has been entered into between this government and the government of British Columbia with respect to the unemployment situation in that province. If these dispatches are correct, would the minister give us the details of this agreement?

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the contributions made by the federal authorities in connection with relief have been the subject of a number of conferences between myself and the representatives of the province of British Columbia. These conferences have taken place during the past two years at the end of each fiscal year. We have arrived at the terms of an agreement to be entered into with the province of British Columbia and a draft of the proposed agreement with the accompanying order in council was tabled to-day. This draft discloses the terms of the agreement which will become effective upon execution by both parties.

CANADIAN NATIONAL-CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BILL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion) if the third reading of this bill will be proceeded with to-day?

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals): The third reading of this bill will not be proceeded with until to-morrow at the request of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King).

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT ESTIMATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Would the hon. Postmaster General inform the house whether he will bring down his estimates to-day?

Hon. ARTHUR SAUVE (Postmaster General) (Translation): I would willingly do so, if I knew definitely when they will be submitted to the house.

I trust they will be brought down between—

Mr. HACKETT (Translation): —at the end of the session.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Certainly, between now and the end of the session; I hope to move their adoption in the course of the present week or, at the latest, next week.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT

The house resumed from Friday, March 24, consideration in committee of Bill No. 21, to amend the Indian Act—Mr. Murphy.—Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

On section 7—Enquiry as to fitness for enfranchisement.

Mr. SMOKE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few remarks concerning the Six Nations Indians. These Indians are not natives of Canada, as we understand the term. At the time of the discovery of America, or at least shortly afterwards, these Indians were settled in the Mohawk valley in the state of New York. As they are not natives of Canada, in the same sense as other Indians, I claim and they claim that they are in a class by themselves. Readers of history will remember that during the revolutionary war these Indians were allies of the British government and while that war turned out so disastrously for the British army, they remained loyal to the British Empire. Subsequently, by virtue of what is known as the Haldimand treaty, they were allowed to come over to Canada. The Haldimand treaty, so-called, is very short and I think I cannot do better than read the material portions of it. It is dated October 25, 1784, and recites:

Whereas His Majesty having been pleased to direct that, in consideration of the early attachment to his cause manifested by the Mohawk Indians and of the loss of their settlement which they thereby sustained a convenient tract of land under his protection should be chosen as a safe and comfortable retreat for them and others of the Six Nations who have either lost their settlements within the territory of the American states or wish to retire from them to the British. I have at the earnest desire of many of these His Majesty's faithful allies purchased a tract of land from the Indians situated between the lakes Ontario, Erie and Huron, and I do hereby in His Majesty's name authorize and permit the said Mohawk nation and such others of the Six Nation Indians as wish to settle in that quarter to take possession of and settle upon the banks of the river commonly called Ouse or Grand river, running into lake Erie, allotting to them for that purpose six miles deep from each side of the river, beginning at lake Erie and extending in that proportion to the head of the said river which they and their posterity are to enjoy forever.

Given under my hand and seal at arms—

In pursuance of that treaty the Six Nations Indians, or the greater bulk of them, came over from New York state where they had been living, and settled in the western part of Ontario. The British government had not at that time acquired all the land which they had agreed to give to the Six Nations Indians, but they afterwards by treaty acquired the land from the Mississauga Indians and subsequently made good their agreement to allow the Six Nations Indians to settle in that portion of western Ontario.

Following that treaty, what is known as the Simcoe deed was entered into pursuant to the Haldimand treaty. I want to read the material parts of the Simcoe deed, which is dated January 14, 1793:

Know ye, that whereas the attachment and fidelity of the chiefs, warriors, and people of the Six Nations, to us and our government has been made manifest on divers occasions by their spirited and zealous exertions and by the bravery of their conduct, and we being desirous of showing our approbation of the same and in recompense of the losses they may have sustained of providing a convenient tract of land under our protection for a safe and suitable retreat for them and their posterity, have of our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, given and granted—

This is a deed; Governor Simcoe, representing the king has given and granted this land.

—and by these presents do give and grant to the chiefs, warriors, women and people of the said Six Nations and their heirs forever, all that district or territory of land—

And so forth, described as I have given it before.

Giving and granting, and by these presents confirming to the said chiefs, warriors, women

and people of the said Six Nations and their heirs, the full and entire possession, use, benefit and advantage of the said district or territory, to be held and enjoyed by them in the most free and ample manner, and according to the several customs and usages of them the said chiefs, warriors, women and people of the said Six Nations; provided always, and be it understood to be the true intent and meaning of these presents that, for the purpose of assuring the said lands, as aforesaid to the said chiefs, warriors, women and people of the Six Nations, and their heirs, and of securing to them the free and undisturbed possession and enjoyment of the same, it is our royal will and pleasure that no transfer, alienation, conveyance, sale, gift, exchange, lease, property or possession, shall at any time be had, made or given of the said district or territory, or any part or parcel thereof, by any of the said chiefs, warriors, women or people, to any other nation or body of people, person or persons whatever, other than among themselves the said chiefs, warriors, women and people, but that any such transfer, alienation, conveyance, sale, gift, exchange, lease or possession, shall be null and void, and of no effect whatever, and that no person or persons shall possess or occupy the said district or territory or any part or parcel thereof, by or under any pretence or any such alienation, title or conveyance, as aforesaid, or by or under any pretence whatever, under pain of our severe displeasure.

And so on. That, as I say, places the band of Indians known as the Six Nations in an altogether different category from other Indians in this country. I want to call the attention of the committee to the definition of the word "band" in the interpretation clause of the Indian Act. Section 2, paragraph (b) reads:

"Band" means any tribe, band or body of Indians who own or are interested in a reserve—

This is not a reserve at all.

—or in Indian lands in common, of which the legal title is vested in the crown.

The legal title to those lands is not vested in the crown because, according to the Simcoe deed which I have read, it is granted to the Six Nations Indians, so that the word "band" does not apply to the Six Nations Indians.

We find the term "reserve" defined in paragraph (j) which reads:

"Reserve" means any tract or tracts of land set apart by treaty or otherwise for the use or benefit of or granted to a particular band of Indians, of which the legal title is in the crown.

Those are the same words used there. I claim that the legal title to those lands is not in the crown and therefore the present Indian Act should not be held to be applicable to the Six Nations Indians.

[Mr. Smoke.]

Let us refer again to the history of the Six Nations Indians. In the war of 1812-14 we find that they took the side of the British in fighting against the Americans. In the rebellion of 1837 they took the part of the loyal citizens of Canada of that day in fighting the battles of Great Britain. Then in the great war I can only refer to a speech made by a former Minister of the Interior in this house when he said that 600 of the Indians of the Six Nations volunteered to fight in the great war. Let us understand what 600 means in comparison with the small number of that whole Indian band, which does not comprise more than 4,000 or 5,000 people, including men, women and children. When one thinks 600 of their men of military age volunteered for service in the great war, surely one realizes that we in considering this bill in Canada owe some recognition of their sacrifices.

By the way, I understand an amendment has been proposed. I am told the legal department of the government hold that the Haldimand treaty is not a treaty, therefore the exception in this bill will not provide the remedy or help out the Six Nations Indians in their present claim. But reading the Haldimand treaty with the Simcoe deed, one cannot come to any other conclusion than that those lands belong to the Six Nations Indians and are to be held by them according to their ancient customs. I should like, if I may, to read a copy of a letter which I received and which was sent to the press, signed by W. F. Powless, who is secretary of the Six Nations council. This letter, which is dated March 11, 1933, reads:

Sir,—Allow me to give you an explanation of the objections and contentions of the Six Nations Indians with regard to the enfranchisement clause of the Indian Act now under discussion in the House of Commons, Ottawa, and of which there appears to be such little interest shown in a matter that is of vital interest to us and which threatens our very existence.

The part of the act dealing with the enfranchisement of Indians has been a matter of concern by succeeding governments, with the object in view of forcing full citizenship on a people the large majority of whom have not as yet attained that point where it would be to their advantage to be placed in business competition with the surrounding whites.

Only two or three generations ago their ancestors obtained their livelihood by the hunt having no knowledge of any other method while the whites have had hundreds of years of experience both in business and the art of farming and now the government is endeavouring to force compulsory enfranchisement on the Indian which we consider is one of the most

vicious pieces of legislation ever enacted. True, there are among the Indians of Canada, outstanding men and women who have obtained a prominent place in both the literary and professional world but they are in a very small minority and the Indians are urging that there be a distinction shown and that the proposed amendment to the act relative to the compulsory enfranchisement of Indians, empowering a body of men to decide as to the fitness of an Indian of a band to take the responsibility of full citizenship without first consulting the party or parties most interested, should not be allowed to become law.

There is a feeling of discouragement among the Indians and a suspicion of the motives of the government in the measure under discussion and as long as there is no satisfactory assurance that they will remain unmolested on their reserves there will be a tendency to neglect improvements on their farms as they contend that they have no guarantee that their children will be able to enjoy the fruits of their industry.

The Six Nations, in the short time that they have taken up farming, have become entirely self supporting and I venture to say that there is less destitution on their reserve at the present time than in any other community in Canada, being less than 10 per cent of the population. This is of course not generally known but what is known among a certain class of whites and of which they take full advantage is that the Indian has not the business ability to compete with his white neighbour.

True, we have been assured that the government has no designs on the Six Nations reserve but the amendment, if passed, will confer the power and may be exercised by a succeeding government if it so desires.

Another matter that should not be lost sight of is the magnificent response made by the Indians in practically every war in which the empire has been engaged in in the last 160 years and particularly in the great war when there was a larger percentage of voluntary enlistments from them than from any other class in Canada. And what is the thanks extended to the Indian returned veterans for their sacrifice? The benefits of relief to small pensioners have been passed to the Department of Indian Affairs while participation in the Last Post fund has been entirely withdrawn although they helped to accumulate the profits derived from canteen funds and were asked to vote on the question of the disposition of said profits.

In conclusion I would appeal to the fair minded people of Canada, who have the interest of the Indian at heart, to make representations to the government urging that the proposed amendment be withdrawn. If that is done and the objectionable measure dropped they will win the everlasting gratitude of a people who never forget a kindness done them.

The Simcoe deed included all the territory from lake Erie along the Grand river, six miles on either side from mouth to source. As the years went on the Six Nations found that they could not usefully occupy the whole of that territory, and from time to time they surrendered certain portions to the crown, and now they occupy all of the township of Tuscarora, part of Onondaga and part of the township of Oneida in the adjoining county of Haldimand. The moneys paid into the Indian office in England, Indian affairs in Canada for several years having been administered in London, for the surrender of these important blocks of land are supposed to be lying somewhere down here in the treasury at Ottawa. The sum in the first place was very close to one million dollars but it has been depleted from one cause or another. I am not complaining of that depletion except with regard to one item, with respect to which I perhaps cannot do better than quote from a return that was passed by the house in 1927, and which is sessional paper 143. It says:

> The only loss which was sustained by the Six Nations fund was owing to the unfortunate investment by the British Indian office of thirty-eight thousand pounds provicial currency in the Grand River Navigation Company.

That was trust money which never should have been so invested. I have been told that over many years there have been applications sent in to this government and to the British government for a refund of that money. Being trust money it was misappropriated. The British government say: Oh well, we handed the whole thing over to Canada in 1867. The Canadian government say: We did not do it at all; it was done before we got hold of it. So they pass the buck from one to the other. That thirty-eight thousand pounds should be restored to the Six Nations Indian fund, although I must confess that the Six Nations Indians have almost given up hope that that will ever be done. I am told that the department claims that it has made that amount good to the Six Nations in various ways. The department has built a splendid hospital in Ohsweken in the county of Brant, and has built schools for the education of the Indians. But that same thing is done for the Indians throughout the whole dominion. It is the duty of the dominion government to do that, and for the department to say, "Oh, we have built hospitals and schools for the Indians of the Six Nations," when they do the same thing for Indians throughout this dominion is to put forward a contention in which I cannot see any merit at all.

I have obtained a copy of sessional paper 106 dated Friday, October 7, 1932, giving a list of the Indians enfranchised under the Indian Act for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1932. I find that from one end of Canada to the other there were only fifty-seven Indians granted enfranchisement during that year, and how many were there enfranchised among the Six Nations? Not one. They do not want it. Why then should legislation be passed amend-

ing the Indian Act and compelling their enfranchisement against their will provided that somebody decides that they are fit for enfranchisement? They do not want it, and are not asking for it.

The minister says that this government does not intend to enforce enfranchisement. If that is the case, why take this power and deprive the Indians of a good legal argument should the present government or any government in the future change the present policy and decide to enfranchise the Indians?

I think that an exception should be made of the Six Nations Indians, and I would offer an amendment for the consideration of the minister, that nothing in that particular section of the act shall apply to the Six Nations Indians of the Grand river.

I want again to refer to what the Six Nations Indians have done for the empire, and in that connection I cannot do better than quote a few lines from John McCrae's poem, In Flander's Fields. If justice is not done to the Six Nations Indians in this matter, I would ask if the government will not be in a similar position to that suggested in the last line of the poem:

> We shall not sleep though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields.

I appeal to the minister to do everything possible, and there is a lot possible, to relieve the Indians of the Six Nations of the necessity of being enfranchised against their will.

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, as the previous speaker has said, the amendment to the Indian Act which is now being considered in committee, has been considered on former occasions. There still seems to be a misapprehension in regard to the bill before us. During the years the government of Canada has, I believe, quite properly taken a very liberal attitude towards the treatment of Indian residents in Canada. Literally millions of dollars have been spent for a certain fixed definite purpose—at least so it seems to me. Money has been spent lavishly for educational purposes; a vast educational system has been built up, residential and day schools have been established, hospitals have been built, and in times of stress, medical services provided for the sick and relief given the aged and destitute. For what purpose have these moneys been spent, especially those moneys spent so lavishly upon the education of the Indian, if not ultimately to bring him to the point where he may enjoy the full status of citizenship? In other words, these moneys have been spent to help take the Indian from a position of wardship, and place him where he may enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of self sustaining and self respecting citizenship.

May I say that at times I believe there is a mistaken public opinion sentimentalizing over our Indians to the effect that they should be spared all healthy discipline. If it is considered that the Indian must be a permanent charge upon the public, then to a great extent our present efforts are a waste of time. Is all self reliance to be drained out of the Indian? As I have stated, we have been generous with the Indian, and rightly so. Certainly he has been treated as a ward, except in cases where he has voluntarily applied for enfranchisement. But, I think, Mr. Chairman, that our efforts are justified only upon the belief that some day he will emerge from that state of dependence. I do not think that we are helping the Indian when we impress upon him the belief that he is never to be held responsible. Certain objections have been raised in committee based on the assumption that the department is going to enforce compulsory enfranchisement. That is not so, because if one reads the amendment carefully he will observe that the Indian is to be enfranchised only after his fitness for such enfranchisement has been passed upon by a board consisting of any judge of any superior court, or any judge of any circuit or county court, an officer of the department and a member of the band to which the Indian belongs. Such board shall make inquiry and report as to fitness. I believe that provision makes it perfectly clear that the Indian is not to be submitted to compulsory enfranchisement, but is to be enfranchised only after a proper investigation has been held.

At the present time an Indian may voluntarily apply for enfranchisement. Before that recommendation is passed on to His Excellency in council a most minute, exhaustive and careful investigation is held as to his fitness. To my mind, the officer or member of that board who will wish particularly to be assured beyond all peradventure as to the Indian's fitness for enfranchisement, will be the member representing the department. We do not enfranchise the Indians simply because they ask for it. We make an exhaustive analysis because we feel our responsibility in the matter, and we know that to enfranchise him before he is fit would not be in his interests, the interests of the government or anyone else concerned.

The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Smoke) speaking about compulsory enfranchisement, referred to the Six Nations Indians. He made further reference to the so-called Haldimand

treaty or agreement, and the Simcoe deed. I have those documents before me, but as he has read from them to the committee I do not think I would be serving any useful purpose by reading them again. May I say however that if there is anything in any treaty or agreement which gives any Indians in Canada special privileges, it is amply provided for in the amendment now before the committee, which reads:

Provided that no enfranchisement of any Indian or Indians shall be made under this subsection in violation of the terms of any treaty that may have been entered into between the crown and the Indians of the band in question.

I have read several of these treaties to which reference was made by the hon. member for Brant, and I am unable to find that the amendment will effect any violation of the terms of any treaty or agreement made. But if there is any such violation, it is amply covered by the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Whilst under the amendment the enfranchisement of an Indian may not appear to conflict with any treaty, would not the enfranchisement itself, in many cases, conflict with what Indians regard as their treaty rights? For example would it not conflict with certain immunities they have, such as the right to hunt in and out of season, the right to draw treaty payments, the right to live on a reserve, and the right of freedom of property from seizure. Would any of these rights be interfered with by enfranchisement?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I should like to ask a question in line with that asked by the hon. member for Bow River. Is it the intention to enfranchise the Indian and allow him to remain a member of the band?

Mr. MURPHY: If the Indian became enfranchised certainly he would not any longer be a member of the band. I do not know whether the hon. member for Bow River has a copy of the amendment—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, I have.

Mr. MURPHY: He will find that the amendment is as follows:

Provided that no enfranchisement of any Indian or Indians shall be made under this subsection in violation of the terms of any treaty that may have been entered into between the crown and the Indians of the band in question.

Then it will be a question for the law officers of the crown to decide as to whether or not the terms of any treaty have been violated.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then the minister is leaving it to the law officers of the crown to determine, afterwards, whether the immunities of Indians are or are not being preserved. That is quite an unfair position. I am drastically opposed to any bill which embodies a principle of that kind.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister tell the committee definitely whether enfranchisement under this legislation will, first of all, dispossess the Indian of his right to live on the reserve? Is the answer yes or no?

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, property rights will not be interfered with. If an Indian on a reserve holds a location there is provision in the act at the present time whereby he retains possession of that property. His property rights are not interfered with in the least by this amendment. He will take his share of the band funds or any other funds, his interest in the common land of the band, he will retain the location which he enjoys at the present time on the reserve.

Mr. VALLANCE: Has the Indian then the right to sell that portion of the property within the reserve that is his?

Mr. MURPHY: After he receives his enfranchisement, and has title to the land that belongs to him, he is the same as any other citizen of Canada; he will be able to deal with it as may any other citizen.

Mr. VALLANCE: That is one of the points the Indian is most opposed to. You are going to permit an official of the department to say a certain Indian shall be enfranchised—

Mr. MURPHY: That is not correct.

Mr. VALLANCE: Then you are going to say that some Indian may be enfranchised, and you are going to allow that Indian to sell his property to any individual he chooses. So in a short time you are going to have your Indian reserves checker-boarded all over with white settlers perhaps. Do you think that is in the interests of the Indian?

Mr. MURPHY: I have endeavoured to make it plain to the committee on every occasion that when an Indian reaches that degree of advancement which entitles him to become a Canadian citizen he should accept the responsibilities of citizenship. I explained a moment ago to the hon. member for Bow River that the Indian becoming enfranchised will have all the responsibilities of a Canadian citizen, that he will receive title to his

land and be in the same position as any other Canadian citizen, and he can deal with his land as he sees fit.

Mr. VALLANCE: Has the Indian now the right, before he becomes enfranchised, to sell that portion of the reserve that is his?

Mr. MURPHY: Only to a member of the band.

Mr. VALLANCE: But when he gets title under this provision he may sell it to any Canadian he chooses, without permission of the council?

Mr. MURPHY: After enfranchisement, certainly.

Mr. VALLANCE: That is what the Indians most strenuously object to. It is going to spoil the whole Indian life.

Mr. SMOKE: Will not the result of that be to let a lot of poor whites in on the reserves?

An hon. MEMBER: White trash!

Mr. SMOKE: Will the best type of white citizen acquire farms on an Indian reserve? It is a great mistake to allow an Indian who is enfranchised to sell his land to any person who is not a member of the band.

Mr. McINTOSH: When this bill was before the house at an earlier time I made a few remarks in connection with it. I took the stand that if an Indian were fit to be enfranchised, if we are sure of our ground, it may be all right. But there seems to be grave doubt as to the wisdom of enfranchising Indians generally. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Smoke) is opposed to it. I am inclined to think that many members on the opposite side of the house are also opposed to it, as are many members on this side. The house is divided on this move by the department.

The minister in his brief statement mentioned the fact that we have spent a great deal of money on the Indians. He gave that as one reason for enfranchisement. But we have on the other side the fact that when we took over the Indian holdings in Canada we bought them at extremely low valuations, and if we have spent money on the Indians since it is only what we ought to have done. I do not think that argument ought to enter into the question at all. If we are going to enfranchise the Indians without their wishing to be enfranchised, is that in harmony with sound principles of British liberty and freedom? That is compulsion. That is not a sound position to take. Then we are told by the minister that he is setting up a board, and this board must pronounce on the question before any action is taken. I would like to ask the minister, from whom must the request come to enfranchise any Indian or Indians? Will the request come from the individual Indian?

[Mr. Murphy.]

Mr. MALCOLM: No, he has that privilege now, voluntarily.

Mr. McINTOSH: Then why take away from him that freedom which he possesses at the present time and compel him to do something that he does not want to do? That does not smack of British freedom. You are not going to build up the independence of the Indian population of Canada in that way; you are only going to weaken it.

There is another point growing out of what the minister said. He laid great emphasis upon educating the Indian. I would think that the end of education is to develop the capacity of the individual to ask questions and answer them. That is the purpose of our training institutions, to develop that power in the human mind. If we cannot do that we are not getting very far. If the Indian does not ask the question, and does not say, I want to be enfranchised, why enfranchise him? Apparently with all our culture and training we are afraid of the Indian not wanting to be enfranchised, and so want to impose it on him. To me that looks like enfranchising the Indian to get his vote. That should not be the end of any legislation; what should concern us is the welfare of the Indian.

Another matter I wish to mention is this. Does this committee think fair the stand we are taking against the Indian wearing his aboriginal costume? As I understand the law now, before he can take part in a dance or stampede or exhibition in his aboriginal costume he must have permission from the agent or the department. Now we are wiping out that provision, and it would appear that we are trying to prohibit the Indian wearing his native costume anywhere, on the reserve or off it. I cannot see why we are making a move of that kind. I believe the Indian is absolutely entitled to wear his Indian costume wherever he likes, and the disapproval of the department is simply intimidating the Indian and keeping him from developing in the continuity of freedom and liberty. We know what took place in Scottish history after the union of the parliaments in 1707. In the uprising of 1745 some small-bore politicians and public men of the period in England decided that they had better forbid the Highland clans to wear their costume—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Order!

Mr. McINTOSH: And for twelve years from 1746 they were forbidden to wear their costume or carry arms. But when a man of some brains and vision, the elder Pitt, during the seven years' war came to govern Great Britain, he saw what ought to be done, and did it immediately. He removed the embargo as it were, and the Highlanders were organized and allowed to wear their costumes, and history tells the result; they went around the world and fought as they never fought before and widened the bounds of the British Empire, made the British Empire, making it a real empire. If that is true of one nationality it is also true of the Indians, and I am going to ask the minister to make a statement on this question. My own opinion is that we should give the Indian more freedom regarding the wearing of his costume, because by doing that I think we will make him a better Indian.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Before the minister replies to what has already been said, I should like him to consider some observations I want to make on the effect of the act as changed by the amendment now proposed. He suggests that this takes away the compulsory feature of the enfranchisement, which is now no longer compulsory. In that, I submit, he is quite wrong. This is not the less compulsory because a judge and an official of the Indian department together with some member of the band selected by the government can make a report upon the Indian as to his fitness or otherwise for enfranchisement. If they report, as they can under this amendment, that the Indian is fit to be enfranchised, then he may be enfranchised no matter how much opposed he may be to it. If it is not compulsory why not leave it as before?

May I call attention to the provision, which I submit is a very serious objection to this legislation:

> In respect of an Indian or Indians of any band who has not or who have not made application for enfranchisement under this section or under section 114 of this act, the Superintendent General may appoint a board—

It goes on to state whom the board may consist of.

> —to make inquiry and report as to the fitness of any Indian or Indians to be enfranchised, and such report shall have the same force and effect and shall be dealt with in the same manner as if the same had been made upon the application of an Indian or Indians under this section.

The report upon the Indian's fitness shall have the same effect as the Indian making application. If it is not compulsory then you do not need the report. I submit that this is taking away from the Indian the right to make the application himself.

Mr. MURPHY: No; my hon. friend is absolutely wrong.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I submit I am not. This is taking away from the Indian the right not to be enfranchised until he makes application for himself. Will the minister say that is not right?

Mr. MURPHY: The section of the act dealing with that now makes provision for the Indian himself to make application. He may still do so after this amendment carries; he may apply himself.

Mr. McINTOSH: He may be rushed into it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: He will have the right which he now enjoys, of not having enfranchisement forced upon him unless he applies, taken away from him by this amendment. That means that it is compulsory. If it is not compulsory it is not necessary. If it is only going to enfranchise the Indian who applies for enfranchisement, or who is willing to apply, it is absolutely unnecessary. What it does is to substitute compulsory enfranchisement for voluntary enfranchisement by application of the Indian, or by the decision of the band.

I want to call to the attention of the minister the protest that has been waged by the Indians; I doubt whether there is one tribe among all the tribes of Indians which is favourable to this legislation. I very much dislike at this stage of the session taking up the time of the house reading these protests, but I do feel that the matter touches so vitally the happiness, the future comfort, and the right of the Indians to obtain a livelihood as they have done in the past that I must protest as strongly as I can. I have here, from the Chippewa council of the Caradoc reserve, a petition dated March 17, 1933, as follows:

> To the
> Parliament of the Dominion of Canada,
> Ottawa, Ontario.
> Sirs,—
>
> On the report in the press that the government of the Dominion of Canada are in the consideration of enacting an act of parliament to force the Indians of the Dominion of Canada into compulsory enfranchisement, we, the members of the Chippewa-Thames Band of Indians of the Caradoc agency, do herein make our humble protest to such enactment of the act of parliament for the following reasons:
>
> The Indians of this part of the province of Ontario are not in a position of qualification to enter into such enfranchisement by education and temperament, and the fact that the smartest of our race living in the various reserves of the province of Ontario who have taken enfranchisement have in a few months, or years, lost all their property, and in most cases have had to receive help. The majority

of the Indians have not even a common or public school education, and therefore cannot compete with the white people.

The Indians from the earliest times have appreciated their treatment by the British crown. Their loyalty has been traditional. In 1876 and 1812 they gave valuable military assistance to our cause. In the great war more than four thousand Canadian Indians enlisted, although they were expressly exempt from conscription. Therefore, we, your petitioners, request your favourable consideration of this, our humble petition.

I wish to have this petition in the hands of the minister so that he may consider it. Bearing on this phase of the subject, I would point out that for generations the Indian has lived a different sort of life from the commercial life of the white people. They are very clever athletes, splendid sportsmen, good hunters, and they possess absolute loyalty and devotion to the crown, as they have shown whenever the test has come. But the point is that once they obtain enfranchisement, with the right to contract with regard to their own property, that property, just as surely as they are given that right, as I said in one previous discussion, is obtained by some whites who live along the border and are not above doing the poor Indian out of what is his. I see here a number of clippings from various letters that have appeared in the newspapers. I have one from the secretary of the Six Nations council, W. F. Powless, written to the Mail and Empire of Toronto. I will not trouble the committee by reading the whole of it but I would quote this part:

This is, of course, not generally known but what is known among a certain class of whites and of which they take full advantage is that the Indian has not yet the business ability to compete with his white neighbour.

Apart from the question of good faith with the Indian, I do not think it can be denied that this is a breach of the relationship that has existed under the treaties that have been entered into at various times, even before the declaration of independence of the United States, because I believe it was before that time that the main treaties were entered into, an undertaking having been given by the king in the old treaties that the Indians would be protected, that they would have their hunting grounds and fishing rights, to quote a saying so much used by the Indians themselves, "as long as grass grows and water runs." These rights were to be preserved; they could not have their property taken away from them if the white man got a judgment against them. That is the great protection which is being taken away by these amendments to the act.

[Mr. Elliott.]

The following is an extract from a letter written on April 4, 1933, to the editor of the Toronto Globe:

Look back only a couple of generations ago and you will see the Six Nations warriors in war paint and feathers, whose means of livelihood was obtained from fishing and hunting and who are being transformed in that short space of time into agriculturists, in which, I believe, we have made greater strides than any other aborigines in the world, but we are far from being able to compete in a business way with our white neighbours.

That comes from Frank Montom, a member of the Madfourth band. Its source is entirely different but it contains the same idea put forth by hon. members of this committee who happen to know something about the habits of the Indians and the white men who have made money out of preying upon the Indians. After all, this vaunted civilization of the white men has been a detriment rather than an advantage to the Indian. The Indian of two or three generations ago who lived among his own kind was better off than the Indian of today who is living partly with whites and partly with other Indians. There is no question at all that this is a breach of faith with the Indians. At this of all times, when there is so much unrest abroad in the land this should not be done. I shall not refer to the great possibilities in times of elections, but I repeat again that this is a breach of faith and the taking away of rights which these Indians have enjoyed for generations. Besides the Six Nations Indians, the Caughnawagas, the St. Regis Indians, the Munceys and the Chippawas and the Blackfeet Indians have all sent me protests against this legislation. Similar legislation was in force for a short period, but it was repealed. These Indians got along in the past without this legislation and there is no reason why it should be forced upon them at this time. During this depression the Indians have not been such a heavy burden upon the government. In some cases they have been a less burden than many white people. They have come through these hard times very well and this legislation should not be imposed upon them. There is no use in my hon. friend saying that it will not be compulsory and will be done only after an inquiry has been held; it will be just as compulsory after an inquiry as if it were done without an inquiry. The result may not be as bad but the action will be just as compulsory.

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The Prime Minister says "no" but I have read the section and I say "yes." I say that most emphatically. The Indian will have just as little voice after

an inquiry to decide whether or not he shall be enfranchised as he had before the inquiry. Let me put this proposition to the Prime Minister. Suppose an inquiry is held and a report is made that a particular Indian is fit for enfranchisement. The Indian receives word that he has been recommended as being a fit and proper person to be enfranchised under this act. The Indian may object but even though an inquiry has been held, the action will be just as compulsory as if there had not been an inquiry. Unless this is being forced upon the Indian against his wishes the old act answers the purposes. If the Indian is to be consulted, if this thing is not to be enforced upon him, then the old act is good enough. It is now suggested that enfranchisement shall be forced upon the Indian and his property put in the same position as that held by a white man. It will be possible to obtain a judgment against him and issue an execution against his property. This could not be done under the old act and it is now proposed to make a complete change. Those who know anything about the Indians will agree with me when I say that should this amendment pass and the property of the Indian be put in the same position as that of the white man, if he can be sued and execution issued against him, in the course of a few years at least ninety per cent of our Indians will be in the position of those referred to in the correspondence I have read. Their property will dwindle away and they will become objects of charity. I urge upon the Prime Minister and upon the minister in charge of this bill that this is not good legislation; it is not good for the people of the country as a whole and it is particularly unfair to the Indians. I do not think it should be pressed.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, had it not been that there has been such grievous misrepresentation of the purposes of this bill, I am quite sure that the protests which have been sent to the government by the Indians would not have been sent. I am satisfied upon that point. I cannot understand why this committee does not deal frankly with the main issue, which is this: should or should not the Indians be enfranchised? The law provides already, by means of complicated sections, for an Indian receiving enfranchisement (a) at his own instance, and (b) at the instance of a majority of his band. It was thought desirable that there should be a continuance of that principle without applying it in a proper sense to those who by education or other fitness should no longer be wards of the nation. Let me amplify this. Every argument to which I have listened and which has been presented to this committee with respect to the ability of the Indian to do business is equally applicable to the Indian who himself sought enfranchisement. That is number one. Number two is that section 110 of the old act—not this bill—states:

> Upon the application of an Indian of any band, or upon the application of a band on a vote of a majority of the male members of such band of the full age of twenty-one years at a meeting or council thereof summoned for that purpose, according to the rules of the band—

And so on, and then outlines the steps to be taken to enfranchise an Indian. Does this committee concede the right of an Indian to secure enfranchisement? If it does, then all the arguments to which we have listened vanish. His status—that is the technical term which should be used—is as it was at the passing of the act. Once we concede the right to an Indian to change his status and become enfranchised, every argument which has been offered over and over again as to his being imposed upon when he gets title to his land vanishes. Every Indian who sought enfranchisement obtained all the rights and privileges of an enfranchised person. Therefore, if we are going to maintain the principle suggested by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, we must repeal that section of the act which provides for voluntary enfranchisement. I think that is a fair statement. Secondly, there is enfranchisement at the instance of the band itself by majority vote, providing that it should be a factor in the case in determining whether he should be recommended for enfranchisement. That is, his attitude of mind towards the matter should be ascertained—

> Which attitude shall be a factor in determining the question of fitness.

I put this to a committee of parliament sitting here this afternoon solemnly considering this legislation that provides that a majority of the band may take steps to enfranchise an Indian: Is the department to be denied the exercise of its jurisdiction?

Mr. McINTOSH: Why tamper with the law?

Mr. BENNETT: This is in order to clear up and remove any possible objection there may be by reason of this situation arising; I do not wish to use names, because it might be inconvenient for the Indian in question. I have received an application from an Indian

to be appointed to the department as a medical doctor. He is a graduate of one of our most important universities and he has a fair degree of experience. I inquired and found—I give this only for what it may be worth because it was not very carefully looked up—that he is not enfranchised. There are in the same position men who have had legal training and experience. Heretofore parliament—not the present House of Commons and Senate—provided for the enfranchisement of Indians. If I were to deal with the question de novo, I might arrive at some different conclusion, but to me it is as simple as anything in the world. The wards have given evidence that they shall no longer be wards and seized with ambition, the individual Indian says: I want to become enfranchised, and he makes his application. That is dealt with in the manner provided by the act. Under (b), the Indians say: John Smith, you should be enfranchised with all the money that has been spent on your education. Then the band meets together and by a majority vote says: We shall enfranchise you, and an inquiry has to take place such as that to which I refer.

Mr. NEILL: Is that application made by the band? Does that not apply to the enfranchisement of the whole band, not of one individual?

Mr. BENNETT: It reads:

Upon the application of an Indian of any band, or upon the application of a band on a vote of a majority of the male members of such band of the full age of twenty-one years at a meeting or council thereof summoned for the purpose, according to the rules of the band and held in the presence of the superintendent general or of an officer duly authorized to attend such council, by the governor in council or by the superintendent general, a board may be appointed by the superintendent general to consist of two officers of the Department of Indian Affairs and a member of the band to which the Indian or Indians under investigation belongs, to make inquiry and report as to the fitness of any Indian or Indians to be enfranchised. The Indian member of the board shall be nominated by the council of the band, within thirty days after the date of notice having been given to the council, and in default of such nomination, the appointment shall be made by the superintendent general.

Mr. NEILL: Of any Indian wishing to be enfranchised.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

In the course of such inquiry it shall be the duty of the board to take into consideration and report upon the attitude of any such Indian towards his enfranchisement, which attitude shall be a factor in determining the question of fitness. Such report shall contain a description of the land occupied by each Indian, the amount thereof and the improvements thereon, the names, ages and sex of every Indian whose interests it is anticipated will be affected, and such other information as the superintendent general may direct such board to obtain.

Then there is provided:

Governor in council may enfranchise Indians, on approval of report of superintendent general.
Effect of enfranchisement.
Procedure where wife living apart.
Right of Indian to choose name, and to be known by same.
Letters patent for his land to be issued to Indian upon enfranchisement.

And so forth. The only point I desire to make is that we are not dealing with the problem whether an Indian shall be enfranchised or not. The arguments we have heard are against enfranchisement at all. The arguments are those that have been made in all courts as to whether wards should be permitted to take over their property when they are twenty-one years of age, and all that sort of thing. But this parliament has said that they may become enfranchised. This amendment purports to do merely one thing; it purports, in view of the provision that has been made, to place the matter on a much more favourable basis than could be said with respect to the law before the amendment was introduced. May I again direct attention to the amendment:

In respect of an Indian or Indians of any band who has not or who have not made application for enfranchisement under this section or under section 114 of this act, the superintendent general may appoint a board to consist of any judge of any superior court or any judge of any circuit, district or county court, an officer of the department and a member of the band to which the Indian or Indians under investigation belongs or belong, to make inquiry and report as to the fitness of any Indian or Indians to be enfranchised—

There is where it stops, but will the committee be good enough to listen to these words:

—and such report shall have the same force and effect and shall be dealt with in the same manner as if the same had been made upon the application of an Indian or Indians under this section.

That is, the department only sets in motion the machinery to make the inquiry. When the inquiry is made, it stands in the same position as though the minister had put the last—

Mr. VALLANCE: The minister said no.

Mr. BENNETT: No, he did not.

Mr. VALLANCE: He said the disposition of the Indians' land was on a different basis.

Mr. MURPHY: I made no such statement.

Mr. BENNETT: The man is in the position of any other enfranchised Indian.

Mr. VALLANCE: I understand to-day an Indian who applies for enfranchisement can do so only by agreeing with the band that they may take over his property in lieu of what they gave for it. The minister said to-day that under this provision the involuntarily enfranchised Indian has the right to take his title and sell it to a white man.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder whether the hon. gentleman has taken the trouble to read the statute. If he had, he would not have made that statement. He certainly misunderstood the minister as to that. The law provides that an enfranchised Indian at his own request will receive letters patent for his land; they will be issued to him and he will receive his share of the fund. Then the land and money of his children and wife are dealt with. Payments are made from the funds of the band if there is no land. Indians not members of the band, and non-treaty Indians may be enfranchised, and granted letters patent. Claims on funds of band cease on issue of letters patent.

That is the law to-day; we are not making it here. It is and has been the law of the country. An enfranchised Indian has all the rights and privileges to which I refer and receives letters patent to his land. The whole argument against his enfranchisement is that we are proposing that he shall be enfranchised. I put to the committee only this question: With the provisions of this amendment I think the Indian with whom we are now dealing is in a much better position than any of them. In the first case the Indian starts the inquiry. In the second, the band starts the inquiry for a single Indian or Indians, as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has said. In the third case the department starts the application, but in no case can anything be done until a report is made. The report made in the last of the three cases puts the Indian in exactly the same position as in the other two, but there has been added this which you will not find in the law as it now stands:

Provided, that no enfranchisement of any Indian or Indians shall be made under this subsection in violation of the terms of any treaty—

And I have just suggested to the minister that, in view of what has been said this afternoon, he adds the words "agreement or undertaking."

—that may have been entered into between the crown and the Indians of the band in question.

Mr. MALCOLM: That would be necessary when you force enfranchisement on the Indian.

Mr. BENNETT: It seems to be so impossible to impress upon this committee that the law with respect to this stands as it is to-day and we are not changing it except that we are providing that the department may make an inquiry, whereas heretofore a majority of the band was required, as the minister has said.

Mr. MALCOLM: The section that is being repealed starts out with these words:

Upon the application of an Indian of any band—

Mr. BENNETT: Or.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is enough to start with, but it goes on:

—or upon the application of a band—

That section is being repealed.

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is the subsection to be repealed.

Mr. BENNETT: That is a subsection.

Mr. MURPHY: The amendment reads:

Section 110 of the said act is amended by adding thereto the following subsection.

Mr. MALCOLM: But section 7 of the bill says:

Subsection 1 of section 110 of the said act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman is not reading from the amendment. He is reading from the wrong bill.

Mr. MALCOLM: It is the only copy of the bill before us. If we were favoured with a copy of the amendment we would be in a better position to discuss it.

Mr. MURPHY: I will send the hon. member a copy.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): The amendment will be found at page 3399 of Hansard.

Mr. NEILL: Would the minister go a little further and concede this point, that the Indian who is to be appointed by the government shall be nominated by the band to which he belongs? I think that would pretty well safeguard the rights of the Indian.

Mr. BENNETT: That would be the practice.

Mr. NEILL: But it does not say so. There might be some Indian who was a hanger-on of the Indian agent and who would be perennially employed at this job.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the suggestion is sound.

Mr. VALLANCE: This deals with a different method by which an Indian may become enfranchised. The Indian himself may apply, the band may apply, and now the department may apply. Has the minister information as to how many Indians have been enfranchised up to date at the request of the band? The Prime Minister used an illustration this afternoon of a doctor. Why did not the Indian band, knowing that this Indian was a medical man and had all the qualifications for assuming full citizenship in Canada, apply for his enfranchisement?

Mr. MURPHY: It is impossible to answer that question. Only the band themselves can say why they did not exercise their privilege.

Mr. VALLANCE: How many Indians have been enfranchised at the request of the band?

Mr. MURPHY: Not any to my knowledge.

Mr. VALLANCE: And now the department is going to exercise the right when the band itself does not want it.

Mr. MURPHY: While I am on my feet I may say that there are certain Indians to-day in Canada who have the franchise.

Mr. VALLANCE: Lots of them; lots of them went to the war.

Mr. MURPHY: Not only those who took part in the war. Others have been enfranchised who do not come within the definition in the act as Indians or non-treaty Indians. In a previous discussion in the house the hon. member for East Algoma raised the question as to the status of certain Indians in his riding, Indians who do not belong to a particular band and who are not classed as non-treaty Indians under the definition in the act. I have obtained an opinion from the Department of Justice on the point, which I shall read for the information of the committee:

419/33
Ottawa, March 10, 1933.

Dear Sir,—

I have the honour to reply to your letter of March 3rd, asking to be advised whether certain persons evidently of Indian blood, referred to by Mr. Nicholson, M.P., in the House of Commons on March 1st, are Indians within the definitions given in section 2 of the Indian Act. I observe that, to fall within the definitions of "Indian" or "non-treaty Indian" prescribed by section 2 (d) and (h) of the Indian Act, a person of Indian blood must:

1. Belong to a particular band, or
2. Be a child of such person, or
3. Belong to an irregular band, or
4. Follow the Indian mode of life.

Evidently the persons to whom Mr. Nicholson refers do not fall within the first or second categories.

Mr. Williams informs me that the department does not know of any irregular band in the part of Canada referred to by Mr. Nicholson, so that evidently not one of them can fall within the first three categories, and those persons who live in the town in which Mr. Nicholson lives and to whom he refers specifically, evidently do not follow the Indian mode of life. These persons are, therefore, not Indians or non-treaty Indians within the meaning of the Indian Act and, so far as I am aware, have the rights of citizenship as other Canadians have and are entitled to the franchise.

The Deputy Superintendent General,
Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Can the minister now tell us the number of Indians who have been enfranchised on their own application? I understood him to say that none had been enfranchised on the application of their respective bands.

Mr. MURPHY: I said not to my knowledge. On a former occasion I gave the information which the hon. gentleman now asks for, but I can get it for him in a moment. But I wish to point out that here are Indians not following the mode of Indian life but who may have ninety-eight per cent of Indian blood in their veins, and who are to-day recognized as citizens of Canada with all the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship. Then we have other Indians in Montreal and Toronto and other large cities, members of the legal and medical professions, who beyond all doubt have received a much higher education and advanced much further than the class of Indians to which I have just referred, and yet who to-day are classed as Indians and have not the privilege of Canadian citizenship.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the minister willing to limit the legislation to those two classes of Indians?

Mr. MURPHY: I think the amendment as drafted amply covers the point in question. The board which will be appointed will certainly make full inquiry as to the fitness of the Indian. The hon. member for West Middlesex said that the Indian might not even be seen by the board and might not know anything about the matter until after the board

had made its report. But the act as it stands on the statute book to-day provides:

In the course of such inquiry it shall be the duty of the board to take into consideration and report upon the attitude of any such Indian towards his enfranchisement, which attitude shall be a factor in determining the question of fitness.

Certainly the board could not determine that question unless the Indian was before them; that is if it is going to do its duty, and I cannot conceive that they would do otherwise. May I again impress upon the committee this fact, that the member of the board who from my own personal knowledge will be very careful as to the recommendations will be the departmental representative. It is not necessary for me to go over the ground which has been so well covered by the Prime Minister so much better than I, but I did wish to answer those few objections.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Replying to the Prime Minister's answer to my argument, I think the Prime Minister has not given this section the thought he usually gives to a section of an act which he endeavours to interpret. There can be no question whatever that this section puts the Indian in an entirely different category from what he ever was in before. That is what it is intended for. Why? Because as matters stand at the present time there have been no applications by the band. That is the best evidence as to whether the members of the band themselves think some of their number should be enfranchised. Secondly, because the applications made by the Indians themselves for enfranchisement have been very, very few. Perhaps the minister has the number now. At all events they are very few, a very small proportion, less than one one-hundredth of one per cent possibly. That is the best evidence as to the attitude of the Indian himself. If the Prime Minister's argument means anything, it means that by this bill we are not violating the right which the Indian now has to say that he shall not be enfranchised against his wish. That is the point I was making. I say that under this amendment the Indian may be enfranchised against his wish. That is what the amendment is aimed at. If you intend to consult him about it he can be enfranchised already under the provisions to which the Prime Minister referred. The Prime Minister argued that under section 110, which reads:

Upon the application of an Indian of any band—

That is, upon his application, or upon the application of the band—

—on a vote of a majority of the male members of such band—

There are two ways in which he may now be enfranchised. Under the bill as originally drawn, those were both cut out; the whole section was repealed. The bill as originally drawn prompted the amendment which was moved with a view partially to meet the objections made by the hon. members on this side of the house. As originally drawn the bill repealed subsection 1 of section 110, that which was read by the Prime Minister, and the following was substituted therefor:

The superintendent general may appoint a board to consist of two officers of the department and a member of the band to which the Indian or Indians under investigation belongs, to make inquiry and report as to the fitness of any Indian or Indians to be enfranchised.

That was the change.

Mr. MURPHY: Is the hon. member reading from the original act?

Mr. ELLIOTT: No; I have made it perfectly clear that I am reading the amendment. The bill as drawn provided, and the reason is very apparent, that because the Indians themselves did not make application to be enfranchised, or because the band did not make any, we must have some new system. The amendment provided for a board, as set out in the bill. It is true that a further amendment to section 110 has been moved, but that does not help the poor Indian who is being enfranchised against his will,—not one particle; it all amounts to the same thing.

An Indian who formerly could not be enfranchised without his consent or without the consent of the band to which he belonged can now, upon recommendation, be enfranchised by the board set up by the bill.

Some discussion has taken place as to what position the Indian would be in after enfranchisement. If the minister will look at subsection 9 of section 110 he will find exactly the position in which the Indian would be.

The superintendent general shall also pay to each Indian upon enfranchisement his or her share of the funds—

Mr. BENNETT: That is the position they are in to-day.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I will say that is the position they would be in to-day if they were making application under subsection 1, which

they are not doing, and which this amendment seeks to change. Subsection 9 reads:

The superintendent general shall also pay to each Indian upon enfranchisement his or her share of the funds to the credit of the band, including such amount as the superintendent general determines to be his or her share of the value of the common interest of the band in the lands of the reserve or reserves, or share of the principal of the annuities of the band capitalized at five per centum, out of such moneys as are provided by parliament for the purpose or which may be otherwise available for such purpose.

Where does that leave your Indian? It leaves him with the money in his pocket, money which he cannot keep in his pocket or anywhere else. It makes him—

Mr. BENNETT: He would be in the same position as he is to-day, if he were enfranchised.

Mr. ELLIOTT: But he is not being enfranchised to-day. Can the minister tell—

Mr. MALCOLM: He does not want it.

Mr. BENNETT: It is for the country's sake.

Mr. MURPHY: During the ten year period from December 31, 1922, to December 31, 1932, under sections 122a of the old act and 114 of the new, 793 Indians were enfranchised.

Mr. ELLIOTT: How many under section 110?

Mr. BENNETT: Section 110 is in the old act.

Mr. MURPHY: Under section 110 of the old act 61 Indians were enfranchised during the same period.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Is that during a ten year period?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, under section 110.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Sixty-one Indians were enfranchised under one clause, and none under the other, in a ten year period.

Mr. McINTOSH: Not much urge there.

Mr. MURPHY: Altogether there were 793.

Mr. ELLIOTT: And that is the position they are in now. There are some pieces of legislation which look worse, the more you examine them. This is one of the worst examples. Under those two clauses in ten years only 61 Indians received enfranchisement, or an average of six and one-tenth Indians per year. That figure is from a total of about 100,000 Indians. Hon. members will note that enfranchisement which may take place would be against the wish of the Indians. That is the situation. The more we examine and discuss the legislation, the worse it appears. It is absolutely useless for the Prime Minister or anybody else to attempt to argue that the Indian will be in anything like the position he was in before. His rights are being taken away from him. He will have money paid to him, and there is no hon. member in this committee who is not familiar enough with the Indian mind to know that money just slips through his fingers as quickly as it does through the fingers of some white people. To put into his hands cash representing the lands he formerly owned and of which he could not deprive himself is, in my view, an abandonment of a duty which for generations the government of Canada has observed. Assuming he gets one, two, three, four or even five thousand dollars for his rights, you may depend he will be on the road inside of a year. That is what will happen to him. His land and his money will be gone.

Mr. BENNETT: The time to say that was before the law was changed to permit enfranchisement at all.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, no.

Mr. BENNETT: Anybody knows that. An argument such as the hon. member has made would be laughed at in any court of law.

Mr. MALCOLM: It would be impossible to add much to what has been said by the hon. member for West Middlesex, but after reading the amendment I feel exactly as I did when I rose to answer the Prime Minister.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. MALCOLM: Under the existing act the Indian must ask for enfranchisement. Under the amendment that privilege is left, but it is also the privilege of the superintendent general, if he wishes, to enfranchise Indians.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not; why say that, when you know it is not so?

Mr. MALCOLM: I have read the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY: The superintendent general may not do it.

Mr. MALCOLM: Then the amendment of the minister simply provides that section 110 shall be left, and states further that the superintendent general may appoint a board—

Mr. BENNETT: That is another matter.

Mr. MALCOLM: Such board will report on the fitness of any Indian. And it shall have the same force and effect, and shall be dealt with in the same manner as if it had been made upon the application of the Indian himself.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. MALCOLM: If that does not provide that the same procedure shall follow the action of the superintendent general as follows the application of the Indian himself, then I am afraid someone else will have to interpret the language of the section.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not what you said. Of course it does.

Mr. MALCOLM: I cannot argue anything else than that the change enfranchises the Indian through the superintendent general in the same way as he would have sought enfranchisement himself. I cannot add anything to what has been said by the hon. member for West Middlesex to clarify that point. I join with him however in protesting to the Minister of the Interior that so far as my experience in the province of Ontario has been, he would do well to accept the advice of the hon. member for West Middlesex.

Mr. BENNETT: Ten or twelve years ago was the time to give it.

Mr. MALCOLM: Probably so. I agree with the hon. member for Brant that the lands of these Indians so enfranchised will pass into the hands of white men who are not necessarily desirable on the reserve, and that the reserves will run down. I believe that some reserves in Ontario are improving greatly. The Indians have some splendid teachers, some splendid missionaries. The Cape Croker reserve I know sent practically every able-bodied man to the war. Those men are voting now. They are improving year by year under good guidance. I do not believe they are going to do as well if a number of whites are allowed to get possession of land now held by the Indians. For my part I agree with the hon. member for West Middlesex that the best evidence that the Indians do not want enfranchisement is the fact that they have not applied for it, and I think the minister will have to show us some other reasons why enfranchisement for which they do not ask should be forced upon them.

Mr. BROWN: It may be presumption for a layman to enter into discussion with lawyers on matters of this kind, but the way the matter appears to me is simply this. There are now two methods whereby an Indian may secure enfranchisement and this amendment proposes a third. If the amendment has any purpose whatever it must be that more Indians should be enfranchised. Evidently under the two methods now existent they are not being enfranchised in sufficient numbers and the object of the amendment is to increase the number. Whether deliberately or not, the Prime Minister only confuses the issue when he says that the results following enfranchisement by this new method will be just the same as those which follow to-day. Naturally they will, so why raise the point? The results will be the same no matter what method is employed. I say again that the purpose of this amendment is that more Indians should be enfranchised. Few are being enfranchised, on application by the individual himself, and none, I understand on application by the band. For some reason the department wants more Indians enfranchised so they propose this new method. I think the hon. member for West Middlesex and others have made it very clear that it is not desirable that any more Indians than at present should be placed in control of their property. That is how it appears to me, and the argument of the Prime Minister has absolutely failed to show me any reason why I should change my opinion.

Mr. McGIBBON: I rise for only one purpose, to express the wish of the Indian bands in my riding, of which there are two, that they should be enfranchised. I think there must be a great diversity of intelligence among the Indians in the ridings of different members, or there would not be such diversity of opinion on this question in this house. The Indians in my riding are quite intelligent people, I would say their intelligence is almost as high as that of the average white man. They have asked me time and again to try to get them enfranchised. I think they should be enfranchised wherever they are intelligent enough. I think when an Indian has reached the stage of education and intelligence at which he is qualified to shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship they should be given to him.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will my hon. friend permit a question? Would he tell the committee how many applications came during the last ten years from Indians in his riding who are anxious to be enfranchised? I understand there were just sixty-two in the whole of Canada, so I wondered how many came from that riding.

Mr. McGIBBON: I have not the figures, I know there have been a certain number. I tell the committee this, that my trouble

has been to get them enfranchised. I have handled some applications myself, and have had to threaten the officials, not only of this government but other governments, that I would go over their heads to the minister to get them enfranchised, and I have done so. The present minister will bear me out in that statement. In my experience there seems to be a prejudice on the part of the officials against enfranchising these men. I think I told this committee on a former occasion of a man who came to me and protested that he could not get work on account of being a ward of the government. He had saved enough money to buy himself a large motor truck, and was as capable of earning a living as anyone else. Why shield these people after all? If they have the degree of intelligence and education to fit them for full citizenship why should they not have it?

Mr. POULIOT: They cannot wear their full regalia!

Mr. McGIBBON: That is the kind of answer I would expect from the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot). Further, I would say that I think a great deal of the objection to this proposal comes from people who want to keep the privilege of being wards of the law. I think there is no doubt about that, they want to hide behind the law so they do not have to pay their debts. I say this parliament and this country have a duty to these people, and when they are ready for full citizenship but will not seek it we ought to make them take it. How are you going to develop responsible, self-respecting people unless you make them take the responsibilities of citizenship?

There are some things about the bill that I do not like or I am not clear about. I do not like the idea of allowing whites to mix with them and get their land, I think that is detrimental to the interests of this country, but I gather from the discussion that that is not a new thing. If it can be prevented I think it is desirable to do so, not only in the interests of the Indian but in the interest of that lower strata of white people who seem to want to mix with any inferior class. I would like to see that prevented if possible. But I would support the minister by telling him that the Indians in my riding have told me time and again that they want to be enfranchised and become full citizens of Canada.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I understand 62 Indians were enfranchised by their own request?

Mr. MURPHY: There are different sections of the act which apply.

[Mr. McGibbon.]

Mr. ELLIOTT: I mean under section 110.

Mr. MURPHY: During the ten year period from December 31, 1922, to December 31, 1932, under section 122a of the old act and section 114 of the new, that is the act now before us, 793 Indians were enfranchised. Under section 107 of the old and section 110 of the new act 61 were enfranchised during the same period. I may say that practically all Indians that are enfranchised to-day are enfranchised under section 114 rather than section 110.

Mr. ELLIOTT: What amount did these various Indians receive out of the moneys of the band, under subsection 9 of section 110?

Mr. MURPHY: I have not that information at hand but doubtless I could get it.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I should be greatly obliged if the minister could give it because it has a very material bearing. We were wondering whether it would be one thousand, two thousand or five thousand that each would get, and I am advised that frequently it did not amount to even one thousand. When it is pointed out to the minister that this legislation is taking away the Indian's land and home and the protection afforded him, giving him one thousand dollars in cash, I think it will be apparent at once that the Indian will be on unemployment relief.

Mr. MARCIL: There are in my county two Indian bands and I have never yet known of any Indian who applied for enfranchisement and was refused. The Indians on the reserve enjoy certain rights with respect to their land and property and I remember one attempt that was made in 1917 to expropriate the lands of the old Indians in Restigouche opposite Campbellton and to settle them in the northern country, the purpose being to take those lands as an annex to Campbellton and to set up building lots. That was prevented by the parliament of Canada. The Indians have been left on their reserves for their own protection, and I can recall that when a law was passed to enfranchise the Indians it was immediately repealed. Some Indians are competent to vote, and those who served overseas vote to-day in my constituency as in other parts of the country. But so far as Bonaventure is concerned I think it would be a great misfortune to enfranchise these Indians, leaving them to roam about away from the reserves, taking the little money they might get and spending it. It would merely add to the ranks of the unemployed, which are already numerous enough. I think the law should stand as it is now.

Mr. McINTOSH: I asked a question with regard to the costumes of the Indians under the proposed legislation, and I wish the minister would be good enough to amplify his statement on that point.

Mr. MURPHY: That clause was considered by the committee and passed several weeks ago.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am not asking what was passed; I am asking the minister for a definite statement on the situation.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not wish to be discourteous to the hon. member, but if he would frame his question differently I might possibly be able to give him the information. He spoke some minutes ago but I am not clear as to what information he does want.

Mr. McINTOSH: The proposed measure, I understand, will interfere with the right of the Indian to wear his Indian costume off the reserve. Does this legislation further prohibit him doing so? Does it interfere with that aboriginal right? If it does, it is absolutely wrong.

Mr. MURPHY: That question was thoroughly discussed in the house and if the hon. member was not present I can only regret the fact. But the section having been passed, I do not think we should be asked to rediscuss the matter now.

Mr. MARCIL: For some years I have been receiving an interesting illustrated catalogue advertising the so called stampede at Calgary. Would this legislation interfere with such an exhibition, where the Indians are allowed to roam in their Indian costumes?

Mr. McINTOSH: That is the question I have asked and which the minister refuses to answer. He says it has already been answered.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that the various suggestions that have been made might be embodied in an amendment as follows:

In respect of an Indian or Indians of any band who has not or have not made application for enfranchisement under this section or under section 114 of this act, the superintendent general may appoint a board to consist of any judge of any superior court or any judge of any circuit, district or county court, an officer of the department and a member of the band to be selected by the band to which the Indian or Indians under investigation belongs or belong, or failing the selection of such member for a period of thirty days after the date of notice having been given to the council, the member shall be appointed by the superintendent general—

That will be found in subsection 2 of section 110 now in respect of other questions of a similar character.

—to make inquiry and report as to the fitness of any Indian or Indians to be enfranchised, and such report shall have the same force and effect and shall be dealt with in the same manner as if the same had been made upon the application of an Indian or Indians under this section: Provided that no enfranchisement of any Indian or Indians shall be made under this subsection in violation of the terms of any treaty, agreement or undertaking that may have been entered into or made between or by the crown and the Indians of the band in question.

So far as the effect of this proposal is concerned, it merely recognizes the existing laws and protects the Indian against any possible undertaking that may have been given in any treaty or agreement, and the provision for selecting a member of the band is exactly what the law now is with respect to the case in which an Indian makes his own application, namely, subsection 2 of section 110. I move that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Is this amendment to replace the one before the committee?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Do I understand that the amendment we have been discussing is withdrawn?

Mr. BENNETT: With the consent of the chamber, yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Would the minister consider adding to the amendment just offered something which I shall propose? I realize that a good deal of the time of the house is being taken up with this question, which to some hon. members may seem of no importance. I do not look upon it in that way at all; I think it is important, for it means everything to the people involved. With regard to the provision that no enfranchisement of any Indian or Indians shall be made under this subsection in violation of the terms of any treaty, I want to point out the difficulty of applying this, assuming that a case arose, as it would. An Indian comes and says, "This is in violation of a treaty". Unfortunately these treaties were made long before Canada had a government of its own. They were made in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some of the first treaties were entered into in the seventeenth century, long before the declaration of independence, and involved the Indians who were in what is now the United States as well as those

then in what is now Canada, because it was then all British territory. It is very difficult to get hold of these old treaties. If I understood the minister correctly, he is unable to tell us at the present time, and I doubt whether any hon. member can tell us, what the treaty rights all are. I think there would be difficulty in establishing precisely what the treaty rights are under these old treaties of several hundred years ago. There is however one fact which he will not have much difficulty establishing and that is that for centuries under these treaties these rights have been recognized, including the right of protection given the ward of the government, not permitting him to alienate his property. I wonder if the Prime Minister and the minister would agree to the amendment reading like this:

No enfranchisement of any Indian or Indians shall be made under this subsection in violation of the terms of any treaty, agreement or undertaking that may have been entered into or made between or by the crown and the Indians of the band in question, or against the will of the Indian whom it is proposed to enfranchise.

Mr. BENNETT: You cannot make it negative.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Unless he is willing to consent, he should not be enfranchised.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member overlooks the fact that for fifteen years the law has contained provisions for the enfranchisement of Indians.

Mr. MALCOLM: Voluntary enfranchisement.

Mr. BENNETT: Not voluntary; by action of the band, if necessary. This committee will be made up of a member of the band, a representative of the superintendent general, and a judge of the superior or county courts. That is a precaution which does not exist with respect to the other two cases. Inasmuch as no such provision as that mentioned by the hon. member for West Middlesex has heretofore found its place in the law, the suggestion I have just made in the amendment with respect to treaties, agreements or undertakings made between or by the crown and the Indians would be ample to protect the interests of the Indian in the view of the judge who would have to be a member of the committee to determine the matter. The judge would be the impartial member, while there would be a member appointed by the government and one by the band. If the judge and the Indian say "no" there would be no doubt about the fact that there would be no enfranchisement. The answer to all the arguments which have been made this afternoon about the terrible white trash that is going to take away the people's land—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): They cannot take the lands away from them.

Mr. BENNETT: —the terrible white trash that might settle upon them, is the fact that the Indian's anxiety to secure money or land has not been evidenced by a desire to secure enfranchisement. I think it may be taken that the exercise of this power, provided it is done with caution and care, will not act unfairly in the determination of the fitness for enfranchisement. The judge of the county or superior court will be the impartial member on the committee. I think the amendment as it now stands makes the four principles much more fair.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The department has always to face the serious question as to whether or not certain individual Indians should be enfranchised. I found that there was opposition sometimes by the band itself against the desire of an individual Indian to be enfranchised. There was always difficulty in getting settlement with the band for his share of the fund and his interest in the lands. I think there must be the same difficulty in that regard as was stated by the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario, because when I had the honour to preside over the department I found that there was a desire to allow Indians to become enfranchised. The logical outcome of Indian life is his merging into the life of Canadian citizenship, but it should not be forgotten that we allow individuals to come to Canada from all over the world without forcing enfranchisement upon them.

Mr. MURPHY: They are not wards.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Up to date we have not done so.

Mr. BENNETT: We put prohibitions against them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The chairman of this board which is to pass upon the fitness of an Indian to be enfranchised may be a judge, but the whole say as to whether or not final action shall be taken will be in the hands of the superintendent general. Under the present act he cannot do that unless the Indian is willing or an application is made by the band. Hon. gentlemen opposite are proposing something different from that at present in the act. As to the lands or prop-

erty owned by the band passing into the hands of white men, that cannot happen. The band takes good care of that. Before an individual becomes enfranchised they see that a settlement is made and an amount arrived at to represent his interest. That is given to him and the lands of the band are preserved. I do not think that principle should be interfered with. So far as the precautions set out in this subsection are concerned, they refer merely to the fitness of the individual Indian to be enfranchised. Whether or not he desires it, his case will be in the hands of the superintendent general. I doubt very much if this action will prove to be popular with the Indian. So far as securing votes are concerned, I think the superintendent general will be out of luck.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, quite so.

Mr. McINTOSH: Do not impute motives.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Personally I think the government are making a mistake. I regret the slowness with which enfranchisement takes place and I know the difficulties of Indians having property and being on the highways and all that; it is rather a difficult situation, but I doubt the advisability of leaving the final say in the hands of the superintendent general. There is always the possibility of a favourable report by the board despite the protests of the individual or possibly of the band itself. If this is the case, the Indian will not be a very happy individual, and I do not think the Indians as a whole will consider that their interests are being protected.

Mr. BENNETT: We will withdraw the original amendment which did not contain the necessary safeguard. Perhaps the chairman would read the last amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): The amendment reads:

That section 110 of the said act be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

14. In respect of an Indian or Indians of any band who has not or have not made application for enfranchisement under this section or under section 114 of this act, the superintendent general may appoint a board to consist of any judge of any superior court or any judge of any circuit, district or county court, an officer of the department and a member of the band to be selected by the band to which the Indian or Indians under investigation belongs or belong, or failing the selection of such member for a period of thirty days after the date of notice having been given to the council, the member shall be appointed by the superintendent general to make inquiry and report as to the fitness of any Indian or Indians to be enfranchised, and such report shall have the same force and effect and shall be dealt with in the same manner as if the same had been made upon the application of an Indian or Indians under this section: Provided that no enfranchisement of any Indian or Indians shall be made under this subsection in violation of the terms of any treaty, agreement or undertaking that may have been entered into or made between or by the crown and the Indians of the band in question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As the amendment is pretty long and was not read sufficiently audibly for me, at least, to hear it, and much less to understand it, perhaps I may be excused if I do not discuss it at all and make my remarks refer to other phases of the matter. I suppose that will be quite in order, otherwise, we shall have to hear the amendment read again first.

There is one point on which I find myself in agreement with the minister and that is that some of the Indians, not now enfranchised, should be. I refer to the sons and daughters of Indian returned men who, by reason of their war service, were made eligible to vote. The returned men vote, but their sons and daughters do not. That matter would, I think, properly come under the election act and not under this. But lest some of my Indian constituents may have heard of the threatening redistribution bill hanging over their representative's head, and think, because of that, I may have lost all interest in my constituency, I believe I should say what I am about to say now. I am in favour of the sons and daughters of returned men having the same rights as have their fathers. Fancy, at this time when we are all trying to renounce war and we hear of the Kellogg-Briand pact and so on, enfranchising someone because he killed, or tried to kill, some fellowman in war! The son comes of age, becomes eventually a father himself and finds that neither he nor his wife can vote. His father has killed a man possibly; he is entitled to vote and he goes to the polls. The son says to himself: I have not killed or been given the opportunity of killing in war a man so I have not the franchise; I cannot vote. Whom shall I kill? He will look around and his keen hunter's eyes may light upon the Minister of National Revenue.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Upon the member for the riding.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Nobody knows upon whose person the lynx-like eye of this Indian who cannot vote, may light. Whom shall he select to massacre?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member seems to indicate whom he will select.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have to take one of them and I have taken the one who seems to be the better prepared to pass away.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This matter is no joke, although we may for the moment make a joke about it. That is the actual condition on the reserve under the federal government. I have never discovered the solution to the knotty problem, but when one of these Indian boys came to my place and stayed there till twelve o'clock midnight explaining why his son should be enfranchised; that he was a good citizen; that he had taken up the peaceful occupation of pastoral as well as tillage farming and yet he could not vote, I had no answer and nobody has any answer to this complaint. If that situation could be corrected in the election act I would hold up both hands for it. I do not want to cause any more annoyance to the government than I can help; that is the spirit in which I make these comments. I know the Prime Minister does not care a snap of his finger about precedents; he is not governed by the hoary precedents of other countries, and he is right; in these days you have to break new ground. But I would like to know whether any other country under the sun ever forced its natives into enfranchisement. The whole history of native populations from time immemorial to the present day is that they have wanted the franchise before their mandatory government was ready to give it to them. This government is going to form the extraordinary precedent of compelling the natives of our country to become enfranchised with all that goes with that. The hon. member for West Edmonton pointed out that we do not do that to white people. So far as I know there are people who have lived from manhood up and died in Canada without taking out their naturalization papers. Why should we take, above all others, the sons and fathers of our own natives, and compel them to become enfranchised?—because that is what the government is doing, describe it how they like. It is putting into the hands of this board the power to enfranchise these people. What is the only argument that I have heard in favour of taking this extraordinary step? I am speaking earnestly and sincerely because I know the Indian population of my constituency; I have known many of them since childhood, since they were in the cradle, and have seen them grow up and become useful citizens, following mainly agriculture. The band in my constituency is an excellent one—I do not mean the Six Nations—it is a musical band; they are accomplished in much that we call the culture of the white people, and these Indians are superior to some whites. Why then should we treat them any differently from the way we are using white immigrants in the way of voluntary enfranchisement?

The argument was that they had become so qualified in certain of the professions, I think it was law and medicine; that they had become too keen competitors for their white brothers. If that is so, it is not a great tribute to the work of the Indian department during the past decade, that these people should have been taken from the primitive condition in which we found them, roaming over the prairies, and been placed in our schools, eventually in our universities, so that now they have become so accomplished that they make the white men scratch gravel to compete with them? If so, let us continue that course of education further before we compel them to become citizens. If the argument advanced by the government is valid, I have not heard of any cases. I do not know in my experience of a single Indian who has gone into any of the professions and embarrassed the white man by his competition. There may be such cases, but the general policy of the department has been rather the other way. Life on the farm seems to be natural to the normal outdoor life of the Indian and he was discouraged from going into the professions for that reason and also because, if he did so, he had to meet some white man's prejudice against an Indian. Consequently this helped to cripple his activities in his competition with the white man. But if he is such an outstanding Indian that he can overcome the prejudice that some people of other colours than his hold against him, this is a great tribute to him and surely because of his attainments in this respect he should not be penalized by being enfranchised against his will. I think the government is making a terrible mistake and being unfair to itself. There is only one explanation of its conduct; though I do not like to suggest motives, there is only one conclusion—

Mr. McINTOSH: The hon. member is coming to it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, and I am going to get there yet. The conclusion is that this government is going to follow the example of the government that preceded the election of 1896, that I remember so well, in the heinous enfranchising acts they had that enabled the returning officers and scrutineers to do everything almost but hang an elector. While we have got away from that by thirty or thirty-five years, my thoughts go back to that time and in the absence of any other

objection or purpose I am driven to the conclusion that this government, by means of this law, will be enabled to go out before an election and convert Indians into voters wholesale. If not, let them put up some valid reason why they are passing this act. I have not heard any so far. I do not think you can quote a precedent on top of this earth where native people have been compelled to be enfranchised. I have had several conversations with the minister, some of them jocular and some serious, and he knows that I entertain this pretty well grounded suspicion, but if he insists upon putting this through I do not think we will waste an awful lot more time trying to prevent him. This is the fifth time this bill has been up before the committee. I spoke on three of the other occasions, and when this order was called this afternoon I went out. I had business of a most pressing nature with a party who wanted to see me, but when I came back into the chamber I found that we were at the exact section that we were discussing two months ago. It is true that there have been some changes. I have been moved for the reasons I have indicated to make these few observations, and when the time comes to amend the elections act I shall be delighted as I have already intimated, to support my hon. friend the minister or whoever has charge of it in giving the franchise to the sons and daughters of the returned men, even if they have not killed or tried to kill anybody in war.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I realize that the discussion has taken longer than I fancy most members of the committee anticipated. I have listened with a good deal of attention to what the Prime Minister said with regard to the amendment that he proposed. It does make a change in that the third member of the board shall be selected by the band, but it still leaves it in the position that that member is all right if the judge is with him, and he is all wrong if the judge and the other member of the board are against him. If he is seeking to protect the representatives of the band I wonder if the Prime Minister would not agree to putting in a provision that no resolution would carry unless it was supported by the vote of the representative of the band? But I do not suppose there is any use in advocating that. I want, however, to move an amendment that there shall be added to the section as proposed to be amended, the following words:

or against the will of the Indian whom it is proposed to enfranchise.

Mr. BENNETT: That would be out of order, Mr. Chairman. It would negative the proposal.

Mr. ELLIOTT: We are amending subsection 110 by adding a subsection and what I have proposed is not a negative of anything in the proposed subsection. I wonder if the minister could now give us an idea of the amounts paid to the Indians.

Mr. MURPHY: I have not been able to obtain it up to the present.

Mr. ELLIOTT: It will be given before the third reading of the bill?

Mr. MURPHY: I shall endeavour to get the information for the hon. member. I want to deal with one point which was raised by the hon. member for Melville with reference to the enfranchisement of the Indians on the eve of an election. He indicated, as he did on a former occasion, that there might be some ulterior motive in the mind of the minister or of the department in proposing this amendment; in this case I suppose it would be the minister. May I say that his position is very illogical because if the Indian is to be enfranchised against his will, as hon. members to your left, Mr. Chairman, suggest, certainly he will not vote for the government that puts such voting power in his hands. Secondly, it cannot be done in that manner because subsection 5 of section 110 already provides:

On the report of the superintendent general that any Indian, male or female, over the age of twenty-one years, is fit for enfranchisement, the governor in council may by order direct that such Indian shall be and become enfranchised at the expiration of two years from the date of such order or earlier if requested by such Indian.

And so forth. That disposes completely of the point raised by the hon. member for Melville, that some government might enfranchise a number of Indians on the eve of an election. It simply cannot be done.

Mr. MALCOLM: The section which the minister has just quoted has a very much fuller meaning than he has given to it. It says:

On the report of the superintendent general that any Indian, male or female, over the age of twenty-one years, is fit for enfranchisement, the governor in council may by order direct that such Indian shall be and become enfranchised at the expiration of two years from the date of such order or earlier if requested by such Indian.

Those last few words just knock out the two-years argument altogether. Enfranchisement may be granted at once if the Indian asks for it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): The question is on the subamendment.

Mr. BENNETT: That cannot be in order, Mr. Chairman. You cannot move an amendment that is a negative to an existing proposal. By voting against it hon. members vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: How many people with both their lugs all right have heard that and understand what it is?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We heard it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: All right. I do not know if my hon. friend from Pictou heard it with his auricular appendage on, but I did not. If I was right on top of it I could not understand it. It is not fair to the committee. We do not know what they are agreeing to. Will someone interpret the amendment in language we can understand, not draftsman's language, but every day language?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Does the hon. member say he does not understand the subamendment moved by the hon. member for West Middlesex?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Let it go.

Mr. MALCOLM: I consider that the subamendment moved by the hon. member for West Middlesex simply repeats section 110 of the act. I am opposed to the amendment which was submitted by the minister on the ground that section 110 does provide for enfranchisement at the instance of the individual or of the band. The amendment moved by the minister simply provides that the superintendent general may initiate the inquiry to determine whether the Indian shall be enfranchised. I am opposed to the amendment on the ground that the Indians do not want enfranchisement as is evidenced by the fact that they have not applied for it under the original section as it now stands. I also submit that the minister misrepresented subsection 5 of section 110 when he pointed out to the hon. member for Melville that even if an Indian were enfranchised before the election he would have to wait for two years. Either deliberately or innocently the minister left out a few words in the subsection which point out that if the Indian so desires, such enfranchisement may take place at once. So the minister's answer to the hon. member for Melville is not an answer at all. I think the committee might just as well vote. We are opposed to the amendment as offered by the minister and we may as well record ourselves as being so opposed.

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am glad I did not hear it.

Subamendment negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Bennett) agreed to, on division.

Section 7 as amended agreed to.

Bill reported.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT

The house resumed from Friday, February 17, consideration in committee of Bill No. 26, to amend the Exchequer Court Act—Mr. Guthrie.—Mr. Cowan (Port Arthur) in the chair.

Mr. DUPRE: This bill was discussed last on February 17. As pointed out at that time by my colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie), it is a well known principle of British law that moneys paid in settlement of a claim or of a litigated matter, when there has been no fraud or threat of any kind made, cannot be recovered. It is further a principle of British law, as my colleague pointed out, that money paid in mistake of law cannot be recovered. The Minister of Justice added that the object of the amendment is to declare that in Canada, in actions or proceedings taken before the exchequer court, the common principle of British law shall apply, and that the law in that respect shall be general throughout the length and breadth of Canada. The effect would be that in all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the exchequer court no party would be able to set up a claim to the effect that he should get his money back because he had paid it under a mistake of law.

Last February the hon. member for Montmagny and the ex-Minister of Justice expressed some doubts as to whether or not there would be some encroachment upon the rights of the province of Quebec. They expressed the opinion that Bill No. 26 relates to property and civil rights in the province of Quebec and for that reason might be ultra vires, in so far as it might come into conflict with property and civil rights of that province. On the other hand my colleague the Minister of Justice stated that in his opinion the amendment did not in any way come into conflict with the laws of the province of Quebec. There are provisions in the Quebec code through which moneys can be recovered when paid in mistake of law, and no one for a moment proposes to disturb that provision. But the exchequer court is a federal court having jurisdiction in all parts of Canada. The Minister of Justice added that it is not in-

tended in any way to disturb the operation of the law of the province of Quebec, as it applies to residents of that province, or to any matter which arises in that province. However the discussion on the bill was adjourned in order to allow the hon. member for Quebec East to express his views. The committee would be pleased at this time to hear from him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am very happy indeed that the government agreed not to proceed with the bill upon the first occasion. At that time I had doubts which have since changed into a certainty. This bill would do indirectly what parliament cannot do directly. Its true title ought to be: An Act to Supersede the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec. I believe I will have no difficulty in demonstrating that assertion. As is shown in the explanatory note, section 18 of the Exchequer Court Act gives exclusive jurisdiction to the exchequer court in respect of any matter which might be the subject of a suit or action against the crown, and so on.

Section 5 of the Petition of Right Act, which is chapter 158 of the revised statutes of Canada, enacts that all petitions of right must come before the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Mr. DUPRE: That is the procedure.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. The Minister of Justice claimed that the bill would not take away any rights enjoyed by citizens of the province of Quebec. Well, it does not take the rights away; they will have the rights, just the same, but they will have no tribunal before which they may appear, because the exchequer court is the only one before which their rights could be presented. A petition of right must come before the exchequer court; by this bill the exchequer court will be deprived of jurisdiction in the matter of claiming amounts which have been paid to the crown in mistake of law. The purpose of the bill is pretty clearly stated, although it is not said that it is for the purpose of preventing the provisions of the civil code of the province of Quebec from operating. It is said in the explanatory note that the object of the bill is to effect uniformity of the law throughout Canada in regard to the recovery of any money paid to His Majesty voluntarily in mistake of law. My hon. friend has been honest and sincere; he says it is a principle of British law that there is no recovery of moneys that have been paid in mistake of law, and he wants this British principle to apply everywhere. Well, I know it is the law in all the provinces which are under the common law, but it is not the law in the province of Qeuebec.

Mr. DUPRE: You mean on account of articles 1047 and 1140?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of articles 1047 and 1140 of the civil code, which I am going to read:

1047. He who receives through error of law or of fact what is not due him is bound to restore it; or if it cannot be restored in kind, to give the value of it.

If the person receiving be in good faith, he is not obliged to restore the profits of the thing received.

1140. Every payment presupposes a debt; what has been paid where there is no debt may be recovered.

There can be no recovery of what has been paid in voluntary discharge of a natural obligation.

I do not want to discuss the advantage or disadvantage of the law, whether the provisions of the civil code are better, more equitable, than those of the common law. I personally believe that when through a mistake in law a man has paid money which is not due there is much in favour of the law that says he has the right to claim it back. It is not the law elsewhere but it is in the province of Quebec. It is the French law; it is a matter of property and civil rights. A man in the province of Quebec who in mistake of law has paid an amount which he does not owe has a civil right to claim it back, and parliament cannot take that right away from him. Parliament cannot take it away from him directly, and parliament should not take it away from him indirectly by depriving him of the only tribunal before which he can lay his claim.

Section 94 of the British North America Act is very interesting in the discussion of this matter, because according to the explanatory note this bill is for the purpose of making the law uniform in all the provinces of Canada. Section 94, which deals with uniformity of laws, says:

Notwithstanding anything in this act, the parliament of Canada may make provision for the uniformity of all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and of the procedure of all or any of the courts in those three provinces, and from and after the passing of any act in that behalf the power of the parliament of Canada to make laws in relation to any matter comprised in any such act shall, notwithstanding anything in this act, be unrestricted; but any act of the parliament of Canada making provision for such uniformity shall not have effect in any province unless and until it is adopted and enacted as law by the legislature thereof.

But this section does not apply to the province of Quebec. Parliament has the constitutional right to enact measures for the uniformity of laws in Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and certainly in the other provinces which have since entered the confederation, and are under the common law; but even then such measures enacted by this parliament would have to be ratified by the provinces concerned. The province of Quebec is excluded from the operation of this section.

Section 101 of the British North America Act gives to this parliament the right to create federal courts. This section does not give to parliament the right to change the laws; it gives it the right to apply the laws. I submit that parliament has not the right indirectly to use the Exchequer Court Act, which creates this federal tribunal, for the purpose of taking away a civil right from any citizen of any province, as would be done if this bill becomes law; because, although as I say the right would still exist under the civil code, there would be no tribunal before which claims could be made; for petitions of right cannot now be tried by the superior court of the province as they were before the Exchequer Court Act was enacted. There has been no change of the law, but there has been a change of the locus. It is the tribunal that has been changed. This amendment would, I submit, take away the jurisdiction in the province of Quebec in matters of recovery of money paid in mistake of law. While the claim under the law would still exist, there would be no court where it might be entertained. So as I said at the opening of my remarks, parliament would do indirectly what it cannot do directly, namely interfere with the law of the province of Quebec in matters pertaining to property and civil rights.

Now the civil law, "répétition de l'indu," recovery of moneys paid in mistake, applied as well against the crown as against ordinary persons. I do not believe anybody can contradict that, and it has been well recognized by the house.

Mr. DUPRE: That is the case of the Exchange Bank vs. the Queen?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it was decided in that case, and in a case of rather recent date, Ross vs. the King, the supreme court was unanimous to the effect that as the duties were paid at the port of Montreal the case was to be determined by the laws of the province of Quebec. And quite recently in the case of the King vs. Cutting, 1932 S.C.R., 410, the petition of right was maintained for the recovery of $13,513 paid to the province of Quebec for succession duties in mistake of law.

Mr. HACKETT: That was against the crown in the right of the province; it was not disputed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But I believe the principle is the same. The crown in the right of the dominion is subject to the laws of the province of Quebec in matters pertaining to citizens of the province.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will conclude my remarks in a very few words. I have submitted and, I think, fairly shown that it is the right of a citizen of the province of Quebec who has paid money under a mistake of law to recover such money. This is a civil right which cannot be taken away by this parliament. Indeed, this bill shows that that is the opinion entertained even by its authors, because it is not being done in a direct way; they are not taking the right away from the citizen but the tribunal, the forum, the locus where he could state the claim to recover that money.

The other objectionable feature of the bill to which I direct attention is its retroactive aspect. The bill reads, "to entertain any action heretofore or hereafter commenced." As a matter of fact, there are actual petitions of right, or at least requests for petitions of right pending against the crown, and even in respect of which fiats have been granted. If this bill becomes law it will be confiscatory, and I think it would be equivalent to expropriation without compensation.

I wish to read to the committee a resolution unanimously adopted by the council of the bar of Montreal, protesting against the bill. I will read it in French, as it has been sent to me:

(Translation)

Whereas Bill No. 26: "to amend the Exchequer Court Act" constitutes an infringement on the civil laws of the province of Quebec, in that it tends to render inoperative the provisions of the Civil Code in respect to recovery of moneys paid in error.

Whereas this bill might affect cases that are pending and that in principle all legislation infringing on acquired rights is contrary to equity and public order;

Therefore, the Council of the Bar, Montreal section, deem it their duty to protest against said bill and respectfully pray the Hon. Hugh Guthrie, Minister of Justice, not to proceed further in this respect

Unanimously.

I will read also a letter I have received from the assistant attorney general of the province of Quebec:

(Translation)

Quebec, February 24, 1933.

Hon. Ernest Lapointe, K.C., M.P.,
56 St. Peter Street,
Quebec.

Dear Sir,—

Your letter of February 20th instant, relating to the amendments of the Exchequer Court Act, and addressed to the Hon. Prime Minister, was handed to me in order that I might examine the question to which it gives rise.

We are of the opinion that this act, after the amendment proposed by Bill No. 26, inasmuch as it affects persons resident in the province of Quebec, would in this respect constitute an infringement on the legislative powers of the province of Quebec as provided by subsection 13 (Property and Civil Rights in the Province) of article 92 of the British North America Act, 1867.

I am,

Yours sincerely,
The Deputy Attorney-General.

Under the circumstances, I think the committee will see that it is no whim on my part but that the stand I am taking against this bill is supported and indeed set forth by the bar of Montreal and by the provincial authorities of Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT: That there is an arguable question at issue in this case goes without saying. The civil law of the province of Quebec does provide that money paid under a mistake of law may be recovered equally as though it were paid under a mistake of fact. That is not the law in the other provinces, nor is it the law in England, although the Lord Chancellor, delivering judgment in a case in England, Cooper v. Phipps, many years ago said that under some circumstances a mistake of law might be a question of fact. However, that issue does not arise in this case.

That the civil rights of the citizens of Quebec are not to be in any sense restricted or taken away from them by legislation of this parliament is perfectly clear; they are guaranteed by the constitution and will be maintained by this parliament. As to that I think there is no question. The only issue is this. Is it competent for this parliament to enact legislation that will secure uniformity of treatment with respect to actions brought for recovery of money paid the crown under mistake of law? Undoubtedly the action could not be maintained in Ontario by an Ontario company, but the same company maintaining an office in Montreal and making payment there might, if the civil code is to be applied, recover the money.

Is that the general purpose of a federal court? I think not. I think the federal court idea, namely, the idea behind the exchequer court, was that all actions brought against the crown, of whatever character, should have general legal principles applied to them with respect to the statute of limitations and with respect to matters of that kind, unless there were a provision to the contrary in express terms. In this case the reason, for instance, that the retroactive feature is found in the act, is a simple one. The persons who are concerned have received the money; they have charged the money against their customers, and the subsequent decision of the courts would indicate that the principle on which the crown claimed from them was wrong. But they having claimed it from their customers and being unable to give it back, the individuals through whom it was recovered should not be able now to recover it and pocket that much more profit. That is a short way of putting it. If parliament adopted retroactive legislation under these circumstances, it would be pursuing the course pursued in Quebec itself with respect to election contests in provincial elections.

I have two suggestions to make to the hon. gentleman. I understand that the Minister of Justice and he discussed the matter, and I gather that he was of the opinion that it would not be proceeded with. If he was of that opinion we will respect his views in that regard. On the other hand, I suggest to him that this matter must ultimately be determined by the courts and we might enact this legislation, adding to it a section to provide that it should not come into force except on proclamation, with the understanding that in the meantime the statute would be referred to the supreme court for the purpose of having its validity determined. I leave either alternative to my hon. friend, but it does occur to me, in view of the questions that are at issue and must ultimately be settled—and the hon. gentleman has placed them before the committee in a most reasonable and fair way—that it might be desirable that we should pass the legislation, providing, as I have said, that it should not come into force except on proclamation and after it had been referred, under the provisions of the Supreme Court Act, to that court for determination. That I suggest would meet the situation. In view of the discussions which the hon. gentleman had with the Minister of Justice, however, I repeat, if that course does not commend itself to him we will discharge the order for the moment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am grateful to my right hon. friend for his suggestion, but I should prefer the first alternative, because I should not like to seem to agree to the prin-

ciple underlying the bill, even if we have to submit it afterwards to the Supreme Court of Canada. I suggest to my right hon. friend that he let this bill sleep for another year. In the meantime he might confer with the provincial authorities and next year if the government think they should proceed with it, it could be again presented. In the meantime I think it would be better to let the bill stand.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Does this bill apply to any province other than Quebec, and does it place any limitation upon the rights of the citizens in provinces other than Quebec to proceed before the exchequer court for the return of money paid in mistake of law?

Mr. DUPRE: I understand it applies to all provinces, but if we agree to the views expressed by the hon. member for Quebec East, it would apply only to the provinces other than Quebec. This would be so because of the civil rights guaranteed to the citizens of that province by the British North America Act.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I do not pretend to have anything but a very superficial knowledge of the situation, but as I understand it, the citizens of the province of Quebec have the constitutional right of proceeding against the crown for the recovery of money paid in mistake of law. Apparently this bill would nullify that constitutional right.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As far as the provinces other than Quebec are concerned, the law will remain as it is.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is why I was wondering if this bill would limit the rights enjoyed at the present time by provinces other than Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They have no such right at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: The English law does not permit one who has paid any money under a mistaken idea as to what the law is to recover that money. Let us take the gallonage tax as an example. Suppose I pay money under this tax and it turns out subsequently that my appreciation of the law is erroneous. In the eight provinces other than Quebec that money could not be recovered by an action in the exchequer court. If I paid $10 when the correct computation was $4, that could be recovered because that payment was made in mistake of fact. I am giving a simple illustration without going into technicalities, and I think the distinction between a mistake of fact and a mistake of law is illustrated by what I have just said.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

In the province of Quebec, under the civil law, the question of the recovery of money paid in mistake of law is in exactly the same position as though it were paid in mistake of fact. In either case the litigant can bring his action. As the former Minister of Justice has pointed out, the effect of this legislation would be that no money could be recovered in any part of Canada, if paid in mistake of law. There would be a universal rule applied to all provinces. The question as to whether this is a matter dealing with substantive law under the authority given by the British North America Act to set up a federal exchequer court or a matter dealing with property and civil rights and remedies that are appropriate for the purpose of enforcing claims in connection with property and civil rights is disputable and arguable. I think that these matters could be settled by the courts in the manner I have indicated but I appreciate the point raised by the former Minister of Justice. If he has relied upon the conversations he had with the Minister of Justice to the effect that the issue was of such a doubtful character, this matter had better stand for further consideration. The Solicitor General will not press the bill for the Minister of Justice in his absence, and he can move that the committee rise.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: As I understand it, at the present time the exchequer court has the right to hear such cases only when they come from Quebec?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. DUPRE: I move that the committee rise.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT

The house resumed from Friday, February 17, consideration in committee of Bill No. 30, to amend the Customs Act—Mr. Ryckman—Mr. Stirling in the chair.

On section 2—Special permission for lightening vessels and unlading goods.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I should like to reiterate the objection I made against this section when the bill was last before the committee. I do not think there should be an exception made for the lightening and unloading of vessels on Sundays. The explanatory note reads:

By permitting lightening and unloading on holidays and Sundays and after and before hours, heavy demurrage loss, amounting in many cases to $2,500 per day, can be avoided.

This explanation does not seem to justify the change being made in the laws of the country. I think this amendment comes in conflict with the Lord's day act, and I urge the minister to withdraw this particular part of the bill.

Mr. RYCKMAN: In view of the very pleasant way in which my hon. friend puts his request, I find it difficult not to accede. I should like to tell the committee how it came about that this proposed amendment was inserted. I am told that there are instances where a loss of $4,000 per day has been incurred which could have been saved merely by attaching a coupling to a ship which was ready to unload. I am told that the Sabbath was made for man and I believe that if such a situation were a personal one to any hon. member of the committee he would be against incurring a loss of $4,000 when it could be saved by attaching a coupling to a pipe line. I can understand this still less when I recall—I am sure the former Minister of Justice will forgive my saying this—that down in his very city on a Sunday afternoon you will find a gang of twenty hired ball players occupying the whole block; that is all right, but silently to attach a coupling to a ship—it cannot be done. Having said this much, I would just like to say, if it is a matter of principle with the hon. member and with anyone else in the house, and if they understood the situation as I have tried to put it in but a few words, that this money will be lost, that a distinguished counsel of Toronto came to Ottawa to see me and said: You do not know what this means in cost to us which is passed on to the consumer, because we have to take care of it. Having stated the facts shortly, I am agreeable to amending the bill.

By the way, let me say that the Lord's Day Act, chapter 123 of the revised statutes of Canada, takes care of this whole matter in railway transportation. If it were the unloading of a train, there would be no trouble; there would be no application to Ottawa for what is sought in this amending bill, but the reason for it is that the unloading of ships has not advanced as fast as train dispatching or unloading. Again I put it to anyone who is really troubled about this: I have personal knowledge of the facts as I have tried to relate them, but I am quite willing to amend the bill so that section 2 will read as follows:

2. Subsection 2 of section 8 of the said act, is amended by adding thereto the following proviso:

"Provided that the collector or other proper officer at the port at which entry of the goods is to be made may give permission in writing for the lightening of a vessel and unlading of goods,—

(a) on a statutory holiday other than a Sunday;

(b) after sunset and before sunrise;

(c) at a place other than a port;

but such unlading shall be done only in the presence of an officer detailed for such service and under such conditions and upon such terms as the minister may authorize or prescribe.

If that is acceptable, I will ask the Solicitor General to move it.

Mr. DUPRE: I move that.

Mr. BENNETT: It seems to me, in any event, the committee might amend it in this way, that if the vessel is unloaded on a Sunday, no action shall be instituted except by the attorney general of a province and no attorney of a province is apt to do so under the circumstances.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is already provided under the Lord's Day Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4—Prohibited or smuggled or unmanifested goods found in any vessel.

Mr. NEILL: I would like to point out what this section really means. The ostensible purpose of the amendment is to make the master liable to a penalty not exceeding $200 in one case and not exceeding $1,000 in another. That may or may not be justified in order to give the master a very particular interest in checking smuggling on his boat. But what I wish to draw attention to is the unjust provision in the part that is not being amended. The part that was there before states that if any prohibited or smuggled goods, or goods not in the manifest, are discovered on board the vessel, the whole boat with its sails, rigging, tackle, is liable to be seized and forfeited, with apparently no trial at all. Perhaps people think in terms of a little gas boat smuggling something, but supposing this were a big liner worth $300,000 or perhaps $400,000, and one of the crew smuggled some dope, and you can smuggle enough dope in the heel of your boot to give you a living for a year; or suppose a packet of cigarettes or a prohibited magazine were smuggled. In such a trivial case as that, in the discretion of the customs official the whole boat may be seized and forfeited. I do not think that is reasonable. We insert these provisions rather glibly or casually, more or less on the understanding that they will not be enforced, and certainly they should not

be, but why put them in? Is such a proceeding fair and just, supposing a member of the crew has committed a petty infraction of the law? Let us suppose these boats carry Chinamen; in every trip of a boat there are new placed devised to smuggle dope which goes into small bulk; you can put enough heroin into a fountain pen to make it profitable, and because one of the crew does such a thing, the whole boat may be seized and forfeited What would the Canadian Pacific ocean services say if one of the Empress boats were seized and forfeited for such a reason?—and so far as I can see this can be done without even summary conviction. I would like the minister, if he can, to explain such an extraordinary provision.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would just like to say to the committee that this clause is in the spirit of the Customs Act. If my hon. friend will permit me, I hardly think he was fair in limiting the charge to the master of the vessel. What appears is that:

> The master or person in charge of such vessel and any other person concerned in such breach or violation, shall be liable—

And so forth. In the case of a Canadian Pacific liner or any other craft, however large or small it may be, the person liable would be the one who was responsible. As my hon. friend knows, if a vehicle or a vessel, because vehicles and vessels of all kinds are covered in the Customs Act, is found carrying what I will call contraband of the act, it is forfeited, but what always happens is this, that the customs official ascertains who is to blame; the one who is to blame is proceeded against and the vehicle or the vessel is released. This penalty clause which appears in section 4 appears in six other sections of the Customs Act. I may tell the hon. gentleman I know of no case in which one who has been innocent has been saddled with the loss of his conveyance, be it vessel or vehicle, and I would not expect, if a clause such as this were put into the act, there would be taken by the Department of National Revenue any action which would be unfair to a man who was not guilty.

Mr. NEILL: The argument in reply to my remarks was exactly as one would anticipate: First, that it was in the act before. I anticipated that and said that that did not make it any better. Secondly, the minister says that it occurs in six other sections. That certainly does not make it any better. If I had murdered a man, it would not be my defence that I had murdered six other men. Next the minister goes to the very opposite extreme and says that this is never used. That is what I was contending; if it is never used, why put it in? And if it should not be put in, why not eliminate it? Finally, the minister says that the procedure will be that they will seize the boat and ascertain the guilty party and release the ship. It is nothing to me whether they seize a Canadian Pacific boat or not; but would the minister tell me, and I ask in all seriousness, having once legally seized and forfeited the boat, apparently without trial, where he gets power to release it? He has no such power. He is going to seize the boat under this desperately arbitrary power, which he says is never enforced; but where does he get authority, once the boat is seized, to give it back?

Mr. BENNETT: The governor in council may do that. The first case of this kind that I recall was when, as a youth, I stepped into the court house in the little village in which I was born. A member of a crew had landed from a ship some goods which technically constituted smuggling. A collector of customs had seized the vessel and an action had been brought against the collector of customs. I well recall the counsel in that case, afterwards Mr. Justice Hannington. The plaintiff was non-suited, for the first time in his life, he said. This legislation is intended to operate as a deterrent and to prevent looseness in connection with the inspection of crews' quarters by the master and officers of the ship, so that narcotics will not be stored and taken ashore, as they might easily be if the severity of the penalty did not in itself ensure the strictest supervision by those chargeable with the responsibility.

Mr. NEILL: Would not personal liability to a fine of $1,000 be sufficient?

Mr. BENNETT: No, the master is responsible for his ship. A provision of that character has long been in the British law, not that that makes it good, but it has been found that a deterrent of this character is the only deterrent that will ensure the master and officers of the ship searching and inspecting and taking every step to guarantee against the use of the vessel to which a member of the crew is articled for the purpose of promoting an illegal practice, the landing of goods that constitute smuggling. In practice it has been found a salutary deterrent, and in my judgment it should be extended.

Mr. NEILL: While this is a severe punishment for the guilty party, would it not also be severe for the innocent owners of the vessel?

Mr. BENNETT: There has never been any complaint. If the innocence of the owners is established an order in council is always issued releasing the ship.

Mr. YOUNG: It seems to me that this section would apply not only to the crew but to the passengers on the vessel who were found with contraband, and the vessel would then be subject to seizure whatever might be the intent of the act. In the administration it works out something like this. I have had no experience with vessels other than prairie schooners, but when anybody in an automobile is found with contraband the car is seized and remains under seizure until the case is settled, generally several months after. If you seize a ship and hold it for several months before releasing it, that would entail a tremendous loss to the owners. No matter what may be the intent of the act some customs officers are very strict and live up to the letter of the law, conceiving it to be their duty to find every possible means of getting convictions. They always take advantage of a strict interpretation of the act to make a seizure wherever possible, and in this case hardships would be worked. I do not give all customs officers throughout the country credit for having more than average intelligence, but it is a fact that some of them seem intent on getting convictions, just like some policemen, and very frequently cars and boats will be seized which in the end have to be released, but in the meantime very great inconvenience is caused to the owners.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I had a case brought to my attention recently, which I turned over to the department. A man, was coming back across the boundary with his wife who had received some presents to the amount of less than five dollars in one of the American cities. They passed the customs officer but were detained by the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. The car was searched and seized. Before it was released they had to pay $18.60, which they have never recovered. That seems to me to be carrying things entirely too far.

Mr. RYCKMAN: This relates only to carriage by sea.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I quite appreciate that fact, but I am pointing out that the same hardship applies in the seizure of automobiles, only to a greater extent. They are not likely to seize a large vessel because one of the crew is found trying to smuggle, but a car is often seized and is tied up at once. I think the penalty is too severe for the small amount involved in such cases, and I think the penalty in this case is also too severe.

Mr. NEILL: I would suggest that the captain be sentenced to death. That would be a still greater deterrent. He could afterwards be revived and released.

Mr. YOUNG: What about the shareholders?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT

The house resumed, from Thursday, May 4, consideration in committee of Bill No. 45, to amend the Soldier Settlement Act—Mr. Gordon—Mr. MacDonald (Cape Breton) in the chair.

On section 1—Certain interest charges remitted.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): When the resolution which preceded this bill was before the house I inquired of the Minister of Labour whether or not he had given consideration to the possibility of closing up the soldier settlement board and turning the land over to the settlers. I asked him at that time for information covering the total costs of revaluation of land, revaluation of equipment and other losses entailed by the board, together with the total expenses of the board since the scheme was inaugurated. Has he that information now?

Mr. GORDON: Mr. Chairman, I have the information for which the hon. member asked. I had prepared a statement giving the information in detail, and when the deputy in charge of this matter is on the floor of the house I shall provide the hon. member with that information. Meantime I should like to draw the attention of the committee to figures for which a request was made when the bill was before the committee on May 4. A number of hon. members asked me concerning receipts and expenditures with respect to various provinces. The answers given then were from such material as I had before me. The information I gave however was by no means complete, and I am sure did not convey the full information desired. For that reason I had three short statements prepared showing administration costs in each province prior to the reorganization of the department in 1930, and figures showing the present decrease in costs both in dollars and in percentages. The tables show, further, the decrease in dollars and in percentages of what are known as controllable expenditures. As a matter of fact these controllable expenditures

embrace practically the total expenditures, because in a measure all expenditures are controllable.

The second statement gives details of administration costs in each province, and a break-up of the first statement, showing salaries, travelling expenses, motor cars and sundry expenses. A further short statement gives collection returns by provinces during the last fiscal year 1932-33. If hon. members will bear with me I shall read the statements into the record so that there will be no misunderstanding of the figures I gave on the previous occasion.

The following is a statement showing the administration costs:

Soldier Settlement of Canada

Administration Costs

District	Administration cost 1929-1930	Administration cost 1932-1933 (estimated)	Decrease Amount	
British Columbia	$ 141,084 80	$ 82,659 08	$ 58,425 72	41%
Edmonton	155,258 50	98,565 22	56,693 28	37%
Calgary	129,971 38	77,421 26	52,550 12	41%
Total Alberta	$ 285,229 88	$ 175,986 48	$ 109,243 40	38%
Saskatchewan	$ 266,931 26	$ 138,572 40	$ 128,358 86	48%
Manitoba	131,915 73	69,533 79	62,381 94	47%
Ontario	115,576 78	67,246 14	48,330 64	41%
Quebec	16,486 40	13,297 56	3,188 84	19%
Maritimes	80,264 91	58,738 16	21,526 75	28%
	$1,037,489 76	$ 606,033 61	$ 431,456 15	42%
Head office	324,632 10	162,956 15	161,675 95	50%
			593,132 10	
Not yet allotted	.....	36,010 24	—36,010 24	
	$1,362,121 86	$ 805,000 00	$ 557,121 86	41%

Subdivision of these totals is:

Soldier land settlement	$1,008,253 88	$ 567,600 00	$ 440,653 88	44%
General land settlement	353,867 98	237,400 00	116,467 98	33%
	$1,362,121 86	$ 805,000 00	$ 557,121 86	41%
	1929-1930	1932-1933	Reduction	
Controllable expenditure	$2,435,255 38	$1,266,400 00	$1,168,855 38	48%

Administration Costs

1932-1933 (Estimated)

District	Salaries	Travelling expenses	Motor cars	Sundry	Total
British Columbia	$ 66,989 25	$ 7,059 40	$ 6,831 62	$ 1,778 81	$ 82,659 08
Edmonton	80,584 20	6,040 97	9,000 55	2,939 50	98,565 22
Calgary	61,437 60	5,722 95	8,153 82	2,106 89	77,421 26
Total Alberta	$ 142,021 80	$ 11,763 92	$ 17,154 37	$ 5,046 39	$ 175,986 48
Saskatchewan	$ 106,915 65	$ 12,729 73	$ 14,754 50	$ 4,172 52	$ 138,572 40
Manitoba	56,550 83	4,969 65	6,201 64	1,811 67	69,533 79
Ontario	50,368 05	7,777 84	6,899 11	2,201 14	67,246 14
Quebec	9,858 00	1,773 72	1,343 60	322 24	13,297 56
Maritimes	45,767 47	6,484 73	5,300 09	1,185 87	58,738 16
Head office	114,931 94	8,641 37	23,913 14	15,469 70	162,956 15
	$ 593,402 99	$ 61,200 36	$ 82,398 07	$ 31,988 34	$ 768,989 76
Unallotted	4,597 01	8,799 64	14,601 93	8,011 66	36,010 24
	$ 598,000 00	$ 70,000 00	$ 97,000 00	$ 40,000 00	$ 805,000 00

"Sundry" consists of—
Postage,
Telegrams,
Telephones,
Guarantee insurance,
Express,
Freight,
Janitor,
Repairs, office equipment,
Legal,
Printing and supplies,
Indian soldier settlement.

Mr. DONNELLY: Is this for the land settlement scheme, or just the soldiers?

Mr. GORDON: This covers all the settlers, I believe.

Mr. McINTOSH: Up to what date in 1933?

Mr. GORDON: The figures are for the fiscal year.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I ask the minister if he has the receipts for 1929-30?

Mr. GORDON: I have not them before me but I could supply them. Hon. members will see that after the reorganization of the department a general reduction in administrative expense has been accomplished of 41 per cent.

Mr. NEILL: Could the minister give a statement of the relation in percentages of revenue and expense? That is very significant.

Mr. GORDON: I have the receipts for 1932-33:

Soldier Settlement of Canada
Receipts 1932-1933

District—	Total
British Columbia	$ 234,469 35
Edmonton	216,400 97
Calgary	169,407 71
Total Alberta	$ 385,808 68
Saskatchewan	$ 317,957 94
Manitoba	122,151 61
Toronto	148,642 36
Quebec	37,180 84
Maritimes	86,257 78
Indian settlement	8,374 69
Total	$1,340,843 25

Mr. NEILL: Could we have the receipts for 1929-30 and the percentages?

Mr. GORDON: I have not those.

Mr. NEILL: The picture is not complete without that. There is a very substantial and commendable reduction in expense but the real test is what percentage of the money collected went in expenses.

Mr. DONNELLY: I would like to ask in regard to Saskatchewan how much of the land that was bought by the soldiers has been taken back and sold to other settlers; and what proportion of these receipts was from the soldiers and how much from this other land that was taken back and sold.

Mr. GORDON: I do not know that I can cover all the information the hon. member asks for. The number of soldiers established was 24,715. I cannot supply the actual acreage. The number now on the land is 19,241. I believe when the resolution was before the house a question was asked as to loans repaid in full. I might give that information now. The number of loans that have been repaid in full in cash is 2,390, and the number taken over by resale, 2,568, making a total of 4,958.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the total number of soldiers who have been put on the land?

Mr. GORDON: 24,715.

Mr. REID: Has the minister the number for British Columbia?

Mr. GORDON: 2,251.

Mr. McINTOSH: What is the number for Saskatchewan?

Mr. GORDON: I have to correct the figure I have given for British Columbia; the number there is 3,515.

Mr. NEILL: Now on the land?

Mr. GORDON: That is the original number.

Mr. NEILL: How many are on the land at the present time in British Columbia?

Mr. GORDON: 2,643.

Mr. McINTOSH: What is the number on the land at present in Saskatchewan?

Mr. GORDON: 5,036.

Mr. REID: The minister gave 3,515 for British Columbia. Is that the original number?

Mr. GORDON: The original.

Mr. REID: When this bill first came up I intended to make a few remarks regarding the situation in British Columbia, but not wishing to delay the bill then I thought I would reserve what I had to say until the matter was in committee. The bill, while it is very desirable and is a good measure as far as it goes, is based I think on the problem as it affects the soldier settlers on the prairies. I am not sure whether the minister has obtained any information from British Columbia with regard to conditions there, but the information that has been supplied me would seem to indicate that the rulings and the bill itself are based on the problem as it affects the soldier settlers on the prairies.

I wish now to direct the attention of the minister to the condition of the settlers in British Columbia. I have here a brief issued by the soldier settlers' organization in British Columbia, and while I do not intend to read

it all, there are one or two salient points which I think should be submitted to the minister. I quote:

For years we have urged that provision be made for settlers' heirs; the reply has been that the board always permits a settler's widow or other next of kin to carry on. In many cases children are not old enough to operate the farm, and where they are old enough they are also old enough to recognize the futility of attempting to carry on. Few of the younger generation will attempt what their parents did. There are very few instances where a sale has been made to return anything to the heirs. Revaluation and thirty per cent reduction made the possibility of an advantageous sale more likely. Now for the past two years during which, owing to conditions, the settler has been unable to make payments, the debts are with accrued interest charges practically as high as they ever were. This together with the fact that all values are greatly reduced below what they were two and three years ago, makes it out of the question to hope for a sale which will bring even the amount of the debt.

When I left British Columbia they were urging then to have the matter looked into, and in this document they maintain that the time is more than ripe for review. Since the bill has been on the order paper communications have reached me from some of the organizations in British Columbia to the effect that while the bill might offer an inducement with respect to payments, this does not nor can it at the moment help the soldier settlers in the Fraser valley. They point out that even if the inducement were five dollars for every dollar paid, they would be unable to obtain any benefit for the simple reason that they have not the dollar to pay. They continue:

We still maintain that the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company gave its purchasers interest exemptions warrants the government giving consideration to the request of the soldier settler. The government is not a commercial organization having to show profits to its shareholders; in fact the policy is apparently to show deficits, and there would be much less criticism of a deficit caused through something which benefited this class of Canadian citizen. The people of Canada with knowledge of the extravagant buying of land by the government, saw the need for concessions to the soldier settlers. The Canadian Pacific Railway could and did sell its lands at much lower prices. The amounts involved in British Columbia land purchases are much higher than in the Canadian Pacific Railway prairie lands.

We acknowledge that the board has carried out its undertaking not to press for payments—

This is something commendable at the moment.

—and all settlers appreciate this, and have continued to pay to the best of their ability directly and also through assignments still in force; but we cannot agree that the question should be left in abeyance until conditions stabilize.

[Mr. Reid.]

Prices to the farmer for beef, mutton, pork, poultry, eggs, milk, fruit, roots and grain are down to the lowest level ever known in British Columbia, and have been at this level so long that one is inclined to the belief that conditions are stabilized.

They offer some comments regarding conditions in the prairies, pointing out that the present bill is based on prairie conditions rather than on conditions in British Columbia.

The general situation with respect to the soldier settler has always been judged by conditions existing in Alberta and Saskatchewan, and whatever opinion is expressed from these provinces, particularly Saskatchewan, is apparently accepted as criterion for all. Why can't our headquarters acknowledge what it well knows to be the vast difference, and not remain always bound by the opinions of Saskatchewan?

Weather conditions have very little to do with success or failure on the farm in British Columbia, whereas in Saskatchewan it has practically all to do with it. We are very glad to know that in general the crop has been good in Saskatchewan.

Had conditions in Saskatchewan been as they were in 1931, some general readjustment of agricultural credits would have been necessary to enable our farming population to carry on, and the soldier settler will have to ask for whatever general measure of relief is necessary. With a good crop in Saskatchewan this general readjustment of agricultural credits may not be necessary for Saskatchewan, and British Columbia can again fight a lone hand.

I will not read the whole of this brief because it is rather long. I am picking out the salient points. Many of these men say in all sincerity that they have rued the day they took up land in British Columbia. That statement has been made wherever I go and at every meeting that I have attended. Many claim they were induced, even against their better judgment, to take up land. Rosy pictures were painted and the government of the day regarded it as their duty to reestablish hundreds of these men on the land immediately after demobilization.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Surely my hon. friend does not think that British Columbia is an exception in that regard.

Mr. REID: I am sorry to say it is not an exception. It is stated that pictures, books and pamphlets were distributed in the camps overseas and these men were even asked where they would like to locate to take up this choice land. They were told they would become independent and the most glowing future was held out to them. They were almost compelled to take up this land. They claim the scheme was actually forced upon them. I know from personal contact with some of these settlers in British Columbia that many of them even assigned or commuted their pension as payment. However,

in many cases dire necessity has forced them into a terrible position. I maintain these men cannot take advantage of the inducements offered by this bill. It is stated that one dollar will be given by the government for every dollar paid by the settler, but these men have no money with which to make payments. They now think it strange that the unemployed should be given $600 without any arrangements being made for repayment. This is being done in the various provinces as a relief measure. Many of these soldier and civilian settlers would be glad to leave the land if they only knew where to go, and they would not ask for any $600.

Many of these settlers are under a greater debt to-day than they were when they took up the land originally. This is a rather serious matter. In some cases they have sold their farm in the hope that they could obtain some recompense, but the purchasers have in many cases quit-claimed the land and so it has come back upon the original settler. The soldier settlers in British Columbia ask that all interest payments be waived for a few years. If they had any money at all they could obtain advantage under the provisions of this bill, but they have not nor have they hope of getting any. Interest charges are piling up and will pile up, and these men are asking that these interest charges be not held against them or the property. The conditions in British Columbia are entirely different from those that prevail on the prairie. I know that many of the settlers in my constituency are in a very serious plight. In many instances they assigned their cream cheques but they have been compelled to ask them back in order to live as the merchants in some instances have refused to grant them further credit. This plea is not put forward by the soldier settlers alone; it is wholeheartedly supported by all citizens. I am going to ask the minister seriously to consider this matter and see if something cannot be done to provide for the waiving of interest charges for a few years, if not for all time. I ask him also to consider the fact that in many cases the load of debt to-day is much heavier than when the original purchase was made. Could the minister tell me how many civilians have purchased land in British Columbia under the soldier settlement scheme, what amounts they have paid and what amounts are outstanding?

Mr. GORDON: In British Columbia there are 1,511 soldier settlers as defined by the act, 902 civilian settlers and 230 settlers under the British family scheme. This makes a total of 2,643 settlers.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Has the minister the information he promised me a short time ago?

Mr. GORDON: Yes. I will send it across to my hon. friend.

Mr. DONNELLY: How many farm supervisors are there in Saskatchewan under this scheme and what are their duties at the present time?

Mr. GORDON: There are 23 supervisors and 3 chief field supervisors. Their duty is to collect the instalments as they fall due, to keep in touch with the settlers to see that they are not proceeded against when they are trying to get along, and when their account falls due to see that they are treated with fairness having regard to their ability to pay. At the present time these men are engaged in general land settlement work under the relief legislation. They are working in conjunction with the officials of the department.

Mr. DONNELLY: As I understand it, these men were hired originally to teach the settlers how to farm. They have been employed for sixteen or seventeen years and surely the settlers should know how to farm by now. I imagine that the necessity for this sort of work has ceased and I cannot understand why such a large body of men is required just to collect the money due. It seems to me that a much smaller number could handle this work.

Mr. GORDON: A very considerable reduction has been made in the staff in Saskatchewan. I am not well enough acquainted with the details of their duties, but they have other duties to perform besides the collection of money. They were able to sell or lease to others some 800 farms during the last fiscal year. The crown has a very large interest in these lands and it is desirable that they be protected as much as possible.

Mr DONNELLY: Some time ago I asked the minister what proportion of the $201,000 collected last year was collected from soldiers and what proportion from the settlers on land which had been taken back and resold.

Mr. GORDON: I regret I have not the figures broken up to that extent, to give the information requested.

Mr. NEILL: Would the minister be kind enough to bring down, say to-morrow on the

orders of the day, a statement giving just two sets of figures, first, the total revenue and, second, the total expenditure for the fiscal year 1929-30?

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: I just want on behalf of the settlers in my district to put on record a little matter so as to prevent misunderstanding. When the resolution on which this bill is founded, was in committee, the minister referred to a Mr. Price who, he said, was president of the Soldier Settlers' Union, and he quoted a letter Mr. Price had written on February 14. I am not quite clear that the gentleman who, I understand from those who know him, is a man of high character, is really president of a general soldier settlers' union, or rather just of the local union where he lives; at least I have before me no record, certainly not as regards British Columbia, of there being any conference of locals appointing such officers, but there may have been some more or less local arrangement. I mean no deprecation of him in that connection, but it somewhat weakens the strength of his presentation.

What I was going to say was this: The minister quoted a letter from Mr. Price in which the latter indicated that he would practically guarantee that the soldier settlers would keep quiet for the next five years and have no criticism to make of this policy as now brought down, if the minister put it through. There is, as I say, some misunderstanding about that, because that was on February 14, and on March 16 Mr. Price was writing—I think it is as president himself—signing himself as such, to the local in my district and taking a wholly different attitude. Instead of saying that he was satisfied with the proposed legislation such as we have it now before us, he said:

> Our main objective is to secure legislation that will obtain for us a much more equitable arrangement than we are at present working under. This would, of course, include the total abolition of interest.

Further on he said:

> We also made it quite clear—

Presumably that was the conference with the minister's officials.

> —that any scheme for final adjustment that did not include a total abolition of interest, would not be acceptable to us.

That does not exactly jibe with the statement he made in the letter quoted by the minister. I presume the explanation is that the letter quoted by the minister was dealing with the temporary matter of relief, whereas this gentleman was writing to this local saying that the ultimate policy of all the unions was the total abolition of interest. I want to have it clearly understood, at least so far as the men I represent are concerned, that they are not satisfied; while they may be grateful for this temporary measure of relief, they believe it is not of a permanent character. When one is dealing with a matter like this it is not a very good thing to give merely a temporary measure of relief; it would be better to take a long view and give them something that not only would afford them hope to continue making payments, such as they may be on a reduced scale, but also allow the minister to deal with the matter finally, so that these men would know, so to speak, where they stood. There is no doubt that is their view, because I quote just a couple of lines from the local union:

> The proposed act is only a form of temporary relief, which in our opinion is not the wish of the majority and which we consider will only temporarily relieve matters. In the meantime the settler has no more incentive to remain on the land than before, as private debts being unavoidably contracted now will hang over his head for years, and, providing a more permanent form of relief is not provided, we are afraid many will be forced to abandon their holdings and go on relief.

Let me say there, that is what I was speaking about a moment ago, that fear or discouragement might lead them to go off the land, whereas if they knew now they would get this further rebate, they might be encouraged to struggle along. Perhaps in five years the minister will give this relief to those who are left, but in the meantime many may become discouraged and go off the land. This man points out that he believes that is the view in the northwest also. He says also:

> There is no doubt in our minds if the interest is cancelled, a large number of appointments of board officials could be cancelled with it.

That is, the overhead can be reduced. The point of view of the settlers and my point of view from my knowledge of them is that the interest should be wiped out from now on, because the government will not get it in any case, and if the government tell them now that it will be rebated, they will be encouraged to continue, whereas while it is hanging over their heads it will be a matter of discouragement; a number will go off the land and it will only be a residue who will get relief along the line suggested. Would it not be better to say now that a permanent settlement of the situation will be made? The government from time to time have been liberal; they have made a revaluation rebate on their land and 40 per

cent rebate upon their stock and so on. They have not been ungenerous; I am not charging the government with not being generous; I am dealing with the situation as it is and will be. It is sometimes the part of a wise creditor to wipe out the bigger portion of his debt and thereby be sure of getting a part of it, rather than to try to force his debtors to pay, saying: You must pay, and in the end getting nothing. That, at least, is the view of the settlers, and unless prospects change most remarkably in the next three or four years there will be no hope of the government getting this interest in any case. It would be the part of wisdom to make now whatever pronouncement they think and believe they will make ultimately. That is the view of the men I represent.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton): Shall the section carry?

Mr. NEILL: I just want to explain that we are not passing the section. It was agreed when someone was in the chair before you, Mr. Chairman, we were not going to pass the bill which consists of one section; we were going to deal only with the individual subsections, and we are now dealing with subsection 72.

Mr. DONNELLY: How much is owing in Saskatchewan for equipment and how much is owing on land?

Mr. GORDON: I am sorry I have not the figures broken up in that way.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister give the total amount outstanding at the present time on all accounts?

Mr. GORDON: The amount is $63,753,868.07.

Mr. DONNELLY: Has the minister those figures broken up into so much for equipment and so much for land?

Mr. GORDON: No.

Mr. McINTOSH: May I ask the minister whether subsections 72 and 73 apply to both soldier and civilian contracts? I understand they do. Am I correct?

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. McINTOSH: If I am correct, then in 1930 certain adjustments were made in regard to the soldier contracts. I understand from a letter that I have under my hand from Leask, Saskatchewan, that since the soldier settlers in 1930 had their contracts adjusted to current prices, no adjustments have been made in regard to civil contracts, and that in the vicinity of Leask to-day the Indian department and soldier settlement board are offering land for $20 an acre, while many civilian contracts were entered into at $30 an acre. What I want to ask the minister is this: These civilian contracts apparently cannot be adjusted; when a settler who has a civil contract wants his land adjusted as the soldier settlement land was in 1930, he is told that the law is so and so and there is no power to make an adjustment. Could an inspector not revalue that land, and if that revaluation is sanctioned by head office or by the minister and his department, could there not be an adjustment made in those civil contracts where the men are heavily indebted? Could there not be certain readjustments made, especially in cases where the revaluation would be greater than the debt?

Mr. GORDON: Answering first the question of the hon. member for Willow Bunch, I find that in 1922 the statute consolidated the debt as between land, implements and so forth, and from that time on the debt has been carried as a single loan.

With reference to the point raised by the hon. member for North Battleford, the subject matter referred to in section 70 of the legislation in the early spring session of 1930; I was not in the house at that time. There was no provision that would cover the cases to which reference had been made. There is no power either in the director or in the minister to make the adjustment to which the hon. member refers. I have been told, and I believe it to be the fact, that in many instances the civilian purchaser was in a much more favoured position than the soldier purchaser, that he bought at current prices on competitive tenders, and took his chances, as it were, of getting value for his money when he purchased his farm. At any rate, the legislation of that year made no provision for the same sort of adjustment with respect to the civilian purchaser that it made with respect to the soldier.

With regard to what the hon. member for New Westminster said, comparing the treatment between the soldier settler and those whom the provinces have endeavoured to place on land, granting them each $600, if the matter is to be judged on the basis of money adjustments, the soldier settler by remedial legislation has in every case received very much more than $600. Reductions have been made by this parliament in years past amounting to almost $32,000,000. I feel certain that we all have one objective with respect to the soldier settler, and that is not to discourage him, but at the same time we must bear in mind that the people have a huge investment in these lands. I believe we are all in agreement that that course

should be followed which on the one hand will ensure that the settler is ultimately able to pay for his farm and on the other that in the course of doing it the government shall not adopt any measures that will make it more difficult for the soldier. In dealing with this whole problem, which is not a simple one by any means, we must bear this in mind: Some people, both in this house and outside of it, have advocated that the soldier settler should be legislated into ownership. From what I can learn from the soldier settler himself, he does not desire that. We must also bear in mind that less than three per cent of those who went overseas are represented by the soldier settler, and many more returned soldiers went into other vocations and found themselves, and find themselves to-day in great difficulty. So far as possible the same treatment must be given to the soldier settlers as to other soldiers who find themselves in difficult positions. I have had many communications from soldiers who went into other lines of work and became the owners of businesses that were heavily mortgaged or the owners of city homes heavily mortgaged, and who are seeking from the government, relief with respect to these debts. In principle I doubt if they are not entitled to receive the same consideration as the soldier settler. Remember, they also invested their money which was probably borrowed from friends or relatives, and many of them probably involved themselves with loan companies and banks. That class of soldier received no assistance in remedial legislation. He had to deal with a common creditor, and in many instances perhaps with the sheriff. The soldier settler, if he has fallen on evil times, at least cannot be sheriffed, if I may use the phrase, out of his farm. The soldier settler, in common with others, has had and is having a difficult time, but the course to be followed I think is to grant such relief as we can, having regard to the rights of the state in the matter, and at the same time in regard to the settler himself to encourage him not to disavow but to discharge his debt, because he has had considerable assistance by way of the legislation to which I have made reference. The principle of this bill is perhaps based on the old principle, he pays the half who does confess the debt, and this is giving him the opportunity to do it.

Reference has been made to what the Canadian Pacific has done with respect to its lands in western Canada? This bill is more than the Canadian Pacific has done. After examining the results of what the Canadian Pacific did a year ago, and having consulted with their officials charged with the administration of those lands, I believe we shall find that many people heretofore discouraged because of the low prices for their products and for other reasons will take a great deal of encouragement from this bill. I have received scores of letters from soldier and civilian settlers in all parts of Canada, commenting upon this legislation, not all complimentary, but the great majority so, and hopeful that with this measure of assistance in the remission of interest and the credit of dollar for dollar for the period named in the bill they will, with any considerable improvement in commodity price levels, be well on their way to paying for their farms. That is the aggregate of the views I have received as a result of the communications which have been directed to me from all over Canada.

There is another aspect of the situation to which I should like to draw the attention of the committee. This bill applies with equal force all over Canada. On March 29, 1930, western Canada was particularly favoured over eastern Canada with respect to the payment of taxes; payments were made and apparently obligations assumed by what was said to be an agreement with the western provinces, in the face of advice which was then upon record, and is still there, that it was illegal to do what was being done. However I presume pressure of the times and the necessity of assisting the settler was apparent to such an extent that the government of the day thought it desirable to take such action. That action however applied only to western Canada. Why it should have been so restricted, I do not know, and there is nothing on record to indicate the reason. The legislation now before the committee, however, applies with equal force throughout Canada, and I am hopeful that the assistance here given the people on soldier settler lands combined with any considerable improvement in prices, will give that kind of encouragement which will be gratifying to every hon. member.

Mr. McINTOSH: I thank the minister for the statement he has given, but I do not believe he has answered my question in regard to any revaluation requests of settlers with civil contracts. Suppose a request comes from a settler under a civil contract to have land revalued that he bought at $25 or $35 an acre, when the same land can now be bought for $20—and is now being offered by the soldier settlement board and the Indian department—in certain sections of northern Saskatchewan, will he consider revaluation of that land and the adjustment of the debt, if the value is greater than the debt?

Mr. GORDON: If a request such as has been indicated came to me, of course I would consider it. But under the legislation I am powerless to make a revaluation, because I assume that is what the hon. member has in mind.

Mr. McINTOSH: That is the difficulty; settlers are told that.

Mr. GORDON: I am powerless to make any such revaluation.

Mr. DONNELLY: I am anxious to find out what the soldier settlement scheme has cost the country. The minister has told us about $63,000,000 is still due, and about $32,000,000 of the debts already owing by soldiers had been written off. I should like to know the original cost of this scheme and how much has been paid in by soldiers, so that we may be able to arrive at an estimate of just what the scheme is costing the country?

Mr. GORDON: The principal investment amounted to $117,670,711.02. The interest as accrued amounted to $22,688,651.10, making a total of $140,359,362.12.

Mr. MacLEAN: That is for land and equipment?

Mr. MALCOLM: Everything.

Mr. GORDON: As of January 31, 1933, there have been repayments of $50,968,482.79. That sum could be broken up into principal and interest, the principal being $34,590,-697.50 and the interest $16,377,785.29.

Mr. DONNELLY: How many soldiers does this amount look after?

Mr. GORDON: Something over 19,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: I believe the minister gave the exact figure of 19,241.

Mr. DONNELLY: In Saskatchewan we have a number of supervisors travelling about the country. They are able to collect only an amount which would equal the cost of maintaining them. Practically all the money they collect goes to them. It seems to me that with conditions such as now exist in western Canada we might do away with these supervisors, and that the payments due by soldiers to the government might be eliminated, or at least the interest thereon. Under present conditions in western Canada prospects of getting any money back from the soldier settlement scheme are very remote indeed. Until conditions improve my advice to the government would be to call in the supervisors and take them off the road entirely. They are going about from one soldier settler to another, bothering and worrying them in an effort to collect money from them, when in fact the soldiers have no money to pay. They make a nuisance of themselves, and continual complaints are being made in respect to them. They are doing no good whatever, and are making trouble instead of helping.

Mr. McINTOSH: I have some more facts to take up in connection with this bill. I do not know whether I shall be able to complete them to-night, but I shall attempt at least to do so—to give one or more instalments, thereof. But before leaving the question of revaluation of land bought under the soldier settlement board by settlers other than soldiers, I have also a few observations to make. The minister said he would take this matter into consideration. May I impress upon him the importance of considering the matter fully? When men bought land at $30 or $35 an acre which can now be bought for $20 I think the men interested have a strong argument for some adjustment. The minister said he would consider the matter. May I impress upon him the importance of having his department give the matter the most complete consideration as quickly as possible.

Following that, may I take up with the minister one or two further points? A few days ago in the house I asked him about a complaint made by Stanley Lawrence of Huntoon, Saskatchewan, and other soldiers throughout the province. The question I put to the minister was this: I said I had received information from northern Saskatchewan that certain soldier settlers could not procure seed or feed oats. I also said these men had applied to the municipality, to the Canadian legion, to the soldier settlement board, and to the minister himself, and up to the time I received the information no action had been taken. Therefore I thought that as a member of this house from Saskatchewan I should ask the minister a straightforward question about this condition of affairs, and I did so. The minister replied the next day something like this; that the settler asked about was located not in the constituency of North Battleford, but, he thought, in the constituency of Weyburn. I did not say that Lawrence was located in North Battleford federal riding; I said I had information regarding this complaint from northern Saskatchewan. I did not even say that the person from whom I received the information was living in the North Battleford federal riding, but I said that I had the information from that part of the province.

Now the minister says this man is living in the riding of Weyburn. I understand he is not living in that constituency but in the riding of Assiniboia, though under the new redistribution bill he will be in Weyburn. Of course the redistribution bill is not law yet, and in its present form may we hope it never will be. However, leaving that point aside for the moment, the information was that feed and seed oats were not got last year by this man Lawrence until June. The minister says he did get the seed in plenty of time. Lawrence says he did not. Whom are we to believe? Lawrence says he did not get the seed, did not sow it and did not reap a harvest. The minister says he got it in time. If he did not get a crop the chances are that he did not get the seed in time, and I am told Lawrence is of the opinion that the reason he did not get the seed in time was that he was a Liberal in politics and therefore was discriminated against.

Mr. GORDON: Oh, nonsense.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am not in a position to verify that statement because Lawrence is not present, but—

Mr. GORDON: You do not believe it, I am sure.

Mr. McINTOSH: His own opinion was that he did not get justice because his politics were not right. I hope he will get justice this year, because I understand he is still Liberal. I have confidence in the minister that he will not hold back seed and feed oats because the man differs politically from himself. Surely not!

But let me continue. This man applied to the municipality, to the settlement board, to the Canadian legion and to the minister, and he got no action until too late last year, and it appeared that he was not getting very quick action this year, therefore he thought the matter should be brought up in the house, and I brought it up. The minister says he has directed him what to do. Well, I am thankful to the minister, but the fact remains that up to the time the information reached here this year this man was in need of seed and had not got it. If action has been taken since I compliment the minister for setting the departmental machinery going so that this man may get the justice to which he is entitled.

Next, let me go back to the dying days of the first part of the present session. It will be remembered that last fall when the question of land settlement and soldier settlement was before the house I put a statement on Hansard, and later the minister also put a statement on the record, saying among other things he had given to parliament all the information he could, from all over Canada. He did give a good deal of information I admit. But he said he had listened to addresses, especially from members from western Canada, which he thought would be more helpful and dependable and effective if the information had been got from the department and not from newspaper clippings and letters. Apparently the government must always have a fling at the newspapers, whether it be the weekly press or the daily. They would have us believe that information given to the house obtained from weekly and daily papers is often unsound information. I do not take that view at all. I believe that a government or a minister can often be put right by information got first-hand by newspapers. I think a statement of that kind was absolutely unnecessary, and would not have been required had we had in Canada a non-political unemployment advisory council for the last three years, national in character, that would have gathered all the information on soldier settlement, unemployment and land settlement generally which would have been available to any member on request. As it is now we have to dig up this information ourselves from whatever source we can get it, from letters and other first-hand information, newspapers and government departments. I believe that on the whole the information daily obtained by a member is just as authentic as anything that can be got from any department of government.

Secondly in that speech the minister said that the department of soldier settlement had been completely reorganized, and so he said it commended itself to the great majority of settlers under its control. Well I only hope that is true, but I do not think it is one hundred per cent true, indeed it is far from it. I know many soldier settlers in northern Saskatchewan feel that although the department has been reorganized it is by no means as efficient or as aggressive as it might be in ways apart from collecting money. I do not want to find fault with the present director; in fact I would like to encourage him, and in turn ask him to encourage the men on the land—the soldier settlers. But the fact that the department has been reorganized is no proof that there are not grievances which ought to be adjusted as completely and as quickly as possible.

Thirdly, the minister further made certain criticisms of myself,—and I am not finding any fault; it was ligitimate criticism and I do not mind anyone criticizing me so long as the criticism appears sound. I had occasion in that

address in the house to put on record a report of a meeting at Medstead, Saskatchewan, in connection with land settlement. The settlers concerned received $600 a year, $200 from the municipality, $200 from the province and $200 from this government, and some of these were soldier settlers. A meeting was arranged at which four or five municipalities were represented. I was invited to that meeting, and I thought it only right that, as a member, I should attend. The meeting was attended by thirty or forty reeves, secretaries, and councillors. As far as the meeting was concerned I put on record a very straightforward statement about the existing condition of affairs in northern Saskatchewan in regard to soldier settlement and land settlement generally. When the minister discovered that that report had been published in my own paper, the North Battleford News, that I had personally attended the meeting, that I had written the report myself and that it appeared in the North Battleford News, controlled by myself, he suggested that the statements could not be proven in that way. That, I submit, is a lame argument; it is about the least plausible argument anyone would wish to hear. If a report appears in a newspaper, weekly or daily, owned by a certain individual, that report being written by the owner of the newspaper, is it more authentic or less authentic then a report written by someone acting simply as a reporter? Any schoolboy would answer immediately that the report of a meeting, written by the owner of a newspaper, a meeting attended by the owner himself and at which he heard every speech delivered, every statement made, every argument put forward touching the question at issue—in this instance the land settlement scheme—would be an absolutely authentic report, a report much more authentic than one written by some person without any interest in the paper and without considering anything apart from a mechanical report of the proceedings. I would say there was no proof necessary. The facts were self evident, and although they were stated in the North Battleford News they were not written to prove anything but to give information to all who wanted to learn.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton): Will the hon. member be good enough to stick to the point?

Mr. McINTOSH: I am sticking to the point, and I am not going to take up very much of the time of the committee. If this matter cannot be fully discussed now, Mr. Chairman, then it will have to be discussed on the third reading, so that it does not make much difference. May I say, then, that one of the reeves present at that meeting said that in his district there would be no crop and no cash. How then could a soldier pay for land without either crop or cash?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton): Surely the hon. member must know that his remarks are not relevant to the section under consideration.

Mr. McINTOSH: We have not been confining ourselves to one section, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton): We are discussing section 72.

Mr. McINTOSH: I introduced my remarks under section 72.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton): I trust the hon. gentleman will use his good judgment and not wander too far.

Mr. McINTOSH: I submit that my remarks are relevant, Mr. Chairman. Another reeve, Mr. Comerford, said that settlers had been dumped into his area of the country and that fifty school children were without school accommodation. These soldier settlers were also in a hopeless situation. The reeve of Medstead, Mr. Soderberg, said that the land the soldiers were put on was hopeless and that it would be impossible for them to succeed. Perhaps I had better give briefly the statements of one or two of these men. Mr. Grimes, the reeve of Parkdale, pointed out clearly that the costs were piling up against these men. They were supposed to pay their taxes but could not; they were supposed to pay for hospitalization but could not; they were supposed to pay for medical attention, and that was impossible. They had no money with which to discharge any of these obligations, and as a consequence the department at Regina requested the reeve and secretary of the latter municipality to interview each settler, and report, which they refused to do. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, I would say that the report placed on Hansard was informative; it did not require to be proven because as I have said, it was self evident, and it was essential that that information should be given to parliament and the country.

With regard to another question which the minister dealt with, he said that the Soldier Settlers' Union sent out an alarming circular, and that these soldier settlers wanted to put something across.

Mr. GORDON: I did not say that.

Mr. McINTOSH: These are the minister's words:

An organization was formed there among the soldier settlers; they communicated with me and sent out rather an alarming circular as to what attitude they intended to adopt with respect to discharging their obligations to the crown. But when they met, there apparently was sound sense among most of the settlers, and those who organized the union were not able to put across the sentiments expressed in the circular.

I do not think there is anything alarming in the circular. I have the circular here and I cannot see for the life of me why the minister characterized as alarming the actions of the men who organized the Soldier Settlers' Union in Saskatchewan, nor do I understand why he should suggest that they were trying to put something across. I for one certainly do not believe that they were trying to put across anything but what was right. I know personally the secretary, Major H. F. Packman, and the secretary, Lieutenant-Colonel H. J. Price.

Mr. GORDON: Mr. Packman was one of the representatives at the meeting when these amendments were discussed—

Mr. McINTOSH: I understand that.

Mr. GORDON: —and he approved of them and abandoned the proposition set out in the circular.

Mr. McINTOSH: Here are some of the points with which the organization dealt in that circular, and I will leave it to the minister to say which of them are alarming and which are not. We may have a difference of opinion about what is alarming. I hope we have.

Mr. ERNST: So do I.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am glad the hon. gentleman has some opinions—also hopes. First of all, the chairman says that the organization is non-political. That should suit the minister. Further, the statement is made that the organization has been formed for the sole purpose of enabling all soldier settlers to get together. Let me quote precisely what is said:

The Soldier Settlers' Union is a non-political organization, which has been formed for the sole purpose of enabling all soldier settlers to get together as a strong, united body, so that we may be able to demand and obtain justice and common sense in the administration of our affairs by the soldier settlement board.

Is there anything wrong with that? Where is the alarming sentiment? There is nothing whatever alarming in that statement. Take the next:

For years there has been a growing feeling of dissatisfaction amongst soldier settlers, both at the terms of our contracts and at the treatment accorded us by the board. This has culminated, in Lloydminster district, in the formation of the union.

In other words, the organization of the Soldier Settlers' Union came about as a result of the dissatisfaction that existed between the soldier settlers and the soldier settlement board; because there was that dissatisfaction, because of unsatisfactory treatment, these men made up their minds to organize. I should like to know what is wrong about any body of men organizing when they have a grievance. Are not assembly and organization two of the fundamentals of what we might term British liberty? I think so. If we have not the right to organize when we have a grievance, then we have no democracy that is worth while. If we cannot assemble to state our grievance, what freedom do we enjoy? None whatever. I say therefore that there is nothing alarming in that statement. Let me quote the third:

Our farms were purchased at highly inflated prices, and in spite of some reduction and concessions made by the government, the amount still owing on them is, in the majority of cases, out of all proportion to their earning power.

That is true, and if it is, even though it is a little alarming, what is wrong with it? Nothing at all so far as I can see. It is a perfectly justifiable statement by men who are anxious to improve their position. Take the next:

It is realized by most of us that it is impossible for us to repay our loans, as they now stand. We are steadily going behind, and piling up a debt of principal and interest, which we can never hope to liquidate.

They are going behind and they do not hope to be ever able to pay up. This is what they tell the minister in this circular, and the minister describes it as alarming. Well, it may be alarming to the department, but the sooner some action is taken by the department to allay that discontent the better. Statement number 5 reads:

This situation is due to no fault of ours, and exists in spite of every effort we have made to clear off our liabilities to the board.

They have done their best but they have gone behind and cannot pay up. They told that to the board, and the minister now says that that was an alarming statement. There is no question about it, it is a statement of fact and if it is alarming, all the more reason why the department should take action. The next statement reads:

Although our present position is obviously due to factors over which we have no control, the government insists that we shall repay our loans in full.

Listen to that! They have made their complaints to the department and they have been told that they must repay their loans in full. They were told at that time, which was August 20, 1932, there would be no hope of any concessions or adjustments held out, they would have to pay the principal and pay the interest. If they did not do that, more than likely they would be evicted.

Mr. GORDON: I know the hon. member would not consciously make a statement—

Mr. McINTOSH: I would not make a statement which I could not back up.

Mr. GORDON: —not in accordance with the facts. I think I stated before that the seizures all over Canada were less than three-tenths of one per cent. These seizures were not evictions in any sense of the word, and in no case was there justification for the attitude taken by the settlers. I am absolutely certain that the action taken by the department in the very small number of cases was the correct action under the circumstances. I believe that that action was proper and I believe it would have been taken by every hon. member of this committee under similar circumstances. The statement has been made by the hon. member with respect to evictions taking place if payment was not made, but that has not been the policy of the government since this depression commenced. The soldier settlers knew that and I think they have done very well considering the difficulties which have confronted them in common with all others in almost every walk of life.

Mr. McINTOSH: My statement was that the thought present in the minds of these soldier settlers was that if they did not pay up in full, in all probability they would be evicted. I did not say that that was the policy of the department.

Mr. GORDON: There was no reason for any such fear.

Mr. McINTOSH: If the minister will listen for a little while I think I can show him that there was a foundation for such a fear. It was because of that fear that these men organized. They satisfied themselves that the quicker they got organized, the better for themselves.

The next statement made in the circular is to the effect that they had received every reasonable reduction and concession from the government and need expect no further help from that source. That is, they got every desirable concession and reduction. They felt that if the information they got that day was correct, then they had no great reason to expect any further reductions or concessions. That was the reason they organized. The next statement has some bearing upon the eviction question. The minister should listen. It reads:

> It was made perfectly clear by these officials that the policy of the board would be to demand full payment of our loans, and that in the event of our failure to meet the payments from any cause whatsoever, eviction proceedings would be taken.

That is the statement made by the secretary of the Soldiers Settlers' Union who writes this circular.

Mr. GORDON: When this circular first came to my attention I read it over carefully and made inquiry with reference to that particular paragraph. I can assure the hon. member that no such statement was ever made by any official of the department. If such a statement had been made at that meeting, does the hon. member think for one moment that the department would not have been deluged by letters and telegrams? Of course that would have happened, but we never heard a word of it until we received this circular. I am absolutely satisfied that the party responsible for the printing of this circular, perhaps not by design but certainly in some way or another, has included a statement which is absolutely in contradiction of the facts. I made certain that no such statement had been made.

Mr. McINTOSH: I will take the word of the minister and the officials of his department. I want to take the word of the minister that eviction proceedings were not in his mind or in the minds of his officials. I am very glad to receive that information but my point still stands that the feeling which prompted these men to organize was that if they did not get busy and organize to protect themselves—as organization always does—they would more than likely be evicted. Another statement reads:

> It would be well for every soldier settler to clearly understand the situation. Unless some means is adopted of changing the present policy of the government, we must pay up our loans in full—an obvious impossibility—or eventually lose our farms.

That statement amplifies the idea of eviction. As the result of that feeling, the soldier settlers organized.

When they organized they had two objectives. The first objective was the finding of a solution for the problem which confronted them last fall. That was their immediate objective. They wanted to find out how they could stay on the land and how they could keep themselves from being evicted. But their main objective was one which brings us more closely to the provisions

of this bill. They asked for a better and more equitable deal for all soldier settlers. This legislation attempts to meet that objective in a modified form. The soldier settlers feel that if they cannot get a new deal they will never be able to pay off their loans and will never be free from the threat of eviction. As this circular states, that threat is constantly before them. There is another statement made in the circular which should be put on the record. I want to be fair to the department, so I will quote this statement along with the others. It is stated that the feeling was that as soon as grain prices went up these collectors would be on their backs again with more fury than ever, dragooning them to pay the last cent of their obligations. That is followed with the thought that the more thoroughly they are organized, the less unreasonable will be the demands they will have to meet. They state quite plainly that they want to meet their obligations. They want to remain on their farms if it is at all possible, and they do not want to cheat the government out of one cent. These are some of the facts in connection with the organization of the Soldier Settlers' Union as found in the preliminary statement of the secretary.

I stated before in my address that there was a certain soldier settler, A. J. Sibley, living over ten miles out of North Battleford. This man had a grievance. As the minister said, officials from Saskatoon were sent to visit that man. On their way to visit him they called at my home and they asked me to go out with them. I went along with them to see what was going on. These officials had an interview with Mr. Sibley that day; they came to a certain understanding; they left and I returned with them. Because I did this, the minister put it on record in a very improper manner. Fancy a minister of the crown putting stuff like this on Hansard! This is what he said:

> The superintendent took him—
>
> That is myself.
>
> —right down to that settler and let him investigate the condition for himself.
>
> I did not investigate the condition.

Mr. GORDON: What did the hon. member do?

Mr. McINTOSH: The superintendent from Saskatoon went out and investigated. The only reason I went with the minister's officials from Saskatoon was that I was asked to go and that if my presence could be of any help in any way to get the two parties together, I was willing to go. I did not even hear or want to hear what was said; I do not know what their understanding or agreement was. Yet the minister makes this statement in the house:

> He knew the arrangement at that time—
>
> I certainly did not know the arrangement.
>
> —and after seeing the condition for himself he drove home with the superintendent and did not have a single word of criticism to offer.

Then he says that after not having a word of criticism to offer, I came to Ottawa and placed critical statements on the record of the house.

Mr. MacMILLAN: The hon. member certainly did.

Mr. McINTOSH: I certainly did place proper criticisms on Hansard, and, if necessary, I will do so again. Such a statement by the minister is absolutely unfair; that report is a departmentally coloured one and not worth the ink with which it is written. I went out merely to help the soldier settlement board to find, if possible, common ground with the settler to have his grievance adjusted. I did not take part in the conversation; I did not know what the settlement was, but I thought my presence there would help and I was willing to go. Because I went, I am told by the minister that I went out and knew all about the matter and then I came down here and found fault. I want again to repudiate that statement in this chamber and to say that it is made out of whole cloth; there is nothing exact about it.

Mr. GORDON: What statement?

Mr. McINTOSH: The statement I have just referred to. Let me go a step further. Further on the minister says that statements made by myself and other western members in connection with soldier settlement were really breaking down the financial structure of Canada; that men who had invested in western bonds, sold them and bade good-bye to Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba as investment areas. I can only say this, that if telling the truth and putting on record the grievances of our soldier settlers who fought in the war to win liberty and who are entitled to redress, will scare away from western Canada some superficial investors, the quicker they are scared out of western Canada the better. So far as I am concerned, I am going to put on record statements of that kind just when I feel they ought to be made public. I do not think by putting them on record, we interfere with western development; in fact I think, by putting these facts on record and telling the truth about western Canada, we help western development.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton): The hon. gentleman's time is up.

Mr. McINTOSH: There is no time limit in committee, is there?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacDonald, Cape Breton): Yes, forty minutes.

Mr. McINTOSH: Well, I shall have something to say a little later on.

Mr. GORDON: If we could get on with this bill, all this discussion can and, I think, probably will take place when the estimates of this department come before the house later on. I would like, if possible, to advance this bill because I want to take the necessary course the legislation contemplates to take care of the various soldiers' accounts and settlers' accounts that will have to be adjusted in conformity with the legislation.

Mr. McINTOSH: Well, I can put on record the rest of my information on the third reading of the bill, if necessary; I do not want to delay the minister too long to-night.

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member for North Battleford has raised the question of seed and feed oats for the settlers. I understand there is no seed and feed oats being put out by the government. When I have been approached, I have given that information. There is one thing in this bill to which I should like to refer, and that is in regard to the interest that is being cancelled. I am sorry that it is being cancelled for only one year. The hard years of 1929-30, 1930-31 and 1931-32, as the minister well knows, have been the most difficult years for the settler and I regret very much that this legislation has not been drawn so that more interest could be cancelled than for the one year. I suppose the minister would not consider an amendment at this time, but although there is a great deal of good in the bill, it would have been more acceptable if the government had been able to cancel more than the interest for one year.

Mr. McINTOSH: I presume I can now speak for another forty minutes, if necessary, but I do not expect to do so. I believe it is better to put on record now the remainder of what I want to say on this bill; it will be more connected.

Coming now to the bill that is before the committee, may I refer to the meeting that took place in Saskatoon when the president and secretary of the soldier settlement union and other representative soldier settlers convened in that city and, I understand, met the soldier settlement director. A general discussion took place about the complaints that I have put on Hansard, and as to what ought and should be done, otherwise these men would lose their farms. In other words, these men had to have a new understanding with the department and they were out to have it. The department very kindly arranged a meeting which was held in Saskatoon, as I said, and a very free and full discussion took place in regard to soldier settlement questions. What transpired at that meeting? Well, the memorandum that was presented at the meeting by the soldier settlers was made up of eight points which bore entirely on the problems of the soldier settlers in the prairie provinces.

The first was that because of unprecedented low price levels of agricultural products, coupled with drought, soldier settlers have been operating at serious loss during the past three years. They were not paying operating expenses because of the low price level of agriculture products and because of the serious drought in western Canada. That was one point which they put in the memorandum.

The second was: The accumulation of debts was so great that the average settler would be unable to overtake his liability even with the return of normal times.

As soon as normal times return and price levels would rise, the soldier settlers felt they would be called upon to make payments they could not make and therefore they were very anxious to bring this important aspect of the question before the department. They made the statement that even with the return of normal times, they were quite hopeless about overtaking their liabilities.

The third point was: As a result of these conditions surrounding soldier settlers, discouragement, hopelessness, a lowering of their morale and a loss of their incentive to work had been brought about. Because they were losing their morale and their initiative, becoming hopeless and discouraged, they welcomed the opportunity of laying their whole case before the department at Saskatoon.

Now for number 4. The soldier settlers agree among themselves that to carry on with any assurance of ultimate success some adjustment of debt is necessary in order to remove anxiety and uphold their faith in the future.

If they are going to carry on there must be a remission of interest from the government and there must be some debt readjustment. Paving the way for this bill, Mr. Chairman, for a bill which a few months before they were told would not be brought down because the department had given the soldier settlers to understand that they would have to pay the last cent and that no action would be taken by the department.

Mr. GORDON: I have already said that no such statement was made a few months previously.

Mr. McINTOSH: I will accept the minister's word, but the soldier settlers got that idea, and I understand that they got it at the organization meeting, and that they were told that. I am not to blame. I am merely putting on record the facts of the case.

Mr. GORDON: Might I interrupt again, because I am afraid there is going to be a misconception, whether it is of importance or not. I have a copy of the minutes of the meeting covering all these points, and I find that what the hon. member is referring to was not presented to the meeting at all. It was after the discussion at the meeting that this memorandum of these various points was drawn up and subscribed to by everybody present at the meeting including the director himself, who assisted in the preparation of what the hon. member is reading from, and it was upon this memorandum together with subsequent conferences that the present legislation was founded.

Mr. McINTOSH: Exactly what I am coming to if the minister would allow me to do it.

Number 5 says that the soldier settlers keenly appreciate the concessions already made on their behalf but these concessions were necessitated not merely because of the inability of the settler to meet his obligations but because of the fundamental defects of the soldier settler scheme which made it impossible for the soldier settler to farm profitably enough to make his payments.

That is a very fair statement, and it entered into the discussions later.

Number 6. It was realized that the soldier settler could not reasonably expect to receive concessions simply as a soldier settler.

That is quite fair, Mr. Chairman, Number 6 continues:

But since the provincial governments are taking steps to relieve the debt burden of the civilian population it was thought the Dominion government, as the authority to adjust soldier settlement schemes, should also effect a general measure of debt adjustment on behalf of soldier settlers.

Mr. GORDON: I must ask the hon. member to permit me to interject again. I am following the certified copy of the report of the meeting, and number 6—there has been some subsection from other topics—

Mr. McINTOSH: I am giving just the essence of each part of the memorandum.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. GORDON: Number 6 has been emasculated beyond all recognition.

Mr. McINTOSH: No, I am coming to that if the minister will allow me. He is in too much of a hurry.

Number 7. Any relief suggested should be devised on an absolutely equitable basis, and not framed to help the improvident. Only in this way can the soldier settlers secure maximum returns at minimum of expense.

The last statement in their memorandum was to the effect that the question of a free grant was discussed, and the soldier settlers said in conference that they did not favour it. The soldier settlers went on record as being desirous of paying for their farms. I have made that statement before, but may I say to the minister that I believe that on the whole the sentiments among the soldier settlers are to the effect that they cannot pay for their farms. They say so. They say that even with a return to normal prices they feel they will be unable to overtake their liabilities. If that is the case I echo the sentiments expressed here to-night by other members from western Canada, that if the soldier settlers cannot pay for their farms, then instead of keeping a certain number of officials in their positions and in the collection field, the quicker something eminently satisfactory is done the better.

May I also say to the minister that if the department demands payment in full, the feeling among the soldier settlers is that the payments could be made just as well to any postmaster in the district, to be forwarded by him to the department. The soldier settlers urge that if that can be done, it should be done, and then these men who are covering the country in their cars, using up cars and gasoline and costing the nation a great deal of money, can be taken off and the soldier settlers can make their payments to some body like the Post Office Department, and the money be forwarded to the soldier settlement department. It would save a great deal of expense, and it would have the effect of giving the soldiers a different feeling towards the department from what they have at the present time.

In conclusion, as the minister said, after this memorandum was presented to the meeting certain action was taken and the point of view of the soldier settlers was given very emphatically. One point of view was this, that there should be a total abolition of interest retroactive to 1929, and that any interest payments that should be made should apply on the amortized debt, that is on the

principal plus the interest up to 1929. By this bill only one year's interest is taken off the debt of the soldier settlers—1931 to 1932.

Mr. GORDON: Is my hon. friend still reading from the same minutes of the same meeting?

Mr. McINTOSH: Yes, the same meeting.

Mr. GORDON: I have a certified copy here and it is entirely different.

Mr. McINTOSH: This must be all right because it is in your bill only you have not gone far enough.

Mr. GORDON: The recommendation with respect to interest is clear and cannot be misunderstood:

> That the interest on outstanding loans for the year 1932 should be remitted, and in any case in which any settler has already paid his interest that payment should be applied on his principal debt.

That is signed by my hon. friend's friends, including Colonel Harry Price, Mr. Packman, General Ross of Yorkton and all the representatives that attended the meeting, and the recommendation was unanimously carried. So that the record will not be hopelessly confused and uninteresting to anyone who wants the facts, I would earnestly suggest that my hon. friend should stick to what the minutes of the meeting say.

Mr. McINTOSH: Here is the statement I have here, Number 1, the same as the minister is reading from, and it is exactly as I have given it, only I have given it in a briefer way.

Mr. GORDON: You have gone back to 1929.

Mr. McINTOSH: The statement is this:

> Total abolition of interest retroactive to 1929, also any interest payment made to apply on principal debt.

Now I understand that the soldier settler wants a total abolition of interest from the year 1929. This bill eliminates only one year's interest, and therefore it is not satisfactory. More than that, I believe that the wish of the soldier settlers is that no more interest be paid on these debts, and the reason simply is that the soldier settlers figure they cannot pay it. That is why they want the interest clause in this bill retroactive to 1929. That is where the bill falls short. I would like to see the bill amended to provide for the total abolition of interest not only back to 1929 but forward through the years, so that these men will be given at least a fair chance to pay their obligations. Otherwise they say they cannot pay, and it is hopeless to expect any interest.

Now, number 2, and I am coming to the clause you are so anxious about, Mr. Chairman, and that is the double credit clause, by which if a man pays one dollar he gets credit for two dollars, and this is to go on for four years. May I compliment the minister and his department for making this for a period of four years? I am not anxious to find fault with the minister or his department. I wish merely to place the facts on Hansard so that they may be recorded on behalf of these men who feel that they ought to have someone in the House of Commons —in fact, many members—speak on their behalf. The clause of the bill which gives a double credit for four years was debated at the conference. I believe the wish of the director, who is present with us to-night, was to make it active for two years. Now in the bill it has been made four years, or just double the suggestion made at the meeting. I congratulate the minister upon taking new ground, and going forward. I like to see people go forward, and in the formation of legislation I like to see departments go ahead. Therefore in that regard the extension of the double credit for four years is, in my view, a sound part of the bill, and will be satisfactory to soldier settlers.

Lastly, the lien on equipment was released. Again I believe this is a sound step in advance, and I thank the minister and his department for taking it. In 1930 the lien was taken off stock. In this bill we are making null and void any lien on equipment, and by doing so I believe we will be helping the soldier settlers.

In closing may I ask the minister to consider very carefully one of the outstanding points in connection with help to soldier settlers, namely the total abolition of interest retroactive to 1929, with provision for no more interest payments in the future. Secondly, I recommend that full consideration be given to the problems of soldier settlers generally, so that if the soldiers cannot pay for their land, something constructive be done to leave them in possession of their property, or, better still, hand their farms back to them free of all encumbrances. If the government will adopt these suggestions perhaps some of the ill-advised expenses now obtaining in connection with staffs collecting moneys from soldier settlers and selling their crops—all but a third, when debts are not paid up to the minute—might be eliminated. When soldier settlers feel it is impossible to pay any more than they are paying, and when officers have not other

work to do, but pester the life out of them to pay! pay! the government would do well to call off these highly paid collecting officials and have soldier settler problems more constructively and economically dealt with.

Section agreed to.

On subsection 73—Additional credit on payments of arrears of instalments.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I should like to ask a question which may have been asked before in an earlier part of the discussion, respecting the relief from interest payments of purchasers from settlers. Supposing a civilian purchased from a soldier settler, what would be the arrangement with respect to interest? As I understand it under this legislation he would receive the same relief as the soldier settler would have received. Is that correct?

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: Carrying out that idea, I suggest we should go farther and define the term "settler." In the explanatory notes I find the expression "any settler or purchaser." But in the bill are the words "any settler or person." In the interpretation clause we find that "settler" is defined as:

> A person who at any time during the war has been therein engaged on active service in a military force.

Then various conditions are given.

Mr. GORDON: That is the reason it is so worded in section 73 of the bill.

Mr. NEILL: Apparently the words "or person" are used but I suggest they are capable of a dangerous interpretation. I would certainly appreciate it if the expression "any settler or civilian purchaser" were used. But when we come to the word "person" we are confronted with the argument that a settler is a person. Is there anywhere in the act a definition of what a person is? It might be argued that a person eventually means a settler, and a settler means a man who has been in active service. The wording may create very great hardship, if there be any doubt as to the application to a civilian purchaser. I do not believe any harm would be done by making a change, even if it were only to allay apprehensions of possible difficulty. I recall a few years ago that on a bill similar to this one I asked the minister then at the head of the department a question in connection with revaluation, as to whether so and so would mean so and so, and I was told most emphatically that it would. The minister's answer appeared in Hansard. Six months later the department absolutely repudiated the assurance I had been given by the minister, and said they were not bound by it. As a result a number of people suffered an injustice. When we come to interpretation, we cannot go by what someone may say; we must take what is expressed. If the minister could see his way clear to put in the words "or civilian purchaser" he would relieve the minds of a good many people, and I believe would be doing no harm to anybody.

Mr. GORDON: That very point was in contemplation when the bill was drawn. From a purely legal standpoint I gave it consideration. In order that there might be no doubt that the word "person" would cover people other than settlers as interpreted in the act, I submitted the section to the officers of the Department of Justice, and their judgment was that the words now appearing amply covered all others indebted under the act, because a settler is interpreted to mean as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has read from the act. Other persons not being settlers who have purchased under the act are taken care of by the language appearing in the first line of the section.

Mr. NEILL: But you do not say "persons other than settlers."

Mr. GORDON: I do not know how we can make it any clearer than we have. "Civilian purchaser" would confuse the issue.

Mr. NEILL: You could say "settler or person other than a settler." How would that do? Then, would the word "arrears" in the twenty-second line of the bill cover a payment made by the government for taxes? Would that come under the things for which he could get a dollar for dollar rebate?

Mr. GORDON: Yes, taxes paid prior would come under the operation of the statute.

Mr. NEILL: Could the minister use the language "or person other than settler'?

Mr. GORDON: I should like to defer to the judgment of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, but as a lawyer I say we are using the broadest possible term we can use. I have submitted the matter to the law officers of the crown and they agree with me. I very much fear if we used any other expression we would be more likely to contract than to expand the meaning.

Mr. NEILL: Very well; you are a lawyer.

Mr. BOTHWELL: In subsection 2 I find the words:

No such additional credit shall be accorded in respect of moneys the proceeds of alienation of any property charged under this act or of fire insurance.

And so on. Then in the explanatory clause on the opposite page I find the following:

Moneys received from the disposal of the department's security and credited to the account of the settler or purchaser will not be augmented by the bonus.

Will the bonus be granted to the present occupant of the land under one of those tripartite agreements?

Mr. GORDON: Yes.

Mr. BOTHWELL: Then in the case of an agreement that is about paid up, if the purchaser under one of those agreements makes the final payment or close to the final payment, he will get a credit of an equal amount, and that will be lessening the equity that the soldier setter had, will it not?

Mr. GORDON: No I do not think it lessens his equity.

Mr. BOTHWELL: Suppose the balance owing on a contract was $500; the soldier settler has an equity in that land of $250. The purchaser pays $250 and gets credit for $500. The $250 would wipe out the equity that the soldier settler himself had in the tripartite agreement?

Mr. GORDON: No, I think the hon. member has a misconception. It would not disturb the equity of the soldier settler at all. The civilian purchaser, if we so call him, would be credited dollar for dollar of the amount he owed the department. It would not destroy or affect any equity that the soldier settler has in the land. I am confident that that is the interpretation.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I doubt whether the minister is correct in that, or whether he understood the question I put. When it comes to the final payment it seems to me that all that civilian settler needs to pay is one-half the amount, and he gets credit for the other half. That other half may be a part of the soldier settler's equity. It seems to me some change should be made in this section to take care of such cases.

Section agreed to.

Subsections 74 and 75 agreed to.

Section 1 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister, for the Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 27, an act to amend the Bank Act.

He said: The amendment is the change of the title to The Bank Charters Continuation Act, 1933. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) had intended to offer that as an amendment because the original bill was entitled An Act to Amend the Bank Act, when as a matter of fact it is an act respecting banks.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

ADMIRALTY ACT, 1933

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house, I move that order number 28, for the second reading of Bill No. 66, an act respecting courts of admiralty be discharged, in accordance with the arrangement made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie).

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT: To-morrow we will proceed with the second readings of bills, and possibly, depending upon the work the Secretary of State has to do, we will take Bill No. 77. We propose to get royal assent to-morrow to the supply bill, and Bill 77 might be disposed of, as a number of organizations desire to have provisions made to deal with creditors, by arrangements that could not be carried out under the Bankruptcy Act. Then perhaps to-morrow evening we will take some supply. It is just possible that it may be necessary to introduce an amendment to the Radio Act. I told the house some time ago that Major Gladstone Murray had been asked to come out and make a report. I received the report on Saturday, and it is likely that one or two amendments will have to be made. If we can avoid them we will.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The other afternoon the Prime Minister indicated that some financial bill might come up.

Mr. BENNETT: No, in view of the approaching conference it was thought that it might be left, that it was undesirable to disturb credit by any legislation at present. There is a loan bill; that is on the order paper.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, May 9, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following letter:

Ottawa, May 9, 1933.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Lyman P. Duff, Chief Justice of Canada, acting as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber to-day at 5 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

James F. Crowdy,
Assistant Secretary to the
Governor General.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

REDISTRIBUTION

Hon. H. A. STEWART (Minister of Public Works) presented the first report of the special committee on Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons and moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. gentleman if this report means that something has been decided. If it means nothing, I have no objection but if it means something to which my electors may object, I must oppose this concurrence.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I hope it will mean a good deal more than nothing. It is the intention to get this bill through this session. My hon. friend appeared before the committee this morning and made his representations and he was promised that they would be given consideration. All this report asks for is permission to sit while the house is in session.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Bennett.]

RAILWAYS

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Toronto-Scarborough) presented the third report of the select standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. A. U. G. BURY (East Edmonton) moved concurrence in the second and third reports of the select standing committee on standing orders relative to the suspension of standing order No. 92.

Motion agreed to.

PETITION

Mr. J. E. LAWSON (West York) presented a petition from the municipality of New Toronto, supported by resolutions of councils of fourteen other municipalities, requesting the enacting of contributory unemployment insurance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would direct the attention of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Lawson) to the fact that the documents he has filed do not constitute a petition.

COMPANIES AND CREDITORS

BILL TO FACILITATE COMPROMISES AND ARRANGEMENTS IN CASES OF INSOLVENCY

The house in committee on Bill No. 77, to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors—Mr. Cahan—Mr. Cotnam in the chair.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Compromise with unsecured creditors.

Mr. BENNETT: The marginal note should read "unsecured" creditors; it reads "insecured."

Mr. COOTE: As very little explanation has been given on this bill; in fact, as I think it was given no explanation on second reading but was simply sent to the committee, I wonder whether the minister would be good enough to explain to this committee the purpose of the bill. I do not believe any explanation has ever been given to the house.

Mr. CAHAN: I thought the bill was quite fully explained on the first reading. Clause 3 provides for a compromise between a debtor company and its unsecured creditors. The gist of the whole bill is this, that any class

of creditors of an insolvent or a bankrupt company may by a three-fourths vote among themselves agree to a compromise between the company and that class of its creditors. Each class of creditors who have the same interest may decide by a three-fourths majority with respect to any proposed compromise and, if approved by the court, such compromise becomes effective. It is very simple. I cannot explain it any more clearly than that.

Section agreed to.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5—Compromises to be sanctioned by court.

Mr. CAHAN: An objection has been raised that the wording could be made clearer by striking out the words in the tenth line:

Class of creditors, including.

And inserting in lieu thereof the words:

the class of creditors as the case may be, and on.

The suggestion is that it should be made clear that each class of creditors having the same interest shall decide among themselves as to the terms of the compromise, and I think this proposed amendment makes the matter very much clearer.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I move that amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7—Scope of act.

Mr. CAHAN: As regards clause 7, the committee on banking and commerce reported in favour of striking out the word "force" and inserting the words "force and effect," but as we have used in another clause of the bill, clause 15, the term "full force and effect," I would suggest that this amendment should read "full force and effect."

Mr. RYCKMAN: I move accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 8 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

On section 14—In Yukon territory.

Mr. CAHAN: This bill was widely circulated throughout Canada and the question arose that inasmuch as it specifically provided for an appeal from a decision in the Yukon territory, that might seem to imply that there should be no appeal from any provincial court, and it was deemed advisable to make it clear that there may be an appeal from a provincial court to the Supreme Court of Canada in order that the procedure under this measure may be regulated, if necessary, by the same judicial authority, throughout all the provinces. I therefore propose this amendment which will be moved by the Minister of National Revenue:

That section 14 of Bill No. 77 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

14. An appeal shall, by leave of a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, lie to that court from the highest court of final resort in or for the province or territory in which the proceeding originated.

2. The Supreme Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction to hear and and to decide according to its ordinary procedure any appeal so permitted and to award costs.

3. No such appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada shall operate as a stay of proceedings unless the judge who permits such appeal shall so order, and to the extent to which he shall order, and the appellant shall not be required to provide any security for costs, but unless he provides security for costs, in an amount to be fixed by the judge permitting the appeal, he shall not be awarded costs in the event of his success upon such appeal.

4. The decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on any such appeal shall be final and conclusive.

This same provision appears in the Bankruptcy Act in section 178 and also in the act with respect to the winding up of companies. I am introducing no new provision. The theory of the Bankruptcy Act with regard to giving security for costs was this, that, though a bankrupt who might have good grounds for an appeal might not be able to provide the security for such an appeal, his right of appeal was maintained, but, in case he gave no security for an appeal to the other party, he could not obtain costs even if the decision on the appeal were given in his favour. That is a principle which has been enacted in other statutes, but particularly in the Bankruptcy Act, and in order to make it clear I am suggesting this amendment which my colleague the Minister of National Revenue will move.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 15 to 20 inclusive agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. FACTOR: I believe that the provisions of this bill are very beneficial to companies and I am wondering whether it is possible constitutionally or otherwise to extend them to individuals. The minister knows that under

the present provisions of the Bankruptcy Act the individual is unable to make a compromise unless he becomes insolvent or a receiving order is obtained against him. I should like to have the minister's opinion on that phase of the problem.

Mr. CAHAN: Such an amendment to the law as the hon. gentleman proposes would not come within the scope of the present bill which deals with companies and is really an amendment to the Companies Act. So far as the individual is concerned, if he is declared bankrupt or insolvent under the Bankruptcy Act provisions are made there for a compromise between such bankrupt individual and his creditors. To go further than we have gone would require very considerable amendments to the Bankruptcy Act and involve very delicate questions indeed as to the right of this parliament to interfere with the legislative jurisdiction of the province, which deals with civil rights. Some of the provinces of the west, I understand, have already introduced and, if my memory is correct, have passed legislation affecting the rights of individuals and their creditors, and I think that some of them even contemplate going further. At the present time while such provincial legislation is under consideration we did not feel disposed to ask this parliament to infringe upon the legislative jurisdiction of the province.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

EXCISE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. E. B. RYCKMAN (Minister of National Revenue) moved the second reading of Bill No. 94, to amend the Excise Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

On section 12—Penalties for sale of spirits unlawfully manufactured.

Mr. RYCKMAN: There is a typographical error in line 29. The word "two" appears instead of the word "three." I would ask my colleague the Secretary of State to substitute the word "three" for the word "two."

Mr. CAHAN: I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Factor.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

AUTHORIZATION OF PROVISION OF MONEYS TO MEET EXPENDITURES AND INDEBTEDNESS

The house in committee on Bill No. 73, respecting the Canadian National Railways and to authorize the provision of moneys to meet expenditures made and indebtedness incurred during the calendar year 1933, and to authorize His Majesty to make loans and advances to the Canadian National Railway Company —Mr. Manion—Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Are the provisions of this bill similar to those of previous bills for the same purpose?

Mr. MANION: There is some slight modification, but they are all in accord with the new legislation. The arrangements are slightly different. By the way, this bill has been before the special committee on railways and shipping.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And has been approved?

Mr. MANION: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Very well.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

ABANDONMENT OF RAILWAY TO BE APPROVED BY RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the second reading of Bill No. 80, to amend the Railway Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL-CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BILL

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved the third reading of Bill No. 37, respecting the Canadian National Railways and to provide for cooperation with the Canadian Pacific Railway system and for other purposes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. MANION: Carried on division.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. CASGRAIN: No; there must be a vote.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Call the yeas and nays.

Mr. A. A. HEAPS (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I should like to say a few words on the third reading of the bill. My reason for speaking is to emphasize that which I stated in the committee stage of the bill, and to make a last plea for those men who are going to be vitally affected by the provisions of the bill.

During the progress of the bill in the committee stage I took the opportunity of moving an amendment providing compensation for employees who, as a result of the changes being made, would lose their positions. My amendment however was ruled out of order. Upon this occasion I should like to outline one or two of the criticisms made against proposals I submitted to the committee. Some hon. members claimed that in asking for compensation for railway employees who would lose their positions as a result of the operation of the legislation I was establishing a new principle. I do not agree with hon. members who take that stand. On many previous occasions this house has adopted the principle of giving compensation to those who lose their positions as a result of acts of parliament. This house has given compensation to employees who have left the service of the government. After members of the judiciary have served the country for a number of years they are entitled to a pension from the dominion. Only recently when civil service commissioners were retired from their positions the government made provision for very handsome retiring allowances.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a recommendation of the committee in that regard.

Mr. HEAPS: Yes, but the principle was established. I am glad that there was a recommendation of a committee which favoured the principle. Then, there are those men in the military service of the country who after giving a number of years' service are entitled to pension. I claim the people engaged in the railway service of Canada are giving as good service as are some in other services I have enumerated.

There is now before the house a resolution asking parliament to approve of a very substantial pension or retiring allowance to members of the tariff board who have given ten years of service. When at this time I ask parliament to approve the principle of giving retiring allowances or some form of compensation to those who have given service to the country, I am not in any shape or form introducing a new principle, but I am merely asking for an extension of one already established by usage and custom. I do not know that I can add anything further at this time to what I have said on previous occasions. I do however take this opportunity to move an amendment to the third reading of the bill. My former amendment was ruled out of order on a technicality. I now move, seconded by Mr. MacInnis:

That the said bill be not now read a third time but that all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"That the bill be referred back to the committee of the whole with the request that the government consider ways and means of providing compensation for such persons whose services will be dispensed with as a result of any of the provisions of this act."

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the amendment is in order. I will look into it. In the meantime the main motion is before the house.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to say on this bill. I made some observations when the bill was in committee, but I have something else to say now in regard to the colonization scheme of the railways. The other day the Minister of Labour read a letter from Mr. J. E. Laforce, colonization agent of the Canadian National Railways. That gentleman lives in Montreal. He says the condition of the settlers throughout the country is very good. Sir, the only observation I have to make about this colonization scheme is that it is a mixup. Too many cooks spoil the broth. We have people engaged by the province, others employed by the railway company and others employed by the federal government. The first land grants that were made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were mostly in the west, and after these grants were made by the Macdonald government the Canadian Pacific was interested in settling the western plains, and there we have the beginnings of immigration in this country. Afterward they had a steamship company that carried immigrants from other countries to Canada, and thus immigration came mostly to the west. Now that that field for immigration is closed to a certain extent they have a colonization scheme for the wild parts of the eastern provinces. I wonder what the real instructions are that are given to Mr. Laforce, and what is the work done by him. He writes letters that are like school-boys' exercises, published in many papers, telling people that they should go back to the land. Every time there is a complaint about the way settlers are treated in this country we have a letter from Mr. Laforce painting everything in rose-pink colours, saying these settlers are not suffering at all. The other day a paper in Montreal

said I should be more careful about securing affidavits from settlers in the north. I did not write first to these men. I did not know them. They wrote to me telling me about their troubles. And the Minister of Labour answers with a letter from Mr. Laforce saying everything is well in the best possible world. I have no petty political motive in this matter, but what I find strange is that when people are suffering and enduring hardship we have this gentleman writing to the Minister of Labour in Ottawa or to the Minister of Colonization in Quebec, saying that everything is going well. I am surprised. I wonder if that gentleman is working to keep his job. I do not see why a colonization scheme organized by the Canadian National Railways is putting people twenty miles from a main highway. Not only twenty miles from the main automobile highway, but farther than that from the railway. They are sent out as prisoners were during the war, worse off than prisoners in concentration camps—not those in this country because here they were fairly well treated, but in other countries, Germany for instance.

I would like to have the truth about the whole matter. As the Minister of Labour is interested in it, because he subscribes to it; as the Minister of Railways is interested because he has the high supervision of all business done by the Canadian National Railways; as the Minister of Colonization for Quebec is interested also, because some of his employees put these people on the land, I ask them to stand together in order to get the truth of the matter. I appeal to the kind heart of the Minister of Railways, as I did to the kind heart of the Minister of Labour, that they will together arrange to ascertain the truth of the matter at once, and, if these people need food, to supply it to them. I ask the Minister of Railways to see to it that, if their employees paint everything in pink in order to keep their jobs, justice shall be done to them, and if they give unreliable reports that they shall be dealt with at once.

Sir, I do not wish to insist on this point any longer. I bring it to the attention of the house for the last time this session, and I hope the good influence of the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Colonization in Quebec will be exerted to see that the right system is provided for these settlers in the north.

Then I have one more thing to say in regard to the trustees of the Canadian National Railways. I do not know who they may be, and if I have used vehement language in this house it was to prevent a bad appointment to the board. I leave it to the wisdom of the government to appoint fairminded men, independent in character, and having experience that qualifies them to achieve success. Then I have a warning to give to the trustees. If we want to trade with other countries we need vessels and steamship lines. We have very good steamships in the Canadian National fleet, such as the Lady Nelson and other ships of that class. Now with a smaller trade moving there is an increase in unfair and cutthroat competition by private concerns. Every member of the government knows what I allude to. In the maritime provinces, especially in Halifax, there are private firms who try to discriminate against the Canadian National steamships. It is a well known fact, it is superfluous for me to give names, but I warn the government and the trustees against those private firms who want to destroy the trade of the Canadian National steamships between Canada and the West Indies.

My last word is that I hope the trustees will give a fair hearing to complaints of employees who have been suffering injustice in the past, will see to it that they have no grievances in the future. For instance, an engine exploded on the Transcontinental railway not far from Quebec. Why? Because no sufficient inspection was made at the shops. Those who are responsible for that lack of inspection are really guilty of manslaughter, whether they be high officials of the Canadian National railways or whoever they are. May I tell them that it is most important for efficient and economical operation that the rolling stock of the railway be kept in good repair, instead of indulging in high capital expenditures. It will save money to the railway and supply work for the men.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, may I add my word of support to the amendment that has just been moved. I do so not only because I am in favour of the principle enunciated therein, but because I realize more and more that this house and this country will have to recognize in the near future that industry, private industry, must be made more responsible for the well-being of the persons who are employed in it. I recollect that it is not long ago that the Minister of Railways himself made a very eloquent plea at a public meeting, suggesting precisely that principle, that industry could not and must not be permitted to discard its men in the callous, cold-blooded way in which men have been and are being discarded by industry. In my opinion the human element in production is more sacred than dividends or profits. The welfare of the

men and women in industry should come before the interests of the investors. Until that principle is recognized we are not going to have either justice or safety in this country.

There is one other matter to which I desire to direct the attention of the minister and the house. That is, within the ranks of the Canadian National system at this moment there are men who are almost directly responsible for any disgrace that may have come upon the system in the last few years and who still hold remunerative positions, who have not been corrected, disciplined or dismissed. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, for over two and a half years this system has been subjected to not only an unfair but a very striking and prolonged attack, and the result has been to bring into disrepute the whole principle of public ownership and the management of the national system. The men themselves feel very hurt in regard to this matter, especially in view of the fact that the principle itself has not been successfully assailed, and because most of the criticism that has been directed against the national system should have been directed against individuals connected with the administration thereof. As for the rank and file of the men, all hon. members have been very generous in their praise, and I can only attribute to them the highest zeal, the greatest efficiency and the most praiseworthy loyalty. It is not the rank and file of the men who are to blame; there are some men on the staff who have not been as zealous in regard to the public interest and the welfare of the Canadian National system as they might have been, and it is to those few individuals that I wish to address my remarks at this time.

Within the ranks of the technical staff, Mr. Speaker, there are some men who should be brought to book. There are persons in that department upon whom much blame should rest. The engineering department of any railway system is one of the most important departments. The engineering department of the Canadian National, as is the case with some other roads, has almost complete control over construction. The operating and mechanical departments of this line, so far as I can ascertain, have nothing to do with the actual construction of branch lines, and that has been the case particularly in western Canada. The construction department of the western division is under the immediate supervision of the chief engineer of western lines at Winnipeg, and under the general control of the chief engineer at headquarters. This construction department had its origin back in the old Mackenzie and Mann days, and it has been maintained by the chief engineer of western lines almost unchanged since that time. It was carried into the so called public ownership form of operation and was continued even during the period of little or no construction. It was used exclusively in the rehabilitation and construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and looked after the construction of branch lines in the west. It was permitted to become very much over-staffed; the organization embraced within its ambit not only engineers but engineers of various and terrible designations. We had engineering experts, supervising engineers, specialty engineers and so on. What has been the result of all this overloading of the technical staff? The Duff report definitely indicates what has been the result. I wish hon. members would turn to page 21 of that report and study paragraph 54, which discloses probably the greatest single source of waste in connection with Canadian National history in our time. The Duff report says:

> It will be observed that the average cost per mile in the case of the Canadian National has shown a progressive increase rising from $40,214 to $51,640 over the period, while the average cost per mile of the Canadian Pacific over the same period has declined from $35,470 to $30,229. The cost of individual branch lines varies not only as between the two systems but as between branches of the same system; nevertheless, a majority of the lines were built in similar territory for like purposes. This difference in costs represents an addition to the annual interest charge of almost $800 per mile.

It must be clear, Mr. Speaker, to any student of railway affairs that an unjustifiable overload of that kind places the Canadian National system in almost a hopeless position. I wonder what has been done; I wonder why these men remain on the staff. After all the chief engineer of the western division must have been responsible for the specifications and construction at the time these lines were built which showed the appalling increase commented upon in the Duff report. I am at a loss to understand why such men should escape while the loyal, hardworking, efficient member of the running trades or the maintenance or operating staff is fired out on his ear without thought of compensation.

It may be suggested that the character of the country through which the lines were constructed differs, but that is not the case; the Duff report so states. It may be argued that construction on the Canadian National was better than construction on the Canadian Pacific, but that argument will not bear examination either. It happens that the grade, the type of construction and everything else differs very little, and there is practically no

difference in regard to the specifications. If hon. members would care to go further into the matter they might examine the conditions which attended the construction of the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia railway, making allowance for the infinitely different type of construction required because of the bush and muskeg country. I believe it will be found that the Canadian Pacific cost of construction, which showed a decline over a period of years, was closer to the mark than the cost of construction on the Canadian National.

I do hope the minister will take this matter into consideration, if only from the point of view of the rank and file of the men, who know these facts and who know that after all the technical experts, who are supposed to know so much, have been responsible for the appalling excess cost of Canadian National construction, amounting to over $30,073,000. That sum has been thrown into the sink by an over-staffed engineering department, apparently filled with its own authority and sense of power. The men responsible for that condition of affairs are retained in their jobs, and that is the point I want the minister to appreciate. I want to ask him to use his good offices to see that the men who have been responsible for these conditions are dealt with properly, and in the meantime I propose to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps).

Mr. SPEAKER: When this amendment was presented I remarked that in my opinion it was not in order. I think I had better give my ruling on the amendment before any further debate takes place on the assumption that the amendment is properly before the house. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) and seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. MacInnis) is that the bill be referred back to the committee of the whole with a request to the government, and for that reason the amendment is not in order. If it is to be sent back to committee of the whole it should be with instructions to amend it in certain particulars, not with a request to the government; or it could be referred back to the committee of the whole for further consideration. If it is desired to amend the bill, such amendments can be proposed on the motion for third reading, but an amendment referring the bill back to the committee of the whole with a request to the government to consider ways and means of providing compensation certainly is not in order. Therefore I rule the amendment out of order.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. HEAPS: I must dissent from Your Honour's ruling because just listening to it I cannot grasp its logic. The inference of the ruling is—

Mr. SPEAKER: That may be regretted but I have given my ruling.

Mr. HEAPS: I want to appeal if Your Honour will allow me to give my reasons.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has a right to appeal from the ruling but he has not a right to enter into a debate.

Mr. HEAPS: If I had known that Your Honour was going to rule against my amendment, I would have given my reasons. The inference is that we cannot—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There were other amendments which could have been moved and probably the hon. member could have accomplished his purpose by other methods. This amendment is not in order.

Mr. HEAPS: I must appeal against Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) having moved an amendment to the motion that this bill be read a third time and The Speaker having ruled said amendment not to be in order, an appeal is made against the ruling.

Ruling sustained on division.

Hon. PETER HEENAN (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I imagine that the house and especially the government would be quite dissatisfied if I did not say something more in connection with this measure. I feel that this measure is the most important piece of legislation ever considered by this parliament, that is, as far as the railway employees of Canada are concerned. This bill gives no consideration to the employees of the Canadian railways. From the very commencement of the railway controversy, the employees have received very little consideration. The Duff commission was appointed to deal with the railroad problems of Canada. The slightest recommendation made by that commission would of necessity affect the employees of the railroads, and yet there was not a representative of the employees appointed to that commission. All through the discussions on this question we find that the matter of wages and the working conditions of the men have been discussed only from the standpoint of the investor. When the bill was introduced in the Senate it contained practically

nothing by way of protection for the employees. It is true that a couple of slight amendments were made in that chamber but I think it has transpired from the discussion in this house that in the main the employees were not protected as they should be. After a considerable controversy in this house, amounting almost to a fight, a few amendments in the interests of the employees were adopted, but in my estimation these amendments do not go nearly as far as the men expected the government would go. For instance, subsection 3 of section 16 contains a very indefinite statement. I ask the minister to follow me while I read this subsection. It reads:

The National company and the Pacific company for and on behalf as aforesaid are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company, created as in subsection two of this section referred to, shall give preference for work to employees in any services or on any works taken over by such new company.

Surely the words "to endeavour" have no place in that subsection. I have an amendment to refer this bill back to committee which I will send over for the minister's consideration. It is quite evident that at this stage any suggestion coming from this side of the house will not be considered very closely. I submit in all earnestness that the words "to endeavour" have no place in this subsection and I suggest that they be struck out before the bill finally passes. The amendment moved by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) covering compensation has been ruled out of order, and the amendment which I proposed to compensate employees for property losses due to economic measures which might be adopted was refused. It is true that the minister has stated that if section 2 of the bill was found to work out unjustly to the men, an amendment would be considered at a future session, but the section as it now stands does not go nearly far enough. An amendment moved by the leader of the opposition to provide that one of the trustees shall be a representative of the employees was also refused. The board of trustees is now surrounded by all safeguards possible and it is entrenched in a position where it can do almost anything with the road and, in my opinion, almost anything with the employees. It is only fair that one of the trustees should be a representative of the employees. The minister has said that the door was not closed, and I am living in hopes that the government may yet decide to appoint a representative of the employees as a member of this board of trustees. Representations against this measure have been made from many points by many organizations. I have under my hand a petition from Fort William which was sent to:

Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, Right Hon. R. J. Manion—

I think the minister ought to take note of this when they address him as the "right honourable." I know I would if I were in his place.

—Right Hon. Mackenzie King, Hon. W. A. Gordon and Joseph H. Harris, chairman of railway committee.

This comes from the joint organizations in and around the head of the lakes, as follows:

Third Mount McKay Lodge No. 298, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
Shuniah Lodge No. 347, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
Thunder Bay Division No. 536, Order of Railway Conductors of America.
Thunder Cape Division No. 631, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
International Association of Machinists No. 820.
Port Arthur Lodge No. 626, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.
Silver Islet Lodge No. 593, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.
Port Arthur Division Order of Railway Telegraphers.
Lake Head Division No. 32, Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees.

I should have added that the petition was also addressed to:

Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, Parliament Buildings, Ottawa.

Together with those representations came a petition in the form of a photostat copy from practically seventy-three business men from the head of the lakes.

Mr. MANION: What was the gist of the petition? It was against amalgamation, was it not?

Mr. HEENAN: It was against amalgamation, yes, and the number of unemployed this measure would create. It is true that the petition was against amalgamation, but it added that this bill would create quite a number of unemployed, and also, in the last paragraph, it says:

It would not eliminate the tax burden of the citizens of Canada. The Canadian National Railways as shown in the Duff report, had an earning power from 1923 to 1931 inclusive, of $281,211,847 in excess of its operating expenses, but cannot take care of the interest on borrowed money. This bond indebtedness would not be taken over by the privately owned railway, but would still be chargeable to the people of Canada and paid for by them through taxation. Therefore, we maintain, it is far more desirable and businesslike to operate the Canadian National Railways in its entirety, and permit

it to earn its operating expenses rather than sacrifice its most productive parts to a privately owned railway and still retain, for the taxpayers of Canada, the debt of borrowed money and the disastrous and far-reaching results of further unemployment of such gigantic proportions.

Mr. MANION: Of course that petition has been complied with in the bill.

Mr. HEENAN: The minister says so. I am sorry I have to disagree with him.

Then we have resolutions from the town of Kenora, the town of Sioux Lookout, from Hornepayne, Nakina and Port Arthur, and from many organizations. Many of these have asked that the bill be left over for at least a year, so that the government might make a survey and take into consideration what the railroad companies, or the government which in the long run is responsible, propose to do with the number of railway men who will be discharged under this measure.

I also consider that this legislation is a breach of faith with the electors of Canada, and manifestly so, because the present government, the Prime Minister and his followers, promised from one end of the country to the other that there would be amalgamation never and competition ever. The minister says that this is provided in the bill. This is, to my mind, merely a very pious wish, but in order to satisfy the opposition there was incorporated in the measure part IV, section 27:

> Nothing in this act shall be deemed to authorize the amalgamation of any railway company which is comprised in National railways with any company which is compromised in Pacific railways nor to authorize the unified management and control of the railway system which forms part of National railways with the railway system which forms part of the Pacific railways.

That, I think, is what the minister alluded to a few moments ago. But my contention is, that notwithstanding that, section 16 of the bill and the authority given to the trustees under it, practically amalgamates the operations of the railroads of Canada; giving the trustees power to form:

> New companies controlled by stock ownership, equitably apportioned between the companies.

What is that but amalgamation? It gives them power to grant:

> Leases, entrusting agreements, or licences, or agreements for the pooling and division of earnings arising from the joint operation of any part or parts of freight or passenger traffic, or express, telegraph, or other operating activities or services;
>
> Joint trackage, running rights, joint ownership, or joint operating agreements, depending upon the nature of the property—

And so forth. What provision can be put into the law stating that there will be no amalgamation when there is right in that section a direction to the trustees that they shall amalgamate these services? I have been advised—I have not seen this—that the railroad companies are now selling joint tickets and they have their time cards arranged for consolidation of train services. What is the difference between calling it amalgamation, consolidation or cooperation? So far as the practical working out of the railways is concerned, the terms all mean the same thing. While it is true that section 27, which I read a little while ago, provides that the trustees can make no amalgamation of the finances of the companies and so on, yet the practical working out of the bill is an amalgamation of the railways. But even at that, it is a breach of faith because the present Prime Minister, when he was leader of the opposition, not only promised amalgamation never but said: Competition ever. This is just the opposite of competition; we are practically eliminating competition and in its elimination we are sacrificing, as I have said, between 20,000 and 40,000 employees. I am still of the opinion that by this measure at least 20,000 good citizens of Canada will be thrown out of employment. We are sacrificing them without any consideration as to what we propose to do for the future of those people or their families and other dependents. We are sacrificing them for what purpose? In the interests, as I have said before, of the money lenders of New York. We are throwing out from their employment between 20,000 and 40,000 Canadian citizens, men who were encouraged to enter railway service many years ago, and we are doing so to pay the money lenders of New York. When the time comes to take sides in this parliament, so long as I have a seat in this chamber I am going to take the side of and vote for the labour men of this country, our own good citizens, rather than taking the side of the money-lenders of New York and other parts of the world so that they get their last pound of flesh.

Mr. MANION: Would my hon. friend permit a question? Would he mind offering to the committee some method by which we can get rid of the obligation of paying interest to what he terms the money-lenders, whether in New York or Canada or England?

Mr. HEENAN: I thought I had done that before, Mr. Speaker, but now that the minister has asked the question, and in the hope that he is really desirous of getting my opinion I shall give it to him. These are days of

world depression. No one will deny that now. The only people who did deny it were the Conservative party in 1930, when they said it was a Canadian depression and that if they were elected they would remedy conditions within a very short time. But not even the members of the government will deny to-day that these are days of a world depression, days when every person is called upon to make sacrifices. The Canadian railroad men through the economies to be effected by this measure are called upon to make sacrifices, and for what purpose? So that we can pay the interest on our bonded indebtedness. Now is it not feasible and is it not right that we should tell the money-lenders of New York—I would do it whether it is right or wrong if the minister wants to know—that during this time of depression and until it has rolled by they could not get their interest?

Mr. MANION: Which, of course, is repudiation of our debt.

Mr. HEENAN: I would not care whether you called it repudiation of our debt or not. Do we not also owe the citizens of Canada some debt? Have we not indebtedness to the workingmen of this country, to provide them with proper safeguards? When you talk of repudiation, must we always see that there is no repudiation of our indebtedness to the men who are lending the money, while at the same time we repudiate our debt to our returned soldiers who went overseas and fought for this empire and came back to their old positions on the railroads, and many of whom are going to be discharged under this bill? They have not got seniority enough to ensure them being kept on, and they are now going to be thrown off, many of them without a war pension because some of them were not injured and others did not ask for a pension. They are to be thrown into the discard so that some foreigner who loaned a million dollars to the Canadian National Railways will receive his last ounce of flesh. Yes, repudiate if you will, and when it comes to the time when I have to decide whether I am going to repudiate our debt to the man who has millions or repudiate our debt to the man who has nothing, I am going to keep faith with the workingman who has helped to build up these roads to the condition they are in to-day. When the minister talks about repudiation, why does he not think of the promise given to the railroad men in 1930? The promise to end unemployment, the promise that those engines that were standing idle on the side tracks near the roundhouse would soon be belching forth smoke again and hauling commodities back and forth across this country, creating employment for Canadian railroad men at higher wages than were prevailing at that time. Are we not repudiating our word of honour to these people who voted for the government on the assurance that they would get consideration? This bill is the repudiation of everything that was promised to the electors of Canada. It means just the opposite of competition. It is amalgamation in the operation of the railroads of Canada. It will create unemployment instead of ending it. There is no provision made to take care of the men who will be thrown off, no provision for financial compensation of any kind. It is simply a case of breaking faith with the railroad men of this country, and I have no apology to make for saying that I am going to vote against the third reading of this bill, and that if I had a hundred votes they would all go against its third reading.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to have it very clearly understood that we in this corner are not opposed to public ownership of the railroads, which ultimately will involve amalgamation. We believe in public ownership, but we believe in a genuine public ownership, and not in a public ownership which gives control very largely if not entirely to the financial interests, and which permits a private road to run in competition with the public road, and very often, it seems to us, throws the advantages to the privately owned road. We think the time is coming when in this country we shall have to have complete public ownership of our roads involving amalgamation at least, and including probably under one transportation commission not only the railroads but the motor transportation services and possibly the air transportation services.

At the present time we are not opposed to all economies which may be brought forward. We think that it is inevitable that some economies should be made, but according to this bill the economies are to be made in the interests of the bondholders. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion) has denied that, but not very successfully; I do not think he was on good ground. It is undoubted that under the present set-up the bondholders are in danger of losing and because the Dominion government has to pay the deficits on the road the Canadian public is under the necessity of carrying a very heavy load. Economies should be effected if possible, but what we claim is that the rights of the individuals

who have helped to build up this system, the employees of the railways, should not be neglected. I think the position which we take is a sound one.

We would say that the care of the people who are thrown out of work by means of the economies under this bill should be a first charge on the savings effected. The minister tries to evade that by saying that there will not be a great many men thrown out of work. Well, I think everyone will recognize that the payroll of the employees is one of the largest items of railway expenditure, and if we are to have economy which will amount to anything it must be made as a result of laying off a very considerable number of men. That must be in contemplation. I quoted Mr. Beatty to that effect on one occasion, and I think his opinion still stands and is reasonable.

Further, the minister says that we ought not to make this provision ahead of time—wait until we see that men are thrown out of work, and how many will be thrown out. I do not think that is the way in which legislation should be put through the house. When the avowed purpose is to effect economies which can be made only through throwing people out of work, the time to safeguard these people is not at the next session of parliament, but now.

A good deal has been said in recent years with regard to the interference by government in business. I think we may as well frankly face the fact that the whole of our railway enterprise is decidedly what might be termed an interference by government in business. The Canadian Pacific railway would not have been built in the first instance had it not received very large subsidies from the public. Later on the Canadian Pacific railway and other roads that were constructed were able to maintain their freight rates because of legislation passed by this house and by decisions of the Board of Railway Commissioners. It was the failure of private ownership, as we all know, that brought the Canadian National railway into being. There is a constant "interference" in business by the government, if you like to put it that way. The fact is that this interference has been pressed upon parliament and the public by the roads affected. I believe the evidence is clear that the present bill based on the Duff report is the result of pressure from the roads. In fact we were told by the minister that Mr. Beatty had suggested a commission should be appointed to consider the whole matter. So that if parliament is taking action at this time it is upon the request of the railways. There is no question of the government simply interfering in private affairs without any proper reason for so doing. In effect the railways have come and said, "You arrange matters so that we can make these savings possible; arrange matters so that the bondholders will be protected." We now say that parliament has a perfect right to lay down the conditions under which this measure may go through.

The minister asked the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River how it would be possible for us to finance the matter if we did not continue to pay the bondholders.

Mr. MANION: No, I asked him how he would get rid of the interest payments on the bonds,—payments which we have to meet.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is taken for granted, of course, that we have to meet interest payments.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why not?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The rights of the men come first.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Our point is that the rights of the employees and the general public of Canada take priority over the rights of the bondholders.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That means a repudiation.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Not necessarily a repudiation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Absolutely.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No, it does not necessarily mean a repudiation.

Mr. MANION: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what they are doing in Russia.

Mr. MANION: I ask this question in all good part: How would the hon. member get rid of these interest payments that we owe to bondholders and mortgage holders of the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Prime Minister has recently been in consultation with the President of the United States, and I suggest that he might have extended his investigations into the way the American president is proposing to deal with financial matters.

Mr. FRASER (Cariboo): Quite an answer.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, it is an answer. It is not the Russian method; it is the American method. I think we have to come to act more or less along the lines being followed in the United States to-day.

Mr. MULLINS: What about the Canadian bondholders?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Canadian bondholders will have to take their loss, as most other men are doing.

Mr. MULLINS: And you propose giving them common stock in the railways; is that what you propose?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Some of the bondholders are tremendously concerned with what we are going to do with them. I would point out that if the bondholders are adversely affected by the present depression and the policies of the present government it is a good thing, because all the rest of the population for some years has been adversely affected. I come back to my original point, namely, that I can see no reason why the bondholders should always be given priority over those of other sections of the community? I believe I am here on solid ground. If other sections of the community have had to take losses, the time has come when the bondholders will have to take their losses. It seems to me that in a matter of this kind the needs and the rights of the employees on the roads have priority over those of the bondholders.

Mr. LENNOX: And make a legal obligation a scrap of paper?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: When it comes to a conflict between what are termed legal obligations and what I would term moral obligations, the moral obligations take priority.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What would become of the credit of the country?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Where is it?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, where is it to-day?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We are trying to sustain it, and you are trying to break it up.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Where is credit to-day? I would point out that as a matter of fact the bondholders to-day, as we have said in other connections, are receiving considerably more than they are entitled to receive, when we consider the purchasing power of the dollar at the time the debts were contracted in contrast with the purchasing power of the dollar to-day. Actually, bondholders are receiving an increase in wages.

Mr. MULLINS: Not at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is all very well for members to shake their heads, but what I have said is so. We know that the bonds issued many years ago were issued when the dollar had not the purchasing power that it has to-day.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The Prime Minister said so.

Mr. MANION: Some of the bonds of the Canadian National Railways were issued away back fifty or sixty years ago, long before present conditions existed.

Mr. MULLINS: Sure.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, that may be so.

Mr. MANION: I refer to some of the Grand Trunk bonds.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: And some of them were not. No doubt in absolute justice that would involve a very complicated arrangement. In the meantime we face an actual situation in which to-day, under conditions of depression which have gone on for some time, we cannot possibly pay the interest on our bonded indebtedness and at the same time give what is due to the employees of the road. I say that when that situation is faced in my judgment there is no alternative but to recognize frankly the priority of the claims of men and women of this country. If that involves repudiation, I say repudiate. By all means, if it involves repudiation, repudiate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what your friends in Russia say.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is easy to speak about Russia; that is the cheapest kind of thing to do. What is in effect repudiation has taken place in almost every country of the world. I shall give an illustration: I happened to be in England when Great Britain went off gold. I had invested good Canadian money in sterling, and when I came to cash my sterling cheques I found they were discounted twenty-five per cent.

An hon. MEMBER: Forty per cent.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No; at that time it was only twenty-five per cent. There was repudiation on the part of the British government to the extent of twenty-five per cent.

Mr. MANION: That was not repudiation; that was a loss on exchange.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: All right, call it a loss on exchange, if you would like it that way. Remember this, the word "repudiation" was

not introduced into this discussion by me, but by some hon. member opposite. If hon. members wish an illustration of repudiation, I am giving them one.

Mr. MANION: But the hon. member has not given an illustration of repudiation; that is our point.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This road has been called a government road, we have been told that this legislation would practically turn it over into the hands of receivers. But we cannot escape responsibility for the conditions under which it is to be turned over. I believe that is clear. As my colleague from North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) has pointed out we have recognized the principle of the rights of men in the cases of the civil service commissioners, judges, the military and so on. We have recognized the rights of people who have been doing service for the government. Although in the direct sense of the word the railways have not been a government concern, we have all regarded them as such and have taken the responsibility for their losses. At this time we cannot lightly relieve ourselves of responsibility for the people this legislation will affect. We have given instance after instance of what is happening in poolings which have already taken place, of people who because of this legislation and arrangements for economy have already lost equities in their homes, people who because of having been transferred are to-day out of jobs, people who are too old to hope under present conditions to find new jobs. I urge these men have certain claims upon the Canadian National Railways and upon the government. For that reason my colleague from North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) sought by his amendment to place this question fairly before the house. I think we have a right to do so. I have tried to alter that amendment into such form as I think brings it within the rules of order, and I would move the following, seconded by the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mitchell):

That the said bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with instructions that the following clause be inserted:

"That the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railway Company shall provide compensation to those whose services will be dispensed with as a result of the operation of any of the provisions of this act.

I think that is eminently fair in principle. It is the least that we can do as representing the general public. If it involves certain heavier expenditure, and that will interfere with payment of interest on the bonded debt, that is something that we cannot help; we regard these rights of the people as prior, and we think that they should be recognized as the legislation is being passed.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I desire to say only one word. I represent a constituency in which there are many railway employees of both companies. I have received, especially during the last few days, from labour unions in my constituency, resolutions of protest against this bill and approving of the stand taken by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan). I want to register my vote against the bill.

Mr. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Before the amendment is put I would say in reply to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) that I represent a constituency in which there is a whole town of railway men. I saw some of them on Saturday, and I saw more of them last night, and they have not one word to say against the bill.

An hon. MEMBER: Those you saw!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The only representation they have ever made is that which I mentioned here on the second reading of this bill, namely that they are against the principle of amalgamation. As good citizens of this country they are willing to let this bill go through and see what economies may be effected in order that the railways of the country may live, otherwise there may be no railways and no jobs for any of them. I venture to suggest that all the whirlwind of talk and debate that we have heard in this house, led by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, is so much propaganda. That is what it is considered to be by the level-headed men of this country, and I want to tell the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, through you, Mr. Speaker, that the railway men I have talked to concerning this matter repudiate the member for Kenora-Rainy River as their spokesman.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Like fun they do!

Mr. HEENAN: The hon. member represents forty-five railway men in his riding!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): A whole town of 1,800 people.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion this amendment would involve the expenditure of public moneys and therefore could only be moved by a minister with the approval of the crown. It is therefore out of order.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think that this amendment involves expenditure of money by this government. Two companies are involved, the companies will have to pay the money, not this government.

Mr. SPEAKER: The argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) is not sufficiently conclusive to cause me to alter my opinion that the amendment as moved by him involves the expenditure of public money which must be raised by taxation. Legislation of that sort can only be introduced by a minister with the approval of the crown. To say that it is a private company is in my opinion merely quibbling, because the money spent by the Canadian National Railways must be voted by this parliament. And money votes of that sort are preceded by resolutions to refer them to the committee of the whole where they must be considered before they can be considered by the house.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Under those circumstances I must appeal against the ruling of Your Honour.

The house divided on the question: Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained? And the ruling was sustained on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Halton), Arsenault, Arthurs, Baribeau, Belec, Bourgeois, Bowman, Burns, Bury, Chaplin, Charters, Davies, Dickie, Duguay, Dupré, Duranleau, Ernst, Esling, Fraser (Cariboo), Gagnon, Ganong, Geary, Gobeil, Gordon, Hay, Jones, Laurin, Lennox, Macdonald (Kings), Macdougall, MacMillan, MacNicol, McGillis, McGregor, McLure, Manion, Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon), Morand, Munn, Myers, Neill, Nicholson, Perley (Qu'Appelle), Pickel, Plunkett, Price, Quinn, Robinson, Ryckman, Sauvé, Séguin, Shaver, Short, Simpson (Simcoe North), Simpson (Algoma West), Smith (Victoria-Carleton), Spankie, Spence, Sproule, Stanley, Stewart (Leeds), Stewart (Lethbridge), Stinson, Stirling, Sullivan, Sutherland, Swanston, Tétreault, Thompson (Lanark), Tummon, Turnbull, Weir (Melfort), White (Mount Royal), Wilson.—74.

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaubien, Blair, Boulanger, Bradette, Brasset, Butcher, Carmichael, Casgrain, Chevrier, Denis, Deslauriers, Desrochers, Dumaine, Factor, Ferland, Fontaine, Gardiner, Garland (Bow River), Hanson (Skeena), Heaps, Heenan, MacInnis, Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre), McPhee, Mercier (Laurier-Outremont), Mitchell, Parent, Pouliot, St-Père, Spencer, Vallance, Woodsworth.—32.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Anderson (High Park) — Golding,
Baker — Bertrand,
Barber — Totzke,
Barrette — Rhéaume,
Beaubier — Ahearn,
Bell (Hamilton) — Mercier (St. Henri),
Bell (St. Antoine) — Raymond,
Bell (St. John-Albert) — Dubois,
Bennett — King,
Beynon — Euler,
Black (Halifax) — Dubuc,
Bowen — McKenzie (Assiniboia),
Boyes — Coote,
Cahan — Rinfret,
Cantley — Cardin,
Casselman — Howard,
Cotnam — Hurtubise,
Cowan (Port Arthur) — Ilsley,
Cowan (Long Lake) — Irvine,
Dorion — Verville,
Edwards — Elliott,
Embury — Bothwell,
Fortin — Fafard,
Garland (Carleton) — Goulet,
Gott — Rutherford,
Guthrie — Lapointe,
Hackett — Perras,
Hanson (York-Sunbury) — Veniot,
Harris — Jacobs,
Johnstone — Donnelly,
Kennedy (Winnipeg) — McIntosh,
Laflèche — Girouard,
Larue — Thauvette,
Lawson — Gray,
MacDonald (Cape Breton) — Urquhart,
MacLaren — Fiset, Sir Eugène,
McDade — Dupuis,
McGibbon — Power,
Maloney — Young,
Matthews — Moore (Ontario),
Mullins — Howden,

Murphy,	Stewart (Edmonton),
Peck,	Lucas,
Perley, Sir George,	Marcil,
Pettit,	Bouchard,
Porteous,	Macphail, Miss,
Rhodes,	Ralston,
Rogers,	Hanbury,
Ross,	Roberge,
Rowe,	Lacroix,
Ryerson,	Taylor,
Senn,	Sanderson,
Smith (Cumberland),	Duff,
Smoke,	Cayley,
Spotton,	Hepburn,
Stevens,	Malcolm,
Stitt (Nelson),	Weir (Macdonald),
Stitt (Selkirk),	Kennedy (Peace River),
Weese,	Fournier,
Willis,	Brown,
Wright,	Luchkovich,
White (London).	Gershaw.

Miss MACPHAIL: I was paired with the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Porteous). Had I voted I would have voted against the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. IRVINE: I was paired with the hon. member for Long Lake (Mr. Cowan). Had I voted I would have voted against the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. SMOKE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Cayley). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. BOWEN: I was paired with the hon. member for Assiniboia) (Mr. McKenzie). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. YOUNG: I was paired with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Maloney). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was paired with the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett). Had I voted I would have voted against the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was paired with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie).

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent, Ontario (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. WILLIS: I was paired with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. LUCHKOVICH: I was paired with the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Wright). Hal I voted I would have voted against the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Mr. MacLAREN: I was paired with the hon. member for Rimouski (Sir Eugene Fiset). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. BELL (St Antoine): I was paired with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Raymond). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. WHITE (London): I was paired with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gershaw). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. PETTIT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Bouchard). Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Embury). Had I voted I would have voted against the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Iberville. Had I voted I would have voted in favour of the Speaker's ruling being sustained.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at three o'clock.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Melville): Mr. Speaker, at the risk of being charged by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), as he charged the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan) with speaking for propaganda purposes, I intend to make a few remarks at this time, the last opportunity of speaking on this bill before it becomes law. I have in my hand a copy of the Canadian Unionist which came to me this morning. It contains the full speech of the hon. member for Kenora taken from Hansard, upon the second reading of the railway bill I have never seen reported in any press on this continent any such full and favourably reported speech of my own since coming to this house. That is how the speech of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, with his photo attached, has been referred to in this labour paper. I have only been able hurriedly to review this speech, but I believe it speaks not only for the railway men and the people of this country but for the Liberal party as well. That is all I can say with regard to the rather measly accusation made by the hon. member for Sunbury and some place else.

I am going to oppose the third reading of this bill although it is a much better bill than

it was when it first started on its jaunt through parliament. As we know, it was originally defined by the Duff commission. It then went through the fanning mill of the upper house. It did not receive a very thorough screening there, the screens were too large and they let a lot of objectionable stuff through. It was given another fanning in the Commons. This was a more thorough fanning machine, it got out more dross and screenings but there is still some vicious stuff and refuse left in. I want to get after that.

There is one objection, sufficiently important as I see it to condemn the bill to perdition forever, which can be made to this legislation. I refer to the abdication by the government of any safety control over the Hudson Bay railway. After this bill becomes law, the Hudson Bay railway can be taken over by these twin railway boards. The day after that it can be dismantled by the same twin boards. No restraining hand can be held out by this government to prevent this action.

Mr. MANION: The Hudson Bay railway does not come under this bill at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, no, but it can be brought under. That is a very nice interjection but unfortunately I am on my feet yet and I can puncture it right away. The Hudson Bay railway can be taken over at any time by this trustee board which has no railway president thereon. The national railways is still headless, as far as having a president is concerned. This trustee board has even more authority than the old presidency. It can take over that railway to-day and dismantle it to-morrow. Someone may say: even though the government has abdicated all authority over this great national railway which is the property of the men, women and sons of Canada, it will use a restraining influence upon any possible depredations by these twin boards. If it exerts any influence at all, what kind will it be? This government decapitated the railway by retiring Sir Henry Thornton; having done that, do you think it will refrain from doing less in connection with the remaining body of this headless railway? Certainly not. We know a tree by its fruits, and the fruits of this government, as far as the national railway is concerned, have been such as will turn sour in the mouths of the people of Canada who believe in the future of this railway. How can I back up that statement? I do it by referring to the penchant this government party has had for destroying this Hudson Bay railway as well as the National. It attempted to send this railway to Port Nelson when every engineer in Canada knew that that port was a useless and hopeless outlet or inlet for the citizens of western Canada. If the road had been sent there it would have been ruined, and I invite anyone to challenge that statement. I invite any hon. member, including the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion) to challenge that statement. If I attempt to read anything by way of proof the chances are the members of the press gallery will take a hike for their other rear quarters; they do not like to hear anyone reading anything. However, I may be obliged to read something if challenged but I will be prepared for their immediate exit. Perhaps I had better keep this opportunity and proof for another day. "He who fights and runs away will live to fight another day," if no one accepts his challenge now. It will be a fine thing for a subsequent occasion, and I have the dope to prove my statement. I have more to say but they cannot bear it.

There is very little use going over the past. I made only one note for my speech, and I made that on the back of this precious bill. That was the word "Pilate," not "pilot." Our hon. friends in the government have been the modern political Pilates in their attitude towards this national railway. They have washed their hands of this fine property of ours, they have abdicated their power over this railway and have handed it over to Herod. Both the original Pilate and Herod were afraid to do what in their hearts they desired to do. They had no Duff commission or Senate to which to pass the buck in those remote days.

Mr. STEVENS: They had the sanhedrim.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The action of the original Pilate and Herod finally resulted in the crucifixion which was ordained from the beginning of the world. These modern Pilates and Herods have been afraid like the originals to do what they would have liked to do. They took off the head of Sir Henry Thornton but they did not know how to mutilate the body sufficiently so that it would not be restored to life. The government have passed the buck to the national railway board and a tragedy is about to be enacted. As I see it, though parabolic this is mighty true to life.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I hear the ignorant guffaw of hon. gentlemen opposite who do not seem to see the parallel between the two.

I will stop now and give them an opportunity to let this filter through their thickened craniums into which you could not jamb a Liberal idea even with the use of a ten-pound sledge hammer.

Mr. H. A. MULLINS (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to my hon. friend. We have campaigned together for more than forty years in western Canada and his speech to-day is the same old red country schoolhouse one that he used to deliver most effectively in the west, all the time misleading the struggling masses on the western prairies. Representing as I do the most outstanding agricultural constituency in western Canada, what do I care what is done with the railroads as regards cooperation or anything else so long as we are given cheaper freight rates so that we may get the products of the land to the markets of the world? During all the years the hon. gentleman sat on the government benches there was not a single reduction in freight rates, either by sea or land; nothing but higher and higher ocean and land rates. No man can farm in western Canada under the conditions to which he is subjected to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLINS: Yes, but this is the result of the actions of hon. gentlemen who occupied government benches during the last eight or ten years. Let me for a moment draw the attention of the house to the Petersen commission. What a fiasco it was! I was brought as a witness from western Canada to try to get a reduction in freight rates. With what result? Nothing at all, not one iota of reduction. Forty years ago in western Canada we had lower freight rates than we have to-day. When the Canadian Pacific was the only railway operating in the west, freight rates were 40 per cent less than they are to-day. But hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, gradually raised and raised the rates until now they are prohibitive for the farmer who wants to deliver his products to the markets of the world. How insincere hon. gentlemen opposite are! This is impressed upon me when I think of one gentleman who made a speech in Montreal in reference to the Hudson Bay railway and of my hon. friend opposite who a few minutes ago talked so kindly of that railway. What did the gentleman say in talking to an audience in Montreal? Let me read this:

> The Conservatives adopt a different attitude. The finances are upside down, yet they spend millions on projects which can wait a year or two years, or even five years, without harming the stability of the country. What is happening to-day as regards Port Churchill? We have Hon. Doctor Manion acting like a beggar in the street, begging people to ship some grain over the Hudson Bay railway to Port Churchill.

That is the kind of speech hon. gentlemen opposite make when they get down to Montreal; then when they come into the House of Commons they talk differently for the benefit of the man out west.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the gentleman's name?

Mr. MULLINS: Yes, hon. gentlemen opposite use the soft pedal here, but this gentleman did not when he was making that speech in Montreal. Do hon. gentlemen opposite want his name?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It does not matter.

Mr. MULLINS: I have his name; it is Cardin.

Mr. CARDIN: May I ask the hon. gentleman to give the date?

Mr. MULLINS: I will answer the hon. member when I have finished.

Mr. CARDIN: What is the date of that speech?

Mr. MULLINS: That is the hon. member's speech in Montreal.

Mr. CARDIN: When?

Mr. MULLINS: June 18, 1932. That shows the insincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CARDIN: I did not speak at that time; that is a mistake.

Mr. MULLINS: The hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan) assumes to speak on behalf of labour. I have ridden the freight trains in the pioneer days of western Canada and I have associated with those railway men. Far be it from me to do anything that would be detrimental to the men who operate the road. I was travelling over the Canadian Pacific when the line was coupled up at Jackfish many years ago. I know the hardships endured by the men who pioneered in those days. To-day the answer of the railroads as to why they do not give a lower rate, is: Look at the wages. The reason is not wages at all. In those days they had five of a crew and when we asked for fourteen cars for cattle, they gave us a trainload rate of sixty and a half cents a hundred from Winnipeg to Montreal. To-day we are paying eighty-five cents a hundred and the

crew of a train still numbers five; they are hauling five times the tonnage, seventy-five cars of cattle, with just five of a crew. So the reason is not wages. But when I look at the head officials, I think of Winnipeg with Sir William White, who came from the track up; I think of Robert Kerr, George Shaw and William Stitt. Their entire salaries did not amount to as much as one railway official is getting to-day in western Canada. It is the head officials who are getting the high salaries. Those salaries should be withdrawn so that the farmer out west may have some chance in shipping his products.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are insincere so far as the Hudson Bay railway is concerned, and if this government had not been in power, I do not believe we would have had the Hudson Bay railway to-day. In western Canada we have great hopes as regards that outlet; it can be developed and because of its coolness it is one of the best outlets for the live stock industry of the west. At times the port of Montreal is extremely hot, but up north we have good cool weather and the cattle will ship to the British market far better than they will out of ports down east. We want, however, all the outlets we can get; we want to be able to ship out of the country and at a lower freight rate.

I say to the railroads: I do not care what you do about cooperation or amalgamation but I do not want to see you build these luxurious trains between Toronto and Montreal and Toronto and Ottawa, trains de luxe for the crême de la crême of eastern Canada, while the man out west is struggling on side lines, sitting on ribbed seats so that when he gets up his back is like a washboard. That is the condition to which we are subjected on the branch lines in my constituency, but we are putting up with that. I want these luxurious trains withdrawn so that the man out west may have a chance to get back to conditions as they were in the pioneer days out west, when, over forty years ago freight rates were 40 per cent less than they are to-day. Under present conditions a man cannot carry on. The salary list on the Canadian National Railways—and there are some from the United States amongst the officials—is terrific; no farmer in a lifetime makes as much as these men were making in a year. These conditions will be righted by this government and through this cooperation. We say and I say: Amalgamation never, competition ever. That will be carried out and by it I hope the commodities of western Canada can reach the markets for which they are destined.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals): I do not intend to delay the house more than a few minutes. A number of hon. gentlemen have spoken and there are a few remarks I should like to make.

The hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) took up the question of compensation for the men laid off. That question has already been dealt with very fully, and it has been pointed out, and I can only repeat, that when the time comes to look after all classes of men who are out of employment the railway men should be looked after at that time, but I do not believe that now is the time to pick out one particular class of men and give them compensation while other men, and even men in that same particular class, railway men who have been laid off previously, are not being taken care of.

The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) mentioned one item in the Duff report which so far as I know has not been mentioned before in the house, and that was the cost of branch lines. He touched upon a very important statement made by the Duff commission to the effect that the cost of branch lines in Canada on the Canadian National had been very much heavier than the cost on the Canadian Pacific, by the amount of some $30,000,000 in the last ten years. That was not overlooked by the government. I myself asked the Canadian National to give me an explanation of the difference in costs, and I hold in my hand a report which they gave to me some six or seven months ago, some time after the Duff report was tabled. They claim in that report that the branch lines went through different types of territory. It has been argued that that was not the case. I am not going to enter into a technical discussion of that kind, but I would point out to the hon. gentleman who stated that some of the officers now in charge of construction were the same as those who were in charge when the Duff report was made and during that construction period, that very heavy cuts have been made in the salaries of the officers higher up. For instance, a few of them who were drawing $30,000 are to-day receiving $18,000, or not much more than half of what they were getting. The engineer in charge of that construction work was not one of those getting that high salary, but he has been cut in proportion. After all it must be pointed out that the government has not the power and had not the power to dismiss any of these men, whatever officers they were. The government, through myself as minister, did draw the matter to the attention of the directors, and the directors and the present

management did bring about the economies which have been effected, and I submit that those economies were very marked and emphatically large. I pointed out in another address that I made in this house that apart from the wages for the men, with which we had nothing to do, the economies among the officers drawing over $3,000 amounted alone to something like $2,000,000 in 1932 as compared with 1930.

I do not think the hon. member for Bow River was quite fair in saying that there was a campaign against public ownership. Certainly there was not so far as the government was concerned. There was a campaign of education to tell the people of this country what it was necessary for them to know, the immense taxation which they had to pay to meet the deficits on the government roads. That is all that was done. So far as the government was concerned, there was certainly nothing at all in the shape of a campaign against government ownership.

So far as the amendment of the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan) is concerned it seeks to amend the clause dealing with the creation of new companies reading as follows:

> The National company and the Pacific company for and on behalf as aforesaid are directed to endeavour to provide that any new company, created as in subsection two of this section referred to, shall give preference for work to employees in any services or on any works taken over by such new company.

The hon. gentleman proposes to wipe out the words "to endeavour." My legal officers advise me that so far as the companies can legally be forced to carry out this—shall I say—admonition to them they are forced to do so under this clause, and that to wipe out "to endeavour" would have no effect whatever. Therefore there is no reason for accepting the amendment. My hon. friend repeated not once, but many times, that no matter what we may say this bill is for the purposes of amalgamation. I can in reply only refer him to the last clause of the bill in which it is specifically stated that nothing in this act shall be deemed to authorize the amalgamation of the two companies. I do not wish to argue or harp upon that question any further.

I was satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) frankly came out in the open and said, particularly the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, that they believed we were looking after the moneylenders and ignoring the human element, and that we must repudiate our debts. I wish to point out in a sentence that the bonds of the

Canadian National Railways or rather the mortgages of the Canadian National Railways, because that is what the bonds of the Canadian National Railways guaranteed by the Canadian government are, are just as much the debts of this dominion as are the ordinary bonds which have been issued by the government of Canada at various times since confederation, and when the government of Canada takes the attitude that it will repudiate the payment of interest on the bonds of the government railways which it has guaranteed, then the government of Canada will have to take the position also of repudiating its ordinary debt, and I simply submit without further argument that that is the position taken by Russia, and Canada has not yet come to the position of repudiating its debts.

I would further point out to the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River and some other members on both sides of the house who have made a very strong argument in regard to the human element, that because we have not accepted everything they proposed, although we have accepted a great deal, does not in any way alter the fact that we are just as anxious to look after the men as is the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River or other hon. members of the house. But it is worth pointing out that the Canadian National Railways in January, February and March, and I think April of this year, has not covered its operating expenses, let alone paying interest on its debt to the public. That in itself shows the seriousness of the situation and the need for the economies which have been made. It also shows the difficulty of complying with every request that is made by some hon. member of the house.

I have two other points to make and then I will sit down. May I point out that the pooling arrangements which have taken place in connection with the services between Ottawa and Toronto, and Montreal and Toronto, were not brought about under this bill at all. Both the railways to-day, without this bill at all, have the right to go ahead and make the pooling arrangements which they have made, and those pooling arrangements had nothing whatever to do with this bill.

One last word about the speech of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell), who said that we were in a position and implied that we would likely take advantage of it, to dismantle the Hudson Bay railway. I cannot quite understand why he should say that except for the obvious reason that he thinks it is pretty good political propaganda.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is what the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) said.

Mr. MANION: And he said the truth. Why would this government for the last three years have been spending millions on the Hudson Bay railway to complete it and get it ready for operation and for opening this year if we were going to dismantle it? The statement is too foolish to waste time on.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the government is going to stand by the bill as it is submitted.

Mr. THOMAS F. DONNELLY (Willow Bunch): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this bill will in any way be a solution for the present difficulties in which our railways find themselves. I believe, and have done so for some months past, that if the railways were left alone to themselves they would be compelled by the present hard times to cut down their expenses and a great curtailment in expenditures would take place. I would not have spoken at any length on the third reading of this bill but for some remarks that were made in this house recently. One was made just a few moments ago by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mullins). He pointed out how low the freight rates had been in this country forty years ago, and compared them with the rates to-day. I hardly agree with his comparison, and would point out that any low freight rates which we had we obtained under a Liberal government, and those rates continued up until 1910.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DONNELLY: Yes, ho, ho. When a Conservative government came into power in 1911 the freight rates were raised, and they were raised higher than they are now. That was done under a Conservative government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I suppose you remember there was a war on.

Mr. DONNELLY: Yes, I know there was a war, but I am telling the hon. member that it was under a Conservative government that the rates were raised, and it was a Conservative government that was in power during the time of the war. Is that not so?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DONNELLY: After the war, when the Liberal government were in power and we tried to have a reduction of freight rates under what is known as the Crowsnest pass agreement, where did my hon. friends stand? Where did the Conservative party stand in those days? They stood for raising the rates; it was a Liberal government that endeavoured to bring them down.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DONNELLY: If you wish to speak, speak after.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I cannot do it; you are asking for it. Take your medicine.

Mr. DONNELLY: The same contention arose with regard to the Hudson Bay railway. We have heard the Minister of Railways and Canals tell how much the government has done for that railway. I say to him that the Hudson Bay railway was about completed when this government came into office; it was practically completed by a Liberal government. Yes, and why was it sent to Churchill instead of to Nelson? When the hon. member for Melville said that the railway should be built to Churchill instead of to Nelson he was condemned not only in the House of Commons but in the western provinces. The railway has been completed to Churchill, and is in operation, but many of us in western Canada believe the same interests which condemned the Hudson Bay railway, and which attempted to send it to Nelson, are beginning to condemn it again. When the measure before us becomes law we do not want the board of trustees to have control over that railway. With that in mind I move the following amendment:

That this bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to the committee of the whole house for the purpose of including the following amendment:

That the Hudson Bay railway as now administered by the Department of Railways be not permitted to pass under the jurisdiction of the railway trustees as in this bill constituted, or under any other authority than that of the government of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT: We will have to take the amendments one at a time. There is one amendment before the house now, is there not? On third reading one amendment must be disposed of before another may be taken up.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think there is any amendment before the house.

Mr. MANION: Did not the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River move an amendment?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was ruled out of order.

Mr. HEENAN: I sent it over merely as a suggestion.

Mr. MANION: Then it was my fault that the Prime Minister was wrong in his assumption. I thought the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River had moved an amendment.

Amendment negatived.

The house divided on the motion (Mr Manion) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Halton),
Arsenault,
Arthurs,
Barber,
Baribeau,
Bennett,
Beynon,
Bourgeois,
Bowen,
Burns,
Bury,
Cantley,
Carmichael,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Cotnam,
Davies,
Dickie,
Dorion,
Duguay,
Dupré,
Duranleau,
Ernst,
Esling,
Fortin,
Fraser (Cariboo),
Gagnon,
Ganong,
Garland (Carleton),
Geary,
Gobeil,
Gordon,
Hay,
Johnstone,
Jones,
Kennedy (Peace River),
Laurin,
Lennox,
Loucks,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
MacMillan,
MacNicol,
McGillis,
McGregor,
McLure,
Manion,
Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon),
Morand,
Murphy,
Myers,
Neill,
Nicholson,
Perley, Sir George,
Pickel,
Plunkett,
Porteous,
Price,
Quinn,
Robinson,
Shaver,
Short,
Simpson (Simcoe North),
Simpson (Algoma West),
Smith (Victoria-Carleton),
Smith (Cumberland),
Spankie,
Sproule,
Stanley,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Sullivan,
Sutherland,
Swanston,
Tétreault,
Thompson (Lanark),
Tummon,
Turnbull,
Weir (Melfort),
White (Mount Royal),
Willis,
Wilson.—84.

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaubien,
Blair,
Boulanger,
Bradette,
Brasset,
Brown,
Butcher,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Denis,
Desrochers,
Donnelly,
Duff,
Dumaine,
Euler,
Factor,
Fafard,
Ferland,
Fiset, Sir Eugène,
Fontaine,
Garland (Bow River),
Goulet,
Hall,
Heaps,
Heenan,
Hurtubise,
King, Mackenzie,
MacInnis,
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre),
MacLean,
Macphail, Miss,
McKenzie (Assiniboia),
McPhee,
Marcil,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Mitchell,
Motherwell,
Parent,
Pouliot,
Reid,
St-Père,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Totzke,
Vallance,
Verville.—47.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Anderson (High Park), Gardiner,
Baker, Bertrand,
Barrette, Rhéaume,
Beaubier, Ahearn,
Bell (Hamilton), Mercier (St. Henri),
Bell (St. Antoine), Raymond,
Bell (St. John-Albert), Dubois,
Black (Halifax), Dubuc,
Bowman, Hanson (Skeena),
Boyes, Coote,
Cahan, Rinfret,
Casselman, Howard,
Cowan (Port Arthur), Ilsley,
Cowan (Long Lake), Irvine,
Edwards, Elliott,
Embury, Bothwell,
Gott, Rutherford,
Guthrie, Lapointe,
Hackett, Perras,
Hanson (York-Sunbury), Veniot,
Harris, Jacobs,
Kennedy (Winnipeg), McIntosh,
Laflèche, Girouard,
Larue, Thauvette,
Lawson, Gray,
MacDonald (Cape Breton), Urquhart,
McDade, Dupuis,
McGibbon, Power,
Maloney, Young,
Matthews, Moore (Ontario),
Mullins, Howden,
Peck, Lucas,
Perley (Qu'Appelle), Munn,
Pettit, Bouchard,
Rhodes, Ralston,
Rogers, Deslauriers,
Ross, Roberge,
Rowe, Lacroix,
Ryckman, Chevrier,
Ryerson, Taylor,
Sauvé, Séguin,
Senn, Sanderson,
Smoke, Cayley,
Spence, Fraser (Northumberland),
Spotton, Hepburn,
Stevens, Malcolm,
Stitt (Nelson), Weir (Macdonald),
Stitt (Selkirk), Golding,
Thompson (Simcoe), Jean,
White (London), Gershaw,
Wright, Luchkovich,
Belec, Fournier,
Stewart (Lethbridge), Hanbury.

Mr. WHITE (London): I was paired with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gershaw). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SPENCE: I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Fraser). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SANDERSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was paired with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GARDINER: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto-High Park (Mr. Anderson). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LUCAS: I was paired with the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Peck). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent, Ontario (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): I was paired with the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Bowman). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MULLINS: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Howden). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Embury). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PETTIT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Bouchard). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I was paired with the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Munn). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Edwards). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald). I was paired with the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Stitt). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was paired with the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Ryckman). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. McINTOSH: I was paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Kennedy). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. AHEARN: I was paired with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Beaubier). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. YOUNG: I was paired with the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Maloney). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PERRAS: I was paired with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. COOTE: I was paired with the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Boyes). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Thauvette). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. McDade). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Rogers). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BERTRAND (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto-North-East (Mr. Baker). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Iberville (Mr. Rheaume). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): I was paired with the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Sauve). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

STATUTE OF WESTMINSTER

LEGISLATION TO GIVE EXTRATERRITORIAL OPERATION TO ACTS OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 74, respecting extraterritorial operation of acts of the parliament of Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Sullivan in the chair.

Mr. DUPRE: This question of extra-territoriality is of primary importance, and was dealt with by the Imperial conference of 1926. The problem was afterwards referred to the committee of experts, which later became merged in the conference on the operation of dominion legislation which met in 1929. That conference, after very careful examination of the whole question, recognized that in view of the state of uncertainty, and the differences in the dominion constitutions themselves, which were reflected in the legal opinion in these dominions, it was desirable that legislation should be passed by the parliament of the United Kingdom to make it very clear that the constitutional limitation did not exist. Accordingly a clause was recommended for inclusion in the statute of Westminster, and that action was approved by the Imperial conference of 1930. That clause is section 3 of the statute of Westminster, which is printed in the explanatory note to this bill, and reads as follows:

> It is hereby declared and enacted that the parliament of a dominion has full power to make laws having extraterritorial operation.

As a result of this enactment, there can be no doubt that all legislation enacted by the parliament of Canada since December 11, 1931, which is the date on which the statute of Westminster came into force, has extraterritorial operation in all cases in which that intention of parliament has been clearly indicated. The statute however has no effect upon Canadian enactments prior to that date. There undoubtedly are on the statute books laws concerning which the question might be raised, giving rise to unnecessary litigation. The question arose with regard to the case of Dunphy v. Croft, which was based on a seizure under chapter 16 of the statutes of 1928, which authorized the seizure of Canadian registered vessels hovering within the twelve mile limit. The Supreme Court of Canada decided that the legislation not coming within the provision of the statute of Westminster, by reason of having been enacted prior to the coming into force of that statute, was ultra vires of the parliament of Canada. This position was reversed by decision of the privy council in the same case, and the legislation was upheld in terms that justified the views expressed by the successive governments in this country throughout the period covering this controversy. Accordingly the enactment might fairly be regarded as a sort of declaratory enactment, and can be justified as placing beyond controversy the validity of Canadian legislation. Its object is to settle definitely this controversial question and prevent unnecessary litigation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am pleased to support this bill. I have always been of the opinion that this parliament had the right of extra-territorial jurisdiction in its legislation, but the decisions of the courts in the matter have varied in such a way that possibly it is better to have this bill made law in order to remove any doubt. As the language of the statute of Westminster indicates, it is declaratory:

> It is hereby declared and enacted that the parliament of a dominion has full power to make laws having extraterritorial operation.

It was not a statute giving power but rather to declare that parliament has that power. However it is better, as my hon. friend has said, that there should be no doubt as to past legislation, and this bill should be made law.

Section agreed to, bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

AMATEUR BOXING CONTESTS—PROTECTION OF CHILDREN—THEFT OF LOGS

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 71, to amend the criminal code.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Sullivan in the chair.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

On the title:

Mr. LAPOINTE: I introduced a bill to re-enact part of section 1024 of the criminal code, and it was stated at the time that the government would take charge of the bill and include it in the amendments to the code.

Mr. DUPRE: The amendment reads as follows:

Subsection (4) of section 1024 of the said act is repealed and is hereby reenacted as follows:

4. Notwithstanding any royal prerogative, or anything contained in the Interpretation Act or in the Supreme Court Act, no appeal shall be brought in any criminal case from any judgment or order of any court in Canada to any court of appeal or authority, by which, in the United Kingdom appeals or petitions to His Majesty in council may be heard.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is satisfactory.

Mr. DUPRE: Then I move this amendment as section 11.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE: Some amendments have been made in the province of Quebec with regard to the grand jury, and we have been requested to amend our criminal code accordingly. The amendments I am about to suggest were drafted this morning by the deputy minister of justice, acting with the respresentative of the attorney general of the province of Quebec, Mr. Amyot, K.C. I have the amendments agreed upon by these two gentlemen. The first is as follows:

Subsection (5) of section 873 of the said act, as enacted by chapter VII of the statutes of 1932, is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

(5) In the provinces of Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, it shall not be necessary to prefer any bill of indictment before a grand jury, but it shall be sufficient that the trial of any person charged with a criminal offence be commenced by a formal charge in writing setting forth as an indictment the offence with which he is charged.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do I understand that this has been suggested by the attorney general's department of Quebec?

Mr. DUPRE: A bill has been passed by the legislature, and we have been asked to make our criminal code consistent, so far as Quebec is concerned, with the new provincial law. The amendments I am reading have been suggested by the attorney general of Quebec. I move the amendment I just read.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE: The next amendment, which I move, is as follows:

Subsection (6) of section 873 of the said act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

(6) Such charge in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta may be preferred by the attorney-general or an agent of the attorney-general, or by any person with the written consent of the judge of the court or of the attorney-general, or by order of the court.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE: The next amendment, which I move, and which will be section 13 of the bill, is as follows:

Section 873 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

(7) Such charge in the province of Quebec may be preferred by the attorney-general, or the deputy attorney-general, or by any person with the written consent of the judge of the court or of the attorney-general.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE: Then I move the next amendment:

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 10, 11 and 12 of this act, if in any proceeding or prosecution under the criminal code begun in the province of Quebec before the coming into force of the present act, a true bill has been rendered by a grand jury against a person charged with a criminal offence, such true bill shall continue to have full force and effect, and the trial of the person against whom such true bill has been rendered may be commenced or recommenced, as the case may be, as if the present act was not in force.

(2) If, in the province of Quebec, a person against whom a true bill has been rendered by a grand jury before the coming into force of this act is convicted and upon appeal is granted a new trial by any court of appeal having jurisdiction, or if such person is granted a new trial by the Minister of Justice under section 1022 of the criminal code, such new trial will be commenced in the manner enacted by subsections (5) and (7) of section 873 of the criminal code, as respectively amended and enacted by this act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE: There are further amendments to be offered. In order to make these sections consistent with the amendment proposed to section 8, the following amendment is moved:

By inserting immediately after section 9, the following as section 10:

Subsection 1 of section seven hundred and seventy-six of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

776. When any person is charged before a magistrate, other than one of those mentioned in section seven hundred and seventy-four, with theft or with having obtained property by false pretences, or with having unlawfully received stolen property, and the value of the property stolen, obtained or received exceeds twenty-five dollars, and the evidence in support of the prosecution is, in the opinion of the magistrate, sufficient to put the person on his trial for the offence charged, such magistrate, if the case appears to him to be one which may properly be disposed of in a summary way, shall after the charge has been reduced to writing, read it to the said person, and shall explain to him that he is not obliged to plead or answer before such magistrate, and that if he does not plead or answer before him, he will be committed for trial in the usual course.

This amendment simply changes the amount from ten dollars to twenty-five dollars.

Amendment agreed to.

53719—300

Mr. DUPRE: I have another amendment, which will be section 11 of the bill. It is:

That paragraph (c) of subsection 1 of section 777 of the act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(c) In the provinces of British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory and the cities of Saint John, Fredericton and Moncton in the province of New Brunswick where any person is charged with an offence mentioned in any of the paragraphs of section seven hundred and seventy-three, except paragraph (h);

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE: I move that the last section be repealed, and the following be substituted therefor:

This act, except sections ten, eleven, twelve and thirteen, shall come into force on the first day of July, 1933. Sections ten, eleven, twelve and thirteen shall come into force on such date subsequent to the first day of July, 1933, as may be fixed by proclamation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why?

Mr. DUPRE: This is necessary because of the changes made in the bill. It has been indicated that the provincial laws will come into force at a time fixed by the lieutenant governor in council by proclamation, and our proclamation will be issued at the same time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think there is some mistake in the numbering of the sections.

Mr. DUPRE: We will have that straightened out.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA-NEW ZEALAND TRADE AGREEMENT

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 97, to authorize the governor in council to agree to extend by proclamation the duration of the trade agreement made between Canada and New Zealand, dated the twenty-third day of April, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two, as approved by chapter 34 of the statutes, of 1932, entitled an act respecting a certain trade agreement between Canada and New Zealand.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury) in the chair.

On section 1—Power to extend duration of agreement.

Mr. BENNETT: It will be remembered that this treaty was for a year which expires on May 24. It has been arranged that it will be extended for a period of time to be agreed upon and this bill will authorize the governor in council to make the necessary proclamation.

Mr. MARCIL: Could we be advised of the quantity of butter which has been imported into Canada from New Zealand since 1930, when this treaty came into effect?

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Trade and Commerce is not present, and I have not that information before me. It has been placed upon the records of this house at least twice during this session in answers to questions asked. The last importations of butter arrived at Vancouver but under the provisions of the treaty they were held until such time as the necessities of our market required them for our consumption, when they were disposed of.

Mr. MARCIL: I was rather anxious to have these figures. This matter was used as an argument during the last elections. The farmers were fooled on that occasion and they want to know why this New Zealand butter is still coming into the country when the consumer has to pay five or six cents per pound more.

Mr. BENNETT: I will endeavour to obtain the information and put it on Hansard.

Mr. MARCIL: Could we have also the amount of customs duties paid?

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. T. G. MURPHY (Minister of the Interior) moved the third reading of Bill No. 21, to amend the Indian Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE BASED ON SPACE OCCUPIED BY ADVERTISEMENTS

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act to provide that the advertising portion of newspapers and periodicals transmitted for a greater distance than forty miles from their place of publication, or of which the publication is of greater frequency than once a week, shall be subject to postage of two cents a pound where the space devoted to advertisements exceeds 20 per cent but does not exceed 30 per cent of the total space; of 3 cents a pound where such space exceeds 30 per cent but does not exceed 50 per cent; and of 4 cents a pound where such space exceeds 50 per cent.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Bury in the chair.

Mr. BENNETT: This resolution was placed on the order paper in my name by accident and so I am proceeding with it.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Not by accident.

Mr. BENNETT: It was an accident. There was no name on it and I initialed it. I am going to say something about it in a moment and make it very simple.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): The Postmaster General should be in charge of it.

Mr. BENNETT: So he should.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I suggest that the Postmaster General should be here to listen at least to his chief's argument on the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: This resolution is very simple. After the representations that were made on behalf of those who where interested were heard, it was decided that only the latter part of the resolution would be proceeded with, so that it will read:

That it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act to provide that the advertising portion of newspapers and periodicals transmitted for a greater distance than forty miles from their place of publication, or of which the publication is of greater frequency than once a week, shall be subject to postage of four cents a pound where the space devoted to advertisements exceeds 50 per cent.

That is all; it is to meet a situation in which the Post Office Department has been cumbered and bothered with handling newspapers containing sixteen to eighteen pages of purely advertising matter, taking the place, in many instances, of catalogues. The Post Office authorities advise that the loss in handling newspapers in this country last year through the post was somewhere between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000. It would be impossible under existing conditions to correct the whole of that loss, but in so far as it may be possible to dispense with the handling by the Post Office Department of very heavy papers containing from sixteen to eighteen pages of advertising, it is proposed to do so by charging four cents a pound for such handling. The matter really resolves itself into the handling of catalogues through sixteen to eighteen page issues of newspapers.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the Prime Minister explain the representations which led to the dropping of the other portions of the resolution?

Mr. BENNETT: It was established beyond question that under existing economic conditions the newspapers were operating at a loss unless their advertising content was equal to 50 per cent. Newspaper representatives waited on the government and made a very clear statement showing the facts in connection with existing conditions. The really determining factor was the placing of the sales tax upon newsprint, a tax which had not been previously imposed. The result is that the revenue derived from that source will be equal to, if not exceeded by the revenue that might be derived from this.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What is the estimated additional revenue under this postage?

Mr. BENNETT: The officials of the department say that it will be difficult to estimate what the additional revenue will be, because it is believed that the probable result will be that people will resort again to the use of catalogues rather than the utilization of newspapers, but if the same quantity were carried, the additional revenue would be in the vicinity of $100,000.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What would it have been under the first part of the resolution which is dropped?

Mr. BENNETT: I did not ask for the figure, after the representations that were made, and after it was decided to impose a sales tax on newsprint.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will this afford protection to Canadian newspapers as against papers coming from the United States?

Mr. BENNETT: There is already in that regard a tax which is not changed. The bill has not yet been distributed, but the explanatory note says that there is no change with respect to that. It says:

The effect of the proviso will be as follows:
(A) Free circulation, no change.
(B) Newspapers and periodicals when the space devoted to advertisements does not exceed 20 per centum, no change.

And so on up to 50 per cent, there is no change. After that the rate is four cents. Up to 50 per cent the existing rates, which were increased, as it will be remembered two years ago will still be continued; that is, they will be one cent or one and one-half cent as heretofore, but after 50 per cent, the rate will be four cents.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Many United States newspapers contain a large number of pages of advertising. I was wondering whether the effect of this particular legislation would be to prevent to any extent the importation of United States publications.

Mr. BENNETT: I should not think there are any United States newspapers with over 50 per cent advertising content coming into this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Magazines.

Mr. BENNETT: As will be recalled, that is all covered by existing legislation. This does not change that.

Mr. NEILL: Can the Prime Minister indicate from the representations that the delegation made to him what the advertising content of the average country newspaper would be?

Mr. BENNETT: This, as will be observed, does not touch the ordinary country newspaper; it touches only the daily newspaper. The daily newspapers have an association and its representatives produced figures to show that under present abnormal conditions a newspaper could not be said to be profitable until its advertising content approximated 50 per cent. But under existing conditions it will be remembered that the newspapers, except in a few instances, do not carry such advertisements daily; they sometimes carry them once or twice a week for a page or two and then for the remaining days a smaller portion of space is taken. The old rule, I was told, used to be—and I asked that question—that 40 per cent advertising and 60 per cent news was profitable. Under present conditions, with the taxes such as they are, this rate had risen to practically fifty-fifty.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would this affect, for example, the Saturday Evening Post from Philadelphia?

Mr. BENNETT: That was covered by the legislation passed two years ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not affected by this?

Mr. BENNETT: My understanding was that none of that class of papers was affected. The section as it reads is section one as amended in 1931 and, as I say, there was no change made in that except the one I have just indicated. I shall, however, make inquiry and ascertain between now and to-morrow whether it makes any difference in the postage payable by that paper.

Mr. YOUNG: It seems to me that if this legislation goes through, the newspapers will sit down and figure whether it will be cheaper to pay four cents extra postage or to increase the reading matter so as to bring the paper under the lower postage rate. In this way the department may find itself in the position of carrying an increased weight without an increased remuneration.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think that difficulty will arise.

Mr. MARCIL: Is any change made in regard to the printed matter coming by express into Canada? If you go down street on Sunday morning in Montreal or anywhere else, you will see truck loads piled with United States papers that formerly would have gone through the mails.

Mr. BENNETT: They pay some contribution to the revenues of the country, although the exact basis I do not carry in my mind. It was discussed in 1931. There is no method at the present moment by which we can prevent Canadian newspapers from circulating their issues by trucks; in fact in the country in which I live, in western Canada, and I suppose it is so in many other parts of the country, newspapers are now distributed by motor trucks where the postal service is not quite convenient in view of the hour of publication. I believe that the magazines and newspapers that come into this country pay customs duties at the border, and distribution is a matter which is arranged between them and their distributing agents. They come in usually by express to large cities like Montreal and Toronto where there is a substantial Sunday distribution, but not in the case of the smaller communities.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did not the Prime Minister suggest that he wished to amend the resolution?

Mr. BENNETT: I was just going to suggest that I would amend the resolution or amend the bill. I move, Mr. Chairman, to substitute the word "four" for the word "two" in line five of the resolution and the figure "50" for the figure "20" in the same line, and to strike out all the words after the word "cent" at the beginning of the sixth line. The resolution will then read:

> That it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act to provide that the advertising portion of newspapers and periodicals transmitted for a greater distance than forty miles from their place of publication, or of which the publication is of greater frequency than once a week, shall be subject to postage of four cents a pound where the space devoted to advertisements exceeds 50 per cent.

The officers of the department tell me that the effect will probably be a deterrent to trying to unload upon the postal service of the country a larger burden than it should carry.

Mr. NEILL: It seems to me that as the resolution reads it would include weekly newspapers. It says:

That it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act to provide that the advertising portion of newspapers and periodicals transmitted for a greater distance than forty miles from their place of publication—

That covers the weekly newspaper. Then there is another class, "or of which the publication is of greater frequency than once a week." The weekly newspapers are frequently transmitted for a greater distance than forty miles from their place of publication in the west where the distances are great.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. gentleman will let that question stand until the bill is before the committee I shall show him what the facts are.

Resolution as amended reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Bennett thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 98, to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is the bill also in the name of the Prime Minister through a mistake?

Mr. BENNETT: The bill follows the resolution. My friends seem to think there is something very strange about this. As a matter of fact when I found it was in my name I spoke to the Postmaster General, and he said to go on with it as it stood. I will ask the Postmaster General to take the bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, we are quite satisfied.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the Prime Minister is doing very well.

Mr. BENNETT: If the house would give the bill its first and second readings to-day I would not move the bill into committee until I get the answers to the questions that have been asked because I want to be sure myself with respect to them.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to have the Postmaster General here. The other day in the absence of the Prime Minister a bill dealing with radio was brought in by the acting minister, and the minister in charge of radio was left to one side. Now an act affecting the post office is brought in by the Prime Minister, and the Postmaster General is not here. The Post Office is one of the most important departments. It reaches every man, woman and child in Canada. There is no corner of Canada which is beyond the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General, and I think he should be here to answer the numerous complaints that are prepared for him.

Mr. BENNETT: They would not be discussed until his estimates are up, in any event. Let us be fair about this thing.

Mr. MARCIL: He was not here when his estimates were called, and now he is not here when the bill has been called.

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure that there is no reason why hon. gentlemen, in their political anxiety, should not be fair. The Postmaster General will be only too glad to answer questions regarding the conduct of his department when his estimates are called, as they will be this evening or this afternoon if it is preferred. He will be here to answer for himself. So far as this bill is concerned I have explained the circumstances in which my name was put on, and I agreed that it should remain there. If hon. gentlemen will agree to the bill being given a second reading this afternoon I will let it stand without moving it into committee so as to be able to answer the questions which the leader of the opposition and other hon. gentlemen have asked me.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. BENNETT moved the second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

TARIFF BOARD ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Tariff Board Act, chapter 55 of the statutes of 1931, to provide that the salary of the chairman shall be $15,000 per annum; and that any member of the board who has served for a period of ten years, and is, on completion of such period, of the age of sixty years or over, may be granted an annuity equal to one-half of the annual salary of such member.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

Mr. BENNETT: The purpose of this resolution is to provide that the chairman of the board, who was a member of the high court of justice of the province of Ontario and who left that position to accept the position of chairman of the board, shall be placed in substantially the same position financially as he was had he not done so. The chairman did not seek the office; the office sought the chairman. I need hardly say to this committee that the appointment of a chairman to this board was a matter of

very great difficulty. To secure one with judicial qualities of mind, and who would commend himself to all those who were concerned in the matters with which he had to deal was not the easiest matter in the world. I consulted in many quarters as to where a judge might be obtained because I believed it was desirable that the chairman should be one who had judicial qualifications.

Mr. Justice Sedgewick was not disposed to accept the position; he took some time to consider it. After consulting with some of his friends he was finally prevailed upon by his sense of public service and duty to accept the position. He was appointed judge in December of 1930, and had been on the bench something over two years. He is now of the age of fifty-five years, and was something over fifty-three at the time of his appointment to the bench. After taking some time to consider the matter he finally concluded, as an act of public service, to accept the position. He desired however that his financial position should not be worse than it would have been had he remained on the bench. This resolution is an endeavour to give effect to that purpose.

I think perhaps the only amendment would be that of changing the word "sixty" to "sixty-four," because it is desired to have regard for the fifteen years of service that he would render if he were on the bench, to secure an annuity. Two of those years are now passed and do not count for anything. We would provide that if he serves ten years as chairman and has reached the age of sixty-four or over, he will receive the annuity mentioned in the resolution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The resolution as it reads relates to the chairman of the tariff board, irrespective of who he may be?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Prime Minister's remarks had reference to the present chairman, Mr. Justice Sedgewick. Probably the resolution should not be limited in its application in the first place to the individual mentioned. However, other and quite different circumstances may arise on obtaining a successor.

Mr. BENNETT: I quite appreciate the point which the right hon. gentleman has made. As a matter of fact it has given me much concern as to whether or not that would be the proper thing to do. If the committee is of the opinion that it is proper, under the circumstances, to place the name in the resolution, instead of leaving it as it is, I am perfectly content. I thought, however, that it was better under all the circumstances to put it in the form in which it appears and to change the figure "sixty" to "sixty-four" so that it could refer to no one else except the present chairman, he having put in something like two years and three months on the bench.

It may be that it would be thought desirable to make a change hereafter, but I believe the explanation I have given and the circumstances under which this condition has arisen might obviate the necessity for putting the name in the bill. However if the right hon. gentleman would like the change, I would not oppose it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was not advocating it. I was drawing attention to the right hon. gentleman's remarks because I had objections quite apart from the one he has mentioned.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What was his salary in Ontario?

Mr. BENNETT: He received $9,000 from the dominion and $1,000 from the province.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend states that it was not fair to ask the present chairman of the tariff board to prejudice his financial position by accepting the chairmanship. I should like to know in what way his financial position would be injured by accepting a position with a higher salary. A salary of $15,000 a year is much higher than the salary he was paid as a judge of the supreme court of Ontario. I should like to learn from the right hon. gentleman how the present chairman would have suffered by accepting the position at the statutory salary?

Mr. BENNETT: I put it this way: Any person who occupies a position of judge of the high court of justice of Ontario, who has his home and is established in the city of Toronto and who under ordinary circumstances, if his health is good, would be entitled to keep that position until he had reached the age of seventy-five years, and to retire upon an annuity of two-thirds of his salary, with a likelihood of promotion, so far as he was concerned, on the bench, would not be as well off financially by accepting the chairmanship, as if he had remained in his former position. That view was supported by business men whom he consulted, and with whom he discussed the matter as to whether or not he would be wise in making a change at this particular time in his life. Nothing but a desire for fairness to himself and his family induced him to accept it under conditions such as indicated in the resolution.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot agree with my right hon. friend. Mr. Justice Sedgewick drew a salary of $9,000 from the dominion, and $1,000 from the province of Ontario. He could not retire and be superannuated, except for cause, illness or inability to fulfil his duties of office. That superannuation would have been at the rate of two-thirds of his salary as a judge, or $6,000 per year. Under the resolution before us there is provision for a salary of $15,000 a year. Then after ten years, even though he be only sixty-two or sixty-three years of age—

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —he would be entitled to one-half of his salary, namely $7,500. It certainly is an improvement in his position. I desire to discuss this matter briefly irrespective of who is to be the incumbent of the position. I have no doubt that the present chairman is well qualified and may be a very good chairman of the tariff board, but I desire to protest against the practice which seems to have established itself in recent years, namely that of taking a judge from one of the high courts, placing him on some board and giving him a salary much higher than that received by the chief justice of the high court of the province from which he came, or judges of the appeal courts. It is a salary even higher than that received by judges of the supreme court of Canada. I do not believe that a man occupying the position of chairman of the tariff board must have better qualifications than one occupying the position of chief justice of the province of Ontario, or a justice of the supreme court of Canada. I do not think it is fair to the other members of the judiciary. Also I object to it on another ground. I do not think it makes for the respect which is owing to the bench that judges should appear as aspirants to these new positions being created in the way of tariff board, railway board, radio board and other similar boards, at higher salaries than their brothers on the bench. I desire to protest against this practice and I am opposed to this resolution.

Mr. CASGRAIN: For the same reason that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has just stated I desire also to register my protest against this legislation. I find here according to section 8 of chapter 55 of the statutes of 1931 that pensions are provided for these people on the tariff board:

> Every member who has served on the board for a period of at least ten years may be granted an annuity for the term of his natural life equal to one-fourth of the annual salary received by him during such period, and if he has served for any period less than ten years but more than five years, he may be granted an annuity equal to one-fifth of the annual salary received by him during such period.

Then subsection 2 states:

> The chairman of the board shall be paid an annual salary of twelve thousand dollars, and the other two members shall each be paid an annual salary of ten thousand dollars.

And the secretary is to be paid $6,000. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the country will support our contention that at the time those salaries were fixed and these pensions provided we were dealing most fairly and even generously with the people sought for to serve in those high positions. I understand that Judge Sedgewick is a very prominent man, I have had occasion to meet him myself, and I would not say anything disparaging of him, but, being elevated to that high position, if this bill is passed he will receive a higher salary than any judge of the supreme court, higher than any judge in the land. I think in years past we have made a mistake in paying such big salaries as we have. For instance we increased the salary of the Auditor General from $9,000 to $15,000. I think it was a mistake. I think a judge of the court of appeal is entitled to a high salary, but if we now put the salary of this gentleman at $15,000 we are giving him as high a salary as the chief justice of the supreme court of Canada and the Prime Minister of Canada. We must not forget this, that the tariff board is only a fact-finding body, which moves only at the instance of the government, the Minister of Finance. They are not in the position of administering justice as judges sitting in any appellate court in Canada, who move because they are seized with cases that come before them from all parts of the land. This board is nothing more than a tool in the hands of the government. I think we are paying too much in increasing this salary to $15,000 a year. I want to register my protest most strongly, more especially in view of the fact that in all big business concerns at present it is the practice to reduce salaries as much as possible. And what did we see on the 30th of March last? This government which is asking us to-day to increase this salary to $15,000 passed an order in council at the instance of the Minister of Finance requesting all departments of the government to keep within bounds and seek to reduce expenses and not incur any expense unless absolutely necessary for the better administration of the country. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he thinks it is absolutely necessary that we should increase this salary $5,000—

Mr. BENNETT: Only $3,000, not $5,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: If he thinks it necessary to increase the salary $3,000 to have better service from this gentleman who is going to sit on that board?

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

SOLDIER AND GENERAL LAND SETTLEMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

Amount required for soldier land settlement advances, for advances under the British family schemes recoverable from the British government, for the cost of administration of soldier settlement and general land settlement, and for the cost of administration of soldier settlement staff performing investigations for the war veterans allowance committee, $1,173,600.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Last evening when the bill went through I was unfortunately called out of the chamber and therefore was not able to present the case in connection with the suggestion I made to the minister that he should take into consideration the possibility of wiping out the whole soldier settlement board administration and turning the land over to the settlers. He was kind enough to provide me with figures which strongly support the idea I have in mind. Although I am not at present advocating it, as naturally the fullest information is not at my disposal. I find that the cost to the country to date is as follows:

Live stock revaluation	$ 2,927,869 99
Land revaluation..	7,479,343 75
Thirty per cent reduction (some years ago)..	11,296,632 03
Interest exemption in 1922..	10,269,108 87
Total of exemptions. ..	$31,972,954 64

The administration costs during that period amounted to nearly two thirds of that amount, or $21,709,929.35.

I pause at this point to direct the attention of the house to that enormous cost of administration of the Soldier Settlement Act. The cost to date, as I have said, is $21,709,929 and on top of that is entailed a loss to the country of nearly $32,000,000 or a grand total of $53,682,883.99.

The case would not be complete if I were not able to show that the total collected did not reach that amount. The total amount collected in the whole period is only $50,968,482.79, so that we have collected $3,000,000 less than the cost to the country. I was informed by the minister yesterday that the total amount outstanding is $63,753,000 in round figures.

Now let me ask this question: If it cost $21,709,000 for administration to collect $50,000,000 when the prices for agricultural products were comparatively high, certainly much higher than they are at present and higher than prices are likely to be for some time to come, how much will it cost to collect the $63,753,000 outstanding? Yesterday I think the government demonstrated good sense and tolerance in regard to the condition of the settlers, and this house did itself justice in passing the bill which was brought in at that time, but the whole question must be dealt with by this government or by the government which will immediately follow it—and I can assure hon. members that it will not be of the same political stripe. We must consider whether this whole act is to be continued. For my part I feel that the government would be well rid of a white elephant and the country would escape appalling losses on the transaction at present prices if the land were turned over free to the settlers. Then we could do away with this whole board and save this cost of administration. I am not sure whether the minister discussed this point yesterday in dealing with the question; if he did so I am sorry I did not hear him. I understand that the original cost of land and equipment was given as $117,000,000, and that the interest lost has amounted to about $2,688,000. Now I should like to know the total interest arrears to date.

Mr. GORDON: In connection with soldier settlers, as interpreted by the act, and civilian settlers the interest arrears amount to $4,175,820.63.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I take it that the two items are combined and there is no way of separating them?

Mr. GORDON: I have not the separate items.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is a recommendation I should like to make to the minister. I noticed that in his replies to several questions, especially dealing with statistics, he included both activities. I seriously suggest that an attempt should be made to separate the costs as between the general land settlement and the soldier settlement, because they are two entirely different matters. One was started in order to absorb the demobilized soldiers; it had in view a definite and praiseworthy objective. The other was a settlement scheme, partly British and partly Canadian, and I think the minister would be well advised to take into consideration separating the two accounts so that next year we may get the exact figures.

Mr. GORDON: Mr. Chairman, I did carry on an investigation about a year and a half

ago along the lines suggested by my hon. friend; I thought it would be advisable to separate the two classes of settlers. I found, however, that the expense in the accounting branch would be very considerable, and in fact would outweigh any advantage that I could see resulting from a separation, although I readily understand that there would be an advantage in having that information available.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think it is unfair to both branches, because in turn each branch is blamed by critics of the other branch. For the sake of peace within the ranks of the settlers themselves it would be advisable to separate the items. Perhaps the department knows that the soldiers do not like to have these costs jumbled up in this way, so that no one knows whether or not the cost of administration in connection with soldier settlement is unnecessarily high. In my opinion that cost has been absurdly high; it has been out of all proportion to the service rendered. It seems perfectly ridiculous that it should cost $21,709,000 to collect $50,000,000. I think the items should be separated, even though it may cost a little more.

Mr. GORDON: I am not prepared to take the position that the cost has not been high. Of course it has been too high; that was abundantly apparent to me in 1930. I could not understand why it should be so high, but, as the hon. member knows, that cost has been reduced by about half so that to-day the cost of administration is less than one per cent, which compares very favourably with the cost of administration of loan companies handling similar business. I hope it can be held at that ratio, and it may be possible to make the cost even lower.

Mr. YOUNG: Is that one per cent of the amount collected or of the total debt?

Mr. GORDON: That is comparing the amount of the investment with the administrative cost.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does that mean one per cent of $117,000,000?

Mr. GORDON: No, one per cent of $63,000,000. No one needs to labour the point with regard to the cost of administration. I do not say this in any endeavour to stir up political matters, but we found field supervisors who had driven the cars of the board across the continent on their holidays, and all that sort of thing; we found men employed by the board who were of absolutely no value. In the reorganization the endeavour was to select from the officials those with actual experience in pioneer settlement and agricultural work, and a review of the personnel of the board at present will show that almost one hundred per cent of the employees are returned men. In almost every case the men in charge have had very considerable experience in agriculture as well.

The history of this effort is well known to every member of the committee. Whether or not it was a proper effort to be made at the time perhaps does not matter now in discussing the situation as we find it, but I believe there should be a constant reduction in the cost of administration. I do not know that I can promise that there will be a very great reduction in each succeeding year, but it should be reduced to the point where the staff will be able to take care of land settlement generally, and the administration of these lands will be practically incidental. I have a very high regard for those who are at present employed as officials of the board; I believe hon. members will agree that politics did not enter into the reorganization at all.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

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

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

Accordingly the house went up to the Senate,

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the house that the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the royal assent to the following bills:

An Act respecting The Canadian Anthracite Coal Company, Limited.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code (Offensive Weapons).

An Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act.

An Act to amend the Penitentiary Act.

An Act to incorporate Devonshire Jockey Club.

An Act respecting The Nipissing Central Railway Company.

An Act to amend The Canada Grain Act.

An Act to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act.

An Act respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Bank Act.

An Act respecting the Inspection and Grading of Hay and Straw.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1934.

SUPPLY

SOLDIER AND GENERAL LAND SETTLEMENT

The house resumed in committee of supply, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

Amount required for soldier land settlement advances, for advances under the British family schemes recoverable from the British government, for the cost of administration of soldier settlement and general land settlement, and for the cost of administration of soldier settlement staff, performing investigations for the war veterans allowance committee, $1,173,600.

Mr. GORDON: As I had just pointed out, the cost of administration has been reduced very considerably, and at the present time, as I said, it will compare favourably with that of loan companies and others carrying on similar work. When the bill was before the committee yesterday I promised the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that I would put on Hansard the receipts and cost of administration in the fiscal year 1929-30 together with the total expenditure for that year. The figures are as follows:

Total revenue..	$4,570,190 99
Total expenditure..	2,435,255 38

Perhaps it might be desirable to put on record the figures for the next year so that they will make a continuous picture of the board's operations. These are the figures for the fiscal year 1930-31:

Total revenue..	$2,382,243 28
Total expenditure..	2,182,591 85

The plan of reorganization of the board did not of course come in until the following year. During the years 1928 and 1929, many seizures were made. I have not had an opportunity or the time to inquire into the causes and the justice of that course and therefore I shall not undertake either to commend or to criticize it, but it was so generally the practice that the law existing at that time was changed so as to give the settler the right to apply to the judge of the district or county court in order to secure relief in such cases. The main reason the receipts have fallen off may be found in the fact that it is and has been the policy of the government, during this time of depressed prices, to encourage the settler to stay upon the land and, as I have said before in this chamber, not to adopt an attitude that might prompt him in discouragement to abandon his holdings. The receipts have fallen off because we have not adopted an attitude of severity with respect to collections. Of course we all hope the collections will come in more easily in the future than they have in the immediate past.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. LUCAS: Have there been any foreclosures during the past year?

Mr. GORDON: My information is that there have been no foreclosures except in the case of absentee settlers, but there have been some quit claims. I am told that there may be half a dozen foreclosures across Canada.

Mr. NEILL: Could the minister turn to page 4704 of yesterday's Hansard and explain the difference between the figure of the total administration cost for the year 1929-30, which is there given covering both soldier land settlement and general land settlement as a total of $1,362,121.86, and the figure below that which reads: Controllable expenditure, $2,435,255.38? The minister just now gave the figure of $2,435,255.38 as the expenditure; would he explain the difference between the figure of $1,362,121.86 and that of $2,435,255.38?

Mr. GORDON: I should have broken up that item. The total expenditure includes advances as well as administration costs.

Mr. NEILL: Advances can hardly be called expenses of administration. The minister a few minutes ago gave the expenses as $2,435,255.38. The figures should be $1,362,121.86.

Mr. GORDON: If we break up the figure of $2,435,255.38, the cost in 1929-30 for administration was $1,362,121.86, and the advances amounted to $1,073,133.52. That makes the total.

Mr. REID: Can anything be done for those who sold a portion or all of their farms to another party and where that has been returned on quit claims, making, in some cases, a greater debt owing to the board by the original soldier settler than he contracted for in the first instance? There are quite a few such cases in British Columbia. Since I came to Ottawa this session, I have had at least three brought to my attention.

Mr. GORDON: I shall be glad to look into the situation generally and see if anything can be done.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): I have listened to discussion coming from this part of the house, especially with reference to the cost of administration in relation to the amount of collections, and I am just a little afraid that in face of that criticism the tendency under present conditions will be to try harder than ever to enforce collections. I have no objection to enforcing payment where it does not reduce the standard of living of the soldier settler below what is reasonable. I may say

that in cases which I have brought to the attention of the director or the minister, they have taken a very reasonable attitude, but settlers are constantly writing to tell me that they have so many bushels of grain, for instance, and that they have signed an agreement to deliver a certain proportion to the board; one man, for example, writes that if the agreement which he has signed is enforced he will be left with $234 with which to provide a living for himself, his wife and ten children for a year.

Mr. GORDON: We would not enforce collection in such a case.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): I sent him a copy of Hansard containing a statement made by the minister, and I suppose he took the matter up with the officials of the board at Edmonton. I have not heard from him since, so it is possible he has reached a settlement in the meantime. I submit that under present conditions, when practically every farm product in western Canada, at all events, is being sold at a loss, it does not matter whether it is wheat or oats or cattle or hogs, regard should certainly be had to the question of leaving the soldier settler sufficient for a reasonable living, provided of course that he is doing his best to see that the property and all his assets are kept up in first-class condition.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES

To provide for payments in connection with the movements of coal under conditions prescribed by the governor in council and for the cost of administration thereof, $2,000,000.

Mr. YOUNG: When this item was last up the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth had the floor. As he is not here to-day I will say what he probably would have said if he were here. During last session and the session before, the government have from time to time appealed to the opposition to assist them in trying to balance their budget and pilot the country through its present difficulties. I think this is a case where we can be of material assistance. Here is a proposal to spend $2,000,000 in subventions to the railways for carrying coal an uneconomic distance. This $2,000,000 must first be taken out of the pockets of the people, and when you take that $2,000,000 out of their pockets you reduce their purchasing power by that much. When you reduce their purchasing power by $2,000,000, it means you create just that much unemployment in the country. This is not adding one iota to employment.

Mr. STANLEY: Oh yes, it is.

Mr. YOUNG: How is it? You are going to force people to buy Canadian coal to give employment to Canadian miners, but in order to do that you are going to reduce the people's purchasing power by $2,000,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And you increase the miners' purchasing power.

Mr. YOUNG: By how much?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): You can tell us.

Mr. YOUNG: You reduce the purchasing power of the people of this country by $2,000,000. My friend says that you increase the purchasing power of the miners by the same amount. In that case there would be no result.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Things would be even.

Mr. YOUNG: No, they would not be even, because when you prevent that amount of coal from coming into this country, you shut up within this country $2,000,000 worth of our products which would otherwise go out to pay for that amount of coal—products which the constituents of my hon. friend from Bow River have a surplus of to sell. You have reduced our foreign market for our surplus products. You have reduced the purchasing power of the people of this country, and you have forced the government to raise $2,000,000 of taxation when they do not know how to balance their budget. I cannot see any justification for the item. I do not know why it was ever instituted. I say that it has no business there whatever, and I move that it be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. NEILL: There is an amendment before the chair, Mr. Chairman, and if we are going to pass the amendment without any discussion I would certainly want to put in a word of protest against it. The hon. member for Weyburn puts the argument that is so well known for his point of view, but I would remind him of the fact that a prominent feature of the Conservative policy adopted at Winnipeg in 1930, which platform was boiled down to eight outstanding items was that such compensating adjustments would be made so as to ensure justice to the various sections of Canada under the above mentioned policy. This is one of those compensating adjustments which we require to afford a meagre measure of justice to some

of the coal fields in the west, and for that reason I would certainly oppose any motion to strike out the item. Of course, I know the government has no intention of striking it out.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It would be out of order to strike it out, but quite in order to reduce it.

Mr. NEILL: We do not want it reduced by even one dollar. It is all very well to indulge in fiscal—

Mr. GORDON: Technocracy.

Mr. NEILL: —fiscal theories, which other things being equal might be all right, but we are dealing with conditions under which there is a high tariff in this country. As I said before, this must be considered as one of those compensating adjustments which helps the consumer who has to buy high tariff priced goods. I assume that the minister is not willing to make any remarks upon that phase.

I would ask him this question. When this item was up before on March 30, some five or six weeks ago, the minister said that only the day before he had spent a couple of hours with the heads of the mining companies, both east and west, looking into the whole situation in the hope that a solution might be found, favourable to them, of course. Can the minister tell me if any such solution has been found?—because I have heard no word of it. I have the press reports under my hand, and they indicate that nothing was arrived at, and the report given out by the principal coal operator on his way home was to the same effect. I wonder if the minister can give us any definite information or hold out any prospect of any policy in the immediate future looking towards an increased bonus, or the imposition of dumping duties to keep out British coal, or possibly some measure of reciprocity with the United States, or whatever his policy is. If he has anything of the kind that will be of assistance to our coal mines, now running three days a fortnight in some cases, it will be very gratefully received.

Mr. GORDON: During the last two and a half years I have had many conferences with the coal producers with respect to this most complex problem. Those who come from mining areas are well aware of the fact that in the last twelve years, so far as coal mining in Canada is concerned, the whole picture has been entirely reversed. Twelve years ago we had a consumers' problem; to-day it is a producers' problem.

Mr. YOUNG: It is still a consumers' problem. People do not know how to pay for their coal.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. GORDON: Of course, I am speaking broadly, so far as the fuel situation of Canada is concerned. Many factors, some of which have been worldwide, have contributed to a contraction in the consumption of coal. If one cared to look at the figures for the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Poland or other large coal producing countries, he would find that in the consumption of coal Canada stands in quite a favoured position, although it is a fact that consumption has very considerably dropped off. Other substitute fuels have contributed to a reduction in consumption. We have had milder temperatures during the last two winter seasons, and this factor has contributed to the lack of production and consumption of coal in Canada. Railroads both here and in the United States have greatly reduced the amount of coal they consume. These factors, along with some others, have placed the coal miner in a most difficult position. As the hon. member for Weyburn probably would say, it may be better not to support the production of coal in Canada if such production cannot be justified on a strictly economic basis.

Mr. YOUNG: Hear, hear.

Mr. GORDON: There are many arguments, however, in favour of the proposition that that viewpoint should not prevail. If we placed ourselves again in the position we occupied between 1918 and 1923, and were paying as high as $27 a ton for anthracite coal—as I have done—then the consumer would find that the efforts the previous government made, and which we have continued in a larger way, are giving the consumer a protection he never had before. The figures cannot be denied; they are plain and their effects are self-evident.

We were entirely at the mercy of one source of fuel, namely, Pennsylvania anthracite. To-day there are many competitive lines of fuel. It is the desire of this government and, I believe, of the members of the committee generally, that this or any other government should take such action as it can take, by way of assisting the coal mining industry, which will permit the carrying on of that industry at least in the mines of Canada which are best able to carry on at a cost per ton which is reasonable and which reflects efficient mining effort. If one of the coal mining communities shuts down by reason of the closing of the coal mines, the people dependent upon the industry will find themselves in a very difficult position. Perhaps among all the various members of our population there are none so helpless as the coal miner, if I may put it that way, in turning to any other vocation. That has been the

history of coal mining since historical records of the industry have been kept. As I say, it is a difficult situation. The hon. member for Weyburn said he intended to express the views that the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth would have expressed.

Mr. YOUNG: Should express.

Mr. GORDON: I thought the hon. member said "would". Had he said "would express", then I would say that the principle underlying this assistance was one of which the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth was certainly an outstanding proponent and advocate. Holding the views that I do with respect to bonusing industries which cannot struggle along on their own feet, it is difficult at times to subscribe to the principle here involved. Yet, with respect to the coal mining industry of Canada I believe any government would be justified in giving such relief as would permit efficiently operated mines to continue. Because, as I said a few moments ago, if we close our coal mines in Canada and revert to the position we were in ten or fifteen years ago, when we were relying upon a source of supply from one country, the consumer will be back just where he was before and will have to pay the price demanded.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Or through the eastern combine.

Mr. GORDON: Quite, the eastern—and western—combine, if one cares to turn to those subjects. Whether or not there is a combine within the meaning of the act, in the east or in the west, has yet to be determined. Competition unquestionably reduces the price of coal to the consumers of Canada. I do not wish to labour this point. However, that is one of the problems with which this country has been and will always be confronted. It is a challenge to the wisdom of those who laid down the political boundaries of the country, and it is again an acknowledgement that the Infinite Being did not place nature's resources where we poor humans could take advantage of them with the least possible effort. It challenges the ingenuity of anybody to make the Canadian coal fields available to industrial centres. The government is doing the best it can. Conferences I have held with coal producers and consumers have not resulted in any solution of the problem.

Mr. YOUNG: No, they have not.

Mr. GORDON: I am quite prepared to admit that. I have not heard any suggestion from anyone that I consider would be a solution of the problem of keeping the coal mining industry on its feet and going. As I say, no solution has been arrived at; I doubt very much if there is any complete solution, because there is certainly a limit to the extent to which one can resort to the treasury for moneys to be devoted to such purposes. No doubt there is a limit. I trust the government will not exceed that limit but will at the same time give such assistance as in the eyes of the taxpayers of Canada will be justified.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I really was sorry—and I do not speak sarcastically—to hear the reply of the minister. If ever there was a case of asking for bread and getting a stone, it was this. His remarks, with which because of their obvious truth, we must all agree, would have been very suitable in giving a lecture to the Young Women's Christian Association, or something of that kind. But in dealing with a condition as vital and desperate as that which we have in the west, I do submit his remarks were inadequate. Really, on my word of honour, I did hope that he had at least some hope for us in the west. He says he has no solution of the problem, and that no one has ever offered any.

Mr. YOUNG: I offered one just now.

Mr. NEILL: Would my friend who is afflicted with fiscal fanaticism mind letting me handle this? I know he is unique in his own sphere, but we are dealing with the world of reality, hungry miners and starving women, and we cannot feed them with fiscal fanaticism. Now the minister says no one could present a solution. I am not here nor is it my business to present a solution for the whole of Canada; that is the minister's problem, but in some small measure I may be able to present a solution for the miners that I represent. I submit that there is a way by which the immediate troubles affecting the coal mines of Vancouver island at least may be relieved, namely by putting a dumping duty on British coal subsidized by the British government, brought out largely as ballast, and under conditions that call for dumping restrictions if ever such restrictions are justified.

I want to speak, now, for a moment, of another matter. When this vote was up before I called the attention of the minister, as will be found at page 3572 and following pages of Hansard, to the manner in which the coal problem had been dealt with in Great Britain. I pointed out that they had discovered or developed a new form of fuel known as colloidal fuel, a mixture of oil and coal dust,

which enabled coal dust to be used in a way that it had never been used before. They had some process that prevented the heavier particles from sinking, and it gave promise of creating an enormous demand for a very low grade of coal and to compete with fuel oil. I also pointed out, having got this information from the British press, that this process had been developed to the stage where the British admiralty, always a most conservative body—if you make a deal with the British admiralty you have got to show you have the goods and continuity of supply of that quality and price—had made a contract for twelve months with some local firm, I think, in England, for the supply of fuel developed from coal for use on one of the British warships, a destroyer called the Westminster. Since then I see they have also adapted it for use on aeroplanes. Everyone knows that aeroplane gasoline must be of the very best quality, and if the British have developed an oil from coal that can be used in aeroplanes it certainly points the way for us to follow as a means of solving the question of the use of this coal. The day has gone by when we can dig and sell it "as is," as run of mine. We have to put it in a form to meet the competition of fuel oil and other competing fuels. I suggested that the government might have put this information before the coal miners of Canada, and asked them if they had any bulletin of the kind. The minister replied:

> Obviously the hon. member has not read the annual report of the mines branch, which deals at great length with the subject to which he has made reference. . . .

Naturally that coming from the minister was supposed to make me feel squashed by the dignity and weight of his authority, but, I could not remember anything of that kind in the report. I thought perhaps I had missed it, so I looked it up. I have the report here. It consists of fifty pages, and when the minister said that the subject I referred to had been dealt with in the report at great length, how many pages would you expect to be allotted, in a pamphlet of fifty pages, to a matter that was dealt with "at great length"? Would you say fifteen, twelve, ten, or what? Or would it be like the man who was striving to save the people of Sodom from the vengeance of Jehovah? Perhaps even one page would justify the expression "at great length": But what are the facts? There is no reference whatever to the term "colloidal fuel." Reference to low temperature carbonization occurs in two instances, one less than two lines, and the other two and a half lines; that does not deal with the matters I was speaking about, the practical use of this fuel to the extent I indicated on British warships. One is simply a casual reference, and the other merely a statement that scientific men had continued work on the development of the new F.R.L method for the low-temperature carbonization of coals. But the British people have gone far beyond that. I suggest that it was a wholly improper statement to make, that the subject had been dealt with at great length, when the only reference thereto was as I have indicated.

This subject of colloidal fuel and the production from coal of gas or oil sufficiently fine to be used in British warships or aeroplanes belonging to the navy is certainly a subject of practical constructive importance, one to which it would well become us to pay the very closest attention with a view to stimulating its development in Canada. I do not believe that even my hon. friend from Weyburn would object to spending public money on developments along these lines, because it would be helping the coal industry to help themselves. Once turn run of mine coal into products such as these and a vast market is opened up, and perhaps the coal mines would not need government subventions thereafter. I am quite sure I would have the support of the hon. member for Weyburn in that regard. As I say, these are constructive ideas leading to permanent improvement of the industry, and it is in that respect I complained about the coal mines branch. I do not blame the minister wholly; he is only the head of it, but the coal mines department is slack in looking after these developments.

The minister also said, and I have no doubt he was correct, that the principal coal operator on Vancouver island had written to him that he regretted my taking this matter up, that he was getting along much better without my interference. A case of butting in! Well, I did keep out of the matter until patience and abstention ceased to be a virtue. I left it to the minister and to the coal operator on Vancouver island to adjust it. Coal was coming in last year and in the early months of this year to a dangerous extent, but I did nothing; I was waiting, partly to be asked to take the matter up and partly to give them an opportunity to get together, as he said he was doing, and find a solution. If I did butt in it was only when I was asked by a representative elected body from the coal mine that is in my district, and when I found that there was nothing doing. And what did I do then? Did I take any unlawful or improper action by way of butting in? I hardly think it. I took the regular line; I wrote to the minister under date of January 23, presenting the matter reasonably and temperately

to him, and the answer I got under date of January 31 was in part:

I cannot say at the moment just what steps may be contemplated to deal with the situation.

That was in January. Three months later, on March 29, the subject came up again and I did feel that I was justified in asking what if anything had been done or what was contemplated. The minister on that occasion said he had had a meeting just the day before. A week later I found in the press under a name known to be close to the government, an intimation that it was not anticipated that anything would come out of the negotiations, which was proved to be all too true by the statement the minister made this afternoon. Then I find that Colonel Villiers, the largest coal operator on Vancouver island, gave an interview in Winnipeg on his way home; he said the minister had expressed his views in the house, and that was all there was to it. He also remarked that he employed 2,000 men at present on a part time basis, and he stated:

They are fine, stout hearted fellows and deserve much credit for the fine way in which they are making the best of difficult times.

I entirely endorse that statement, but for the very reason that they are fine fellows and are making the best of present conditions it is more necessary than ever that the coal operators, the minister and the department exert themselves in an endeavour to find a solution to this very difficult problem. It is all very well to say they are fine men; that hardly meets the situation, which is getting worse. I have a letter here from a very prominent man in one of the coal mining towns on the island, a well known Conservative; he says that during the last fortnight in March the mine worked for three days. So I say matters are getting worse. I have before me the record of the coal output for March of this year. As compared with March of 1932 the coal output of Vancouver island dropped from 70,391 tons to 49,663 tons, a drop of 25 per cent. In view of this ever decreasing production on Vancouver island is it not time for me, even at the risk of being told that I am butting in and that I lack propriety and dignity, to stir up the dead ashes and try to find some solution, or at least get some action?

I have already suggested some steps that might be taken. Great Britain subsidizes her coal; the exchange is against us, and it is convenient to bring coal in ballast as a result of the conference agreements. These are all factors which enter into the situation, and I suggest that the time has arrived when we should apply those dumping duties that have been so readily and quickly and gladly imposed by the Minister of National Revenue in matters affecting indutries in Ontario. They hardly need to wait a day to get that dumping duty slapped on. We have seen these dumping duties applied with such haste that they have had to be removed after two or three days because it was found that they did not meet the situation. Now I should like to deal with another matter, and perhaps at this time we might call it six o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT

The house resumed from Friday, May 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Coote for the second reading of Bill No. 81 to amend the Interest Act.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of traversing the ground covered in the debate on Friday evening, but I would like to say a few words in reply to some of the statements made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes): It seems to me that the attitude taken by the minister might be summed up in this way: he sympathizes with any person who has to pay interest rates of any size with commodity prices at the present levels, but he feels that nothing can be done about it. His attitude would lead us to believe that there is just so much money in Canada, a fixed sum, and therefore the borrowers will have to do the best they can under the circumstances. It is the duty of the federal government to see that there is sufficient money available at all times for the carrying on of industry and trade and commerce. There should also be sufficient available for the payment of interest charges as these charges enter largely into the cost of conducting every business and industry. Money is of no use unless it circulates and if the government takes the attitude that industry must be carried on with the money now in existence, it should take steps to see that the money now in Canada is circulated and at rates of interest which industry can afford to pay. If the minister would put a tax on unspent balances, the money in the country would soon be put to work. The minister states that capital is floating and that if it cannot secure the rates of interest

it desires in Canada, it will go elsewhere. I am sorry the minister did not tell us just where it would go. Where could it get better returns than in Canada? Would it go to the United States? I went to the library to-day to look up the financial papers to see what rate of interest government bonds in the United States were returning. I found that Liberty 3½'s were quoted in New York at 101. Surely our money would not go there to earn that very low rate of less than three and a half per cent. Would it go to Great Britain? According to the London Times, British government 3½'s are quoted at from 100 to 101. Evidently our money would not go there. Treasury 2's due in 1935 and 1938 were selling in London at 99¾. Canadian capital could not go to Great Britain and obtain higher returns than is being asked for in this bill.

Very little capital could be taken out of Canada in any event as there is a very small amount that could really be moved. I think there is a good deal of misunderstanding with regard to this moving of capital, I do not see how it could be moved. When the Dominion government cannot secure money at five per cent, I think it is the duty of the government to use some of its own money. The Dominion government is the source of all real money; the only legal tender in Canada is issued by the Dominion government. The rate of interest paid on Dominion government bonds is the chief factor in fixing interest rates, and in my opinion any Dominion government that pays five per cent or more than five per cent for money is surrendering its natural right to the money trust. The government should always bear in mind the fact that the rate of interest which it pays on its bonds sets the interest rates for other bonds. In 1927 the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) adopted a different attitude when he suggested to the late Hon. Mr. Robb, then Minister of Finance, that he should float a four per cent bond issue and compel the banks and insurance companies to subscribe to that issue. I shall not take the time to read all of the Prime Minister's remarks.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not quite correct. I said that a percentage of the reserves of the insurance companies, to be decided by the minister, should be invested in these four per cent securities.

Mr. COOTE: I accept the correction of the Prime Minister. I think he proposed a very proper practice when he suggested that a certain percentage of the reserves held by the banks and insurance companies should be invested in that four per cent issue. I should like to read briefly from his proposal. He said:

> Therefore I propose that the Minister of Finance should, after creating his four per cent consolidated Canadian securities, provide by legislation that a percentage, to be hereafter determined, of the revenue of the insurance companies, amounting to a net total of over $110,000,000 this year, and from the deposits of the Canadian people in our savings banks, amounting approximately to at least another billion and three-quarters, should be utilized for the purpose of paying off this $100,000,000. This four per cent security I would maintain at all times at par—a very simple process.

I think the Prime Minister made a very useful suggestion at that time, one which the government of that day might very well have acted upon. The Minister of Finance referred to the bonds of Alberta and British Columbia which he said were selling on a basis to return 6.6 and 6.45 per cent respectively. I want to say without any mental reservation that no province in Canada can afford to pay such rates of interest. It was current gossip at that time that the provinces were held up by the bond houses and told that if they would not accept the offer made at that time they would not be able to sell their bond issues at all. It is to be regretted that the Dominion government did not tell the money authorities at that time that they must take up those bond issues at a lower price. Either that, or the provinces should not have floated any issues. However, the provinces were helpless and they had to accept the bids made by the bond houses or do without.

I think it all comes back to the fact that in 1931 the Canadian government floated the national service loan at a price which returned over five per cent. When that loan was issued the price of all other bonds outstanding in Canada was depressed. Bond prices fell almost immediately afterwards. Practically every financial institution in Canada had millions invested in these bonds and the depressed prices had a serious effect upon their balance sheets. Later on in the year the government passed an order in council authorizing the banks and insurance companies to value their securities at higher prices than those at which they were quoted on the market. There would have been no need for that action had the government insisted that the national service loan be taken up at four per cent. Then the provinces could have easily financed their needs at five per cent. In 1927 the Prime Minister did not hesitate to say that he would insist upon the banks

and insurance companies investing a certain percentage of their reserves in the bond issue at four per cent, and I think he should have insisted upon the same thing in 1931. In 1931 commodity prices had fallen off by at least thirty per cent as compared with those prevailing in 1927. Yet every province in Canada has been compelled to pay interest rates much higher than they paid before.

The minister then went on to say that setting a maximum rate of interest would interfere with control of credit and interest in Canada by a central bank. I would say that when the minister establishes a central bank in this country he can repeal this legislation if it should have become law. Further than that, may I say I have asked for years that a central bank should be established. If we had had a central bank properly established and operated, the government would never have had to pay five per cent interest in times of low commodity prices. If we had had that central bank I would not be bringing in this bill to-night. But the question in my mind is: Is the government going to establish a central bank, and, if so, when is it going to be established? I have waited until practically the end of the session to bring in this bill. I hoped the government would take some action to raise commodity prices, to bring about lower interest rates. I hoped the banking committee might before this have recommended that some action be taken in regard to interest rates on existing obligations. But nothing happens; the committee does not report. The government does nothing; it does not establish a central bank or do anything to raise commodity price levels. Are we to sit here doing nothing and see our people left at the mercy of the money changers? Last year the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) said:

> No agriculturist, no industrialist and no merchant can afford to pay ten per cent interest for the money he uses in his business; it simply cannot be done; normal business will not permit of that rate of interest. Moreover, no bank can afford to take a loan at ten per cent, because it is too risky.

Then again he said:

> But I lay down the principle that a rate of interest around eight or ten per cent makes successful operation of the ordinary business activities impossible and unprofitable.

The Minister of Finance said the other night that old established industries in Canada are paying nine per cent. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said last year: They cannot do that. The Minister of Finance said that great public utilities with long records of good service behind them are paying ten per cent. Is it not time that we do something about this? The Minister of Trade and Commerce said last year that business cannot pay these rates and we know they cannot. Evidently something should be done about the matter, but the Minister of Finance does nothing. He says:

> It is idle to suggest, even with all the "isms" that are afloat to-day, that there is any other method whereby the rate of interest can be determined than the age-old law of supply and demand.

Well, we could take some steps to increase the supply. In the last three years the supply has been lessened by $700,000,000 and this house has done nothing about the matter. If we would increase the supply by the $700,000,000 that has disappeared in the last three years, we would be doing something. If there is anything in the argument of the Minister of Finance that there is only so much money; that we must pay that rate of interest and that the rate is determined by the law of supply and demand, let us increase the supply; the demand, we will take it for granted, remains the same, and according to the minister's argument, the rate will come down. I think that naturally follows.

Let us look for a moment at what is being done in the United States. In a dispatch in the Ottawa Journal two or three days ago, I find this:

> Inflation bill is passed by the United States house.

These are the chief provisions as listed in the press dispatch:

> The president is authorized to arrange with the federal reserve banks and board for the banks to purchase in the open market up to $3,000,000,000 of government obligations, including stock in corporations of which the United States is the majority stockholder.
>
> If the president is unable to arrange this operation, or if it be found inadequate to raise prices to the desired level, the president may.
>
> Direct the issuance of United States notes up to $3,000,000,000 to buy government obligations, and make provisions for retiring four per cent of this amount annually through congressional appropriations.

If our government is prepared to take similar measures in Canada, it can reduce the rate of interest on all government obligations. The president is also given power to:

> Reduce the gold content of the American dollar by as much as 50 per cent.
>
> Provide for the unlimited free coinage of silver at a fixed ratio with gold.
>
> In addition, the president is authorized to accept silver up to $200,000,000 in payment of war debts during the next six months, valuing the silver up to fifty cents an ounce, to be used as the basis for the issuance of silver certificates.

I do not think our government can afford to sit back and say: We can do nothing about the matter. This government could very well take similar measures.

Mr. ERNST: Does the hon. member's bill apply only in future, or does it apply to past due interest? I want to ask possibly three questions.

Mr. COOTE: I intended to mention that before I sat down. The bill applies only to future borrowings. The reason that I have not asked that it apply to existing obligations is that that matter was definitely referred to the banking and commerce committee and I did not like to go to the length of asking the house practically to take that matter out of the hands of the committee.

Mr. ERNST: It was not made retroactive because of the fact that possibly legal opinion had arrived at the conclusion that past due interest was a matter of civil contract.

Mr. COOTE: I would not like to answer the hon. member on that point; I am not a lawyer. I know there are conflicting opinions, but I understand that the majority of the opinions given to the committee by the authorities to whom they sent a questionnaire are to the effect that jurisdiction over interest on existing obligations also rests in the dominion house.

Mr. ERNST: One more question. With reference to the future, I assume the hon. member will agree with the proposition that capital is fluid. Supposing we fix in this country an interest rate beyond which one cannot go and the interest rate in the country to the south becomes higher; will the money be loaned in Canada or will it be loaned in the United States or any other country where there is a higher interest rate than that in Canada? If that condition arose, what would the hon. member do to meet it?

Mr. COOTE: The Prime Minister has very wide powers under the Unemployment and Farm Relief Act, and, if necessary, he could correct any situation which might arise such as the hon. member suggests.

Mr. ERNST: Surely the hon. member, being a free trader, would not agree to the restriction of capital.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is second reading, not committee of the whole house.

Mr. COOTE: I am glad to have the hon. member's question and, sir, I do not object, so long as you will allow it, to any question which may be asked in regard to the bill which I have introduced. If the hon. member will make a thorough study of this question of the movement of capital, he will find there is not in Canada very much capital that can be moved out. Most of the capital that is invested in this country is invested in factories, plants, railroads and similar assets of one kind or another; there is not very must of what is generally referred to as liquid capital which can be moved out of the country.

Mr. ERNST: In case a situation did arise where capital could profitably be invested outside of Canada, is the hon. member in favour of an embargo on capital in order to meet such a condition?

Mr. COOTE: That is a situation which I do not think will arise, and I do not think at the moment—

Mr. ERNST: Suppose it did arise.

Mr. COOTE: I do not think it can.

Mr. ERNST: But the banks to-day have hundreds of millions of dollars on deposit.

Mr. COOTE: If the hon. member will allow me to put the matter in this way: Were I adviser to the Minister of Finance at any time and such a condition arose, I would say to him: Let those people take their capital out if they know any way of doing so and we will supply the deficiency by drawing on our national credit; we will replace that capital with national credit borrowed from our central bank. I think that is the best kind of capital we could have in Canada.

Mr. ERNST: In other words, the hon. member would inflate our currency?

Mr. COOTE: That would not be inflation; it would be reflation; it would be replacement of capital taken away with capital raised on our national credit. That national credit would cost us nothing and we would get rid of capital that is costing us high rates of interest.

Mr. ERNST: But there is the question of the currency that has gone out of the country.

Mr. COOTE: If we can print any currency that will go out of the country and stay out we shall be that much to the good, but this currency has a habit of coming back to Canada just about two days after it gets out, and we have to redeem it. If we send out too much and it comes back to be redeemed, our dollar would soon be depreciated in outside countries. Then we would get a rise in the commodity price level which the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg himself will admit is badly needed.

Mr. ERNST: Hear, hear.

Mr. COOTE: So the more capital goes out of Canada under those conditions the better for his constituents and mine.

I have perhaps dealt with this question a little longer than I had intended. Before I leave the position of the United States and the action that has been taken there, I want to draw to the attention of the house the effect which that action has already had in raising commodity price levels in the United States. These figures are taken from the New York Times which I saw in the library to-day. According to Moody's commodity price index in the United States, using the index figure of December, 1931, as 100, on March 31, 1933, which was five or six weeks ago, the index figure stood at 86.3, and on May 5 at 110, a rise of 24 points inside of six weeks. That shows what can be done by a man who is determined to get action. It is a result of the action of President Roosevelt of the United States, and I only wish that Canada had a Roosevelt in power here.

I have introduced this bill more particularly because of the position of mortgagors in Canada. Their mortgages are falling due, and as I said the other night, I have the proof in my files that mortgage holders are forcing people to pay a higher rate of interest now when they are renewing their mortgages. Mortgage companies have been paying dividends of 11½ per cent for the past three years. Borrowers on mortgage cannot afford to pay any higher rate of interest now than they have paid in the last three years. Many of them find it almost impossible to pay interest at all, and why they are held up in this way when they have to renew their mortgages is more than they can understand. Because I cannot get action in any other way I finally came to the conclusion that I should introduce this bill. The United States congress has passed a bill to set aside a fund of two billion dollars for the financing of farm mortgages, and any mortgage holder can go to the federal land bank in the United States and exchange his mortgage up to fifty per cent of the value of the property for bonds bearing interest at the rate of four per cent, which are guaranteed by the government of the United States. The mortgagor then pays to the land bank 4½ per cent, regardless of the rate stated in the original mortgage and this bill has been amended so that small home owners with mortgages on homes valued at $10,000 or less can get exactly the same advantage under the bill as farmers. Are we doing anything to assist mortgagors in Canada? I say frankly that this interest bill is not the kind of bill I would really like to introduce into this house, but everyone knows that the rules of the house prevent private members introducing any bill which calls for the expenditure of a dollar. So we are precluded from bringing in many bills which we should like to see enacted here. We have urged the government repeatedly to bring in a money bill of some kind which would give us a little inflation or reflation in Canada. We have asked them for that so often that I am not going to do it any more. We have also asked them to establish a central bank. We cannot bring in a bill for that purpose. I would also like to see established some kind of public finance corporation to make an advance of even fifty per cent against these farm mortgages as well as urban mortgages at a rate of perhaps 3½ or 4 per cent. But as I said, we cannot introduce such bills, and the government so far has refused to do anything at all along that line. As the rules will not allow me to introduce such a bill there is only one thing left for me to do, and that is to introduce this bill asking that a limitation be placed upon the rate of interest which can be legally charged in Canada. I have already said in answer to the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg that I do not ask that this legislation be retroactive or apply to existing mortgages. That was referred to the banking committee.

There is, of course, some question as to whether or not this house has jurisdiction. In my humble opinion it has, but I do not pretend to know because I am not a lawyer. I think it is beyond doubt that we have the power to fix a maximum rate of interest for new obligations.

I admitted the other night that there might be a very proper objection taken to this bill in the case of small loans. I think we should allow a service charge to be made in the case of small loans, not because large loans are safer than small loans, for the majority of the losses which have been made in this country have been made on large loans. I think on the average the small loan is the safer, but sometimes the interest charge on a very small loan is so small that a service charge in addition is justified, and I said to the house that I would be very willing to have an amendment made to the bill providing for that if the bill were allowed to go into committee.

There may be another objection in the minds of many members, and that is in asking for a maximum rate of five per cent. I have set that rate in the bill after a good deal of thought. I finally felt that five per

cent was as high as people could afford to pay, and if we are going to fix it on that basis I think five per cent is about as high as we ought to go. I have heard some members say that they would agree to the bill if the rate were higher than five per cent. As far as I am concerned I would be glad to have the bill go into committee and let the committee decide what that rate ought to be, although I have set five per cent in the bill. If the house is willing to allow the bill to go into committee, perhaps the committee can agree on a higher rate that might be fixed as a maximum, and then the house can decide on the third reading whether the bill should be passed. But I certainly feel, seeing that we have not taken any action to raise commodity price levels or lower interest rates or make more money available, some action should be taken by this house for the protection particularly of those whose mortgages are falling due. There are many people, of course, with other money contracts, and these money contracts they are, in some cases, being forced to renew for a period of years at a higher rate of interest than in the old obligation. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the bill the most favourable consideration possible by this house.

The house divided on the motion of Mr. Coote, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Brasset,
Butcher,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Coote,
Denis,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Donnelly,
Dumaine,
Dupuis,
Factor,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Hurtubise,
Kennedy (Peace River),
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
MacInnis,
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre),
MacLean,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Mitchell,
Pouliot,
Reid,
Rhéaume,
Séguin,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Thauvette,
Totzke,
Woodsworth.—34.

NAYS

Messrs:

Anderson (Halton),
Arsenault,
Arthurs,
Barber,
Baribeau,
Barrette,
Belec,
Bennett,
Bourgeois,
Burns,
Bury,
Chaplin,
Cotnam,
Davies,
Dickie,
Duguay,
Duranleau,
Ernst,
Fortin,
Fraser (Cariboo),
Ganong,
Geary,
Gobeil,
Gordon,
Hanson (York-Sunbury),
Hay,
Johnstone,
Jones,
Larue,
Lawson,
Lennox,
Macdonald (Kings),
MacMillan,
MacNicol,
McGillis,
McGregor,
Matthews,
Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon),
Myers,
Neill,
Nicholson,
Peck,
Pickel,
Plunkett,
Price,
Quinn,
Robinson,
Sauvé,
Shaver,
Simpson (Simcoe North),
Simpson (Algoma West),
Smith (Victoria-Carleton),
Smoke,
Spankie,
Spence,
Stanley,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stewart (Lethbridge),
Stirling,
Sutherland,
Tétreault,
Weir (Melfort),
White (London),
White (Mount Royal).—65.

Mr. HEENAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was paired with the hon. member for Rimouski (Sir Eugene Fiset). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PETTIT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Bouchard). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): I was paired with the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Bowen). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SANDERSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Halidmand (Mr. Senn). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. HARRIS: I was paired with the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BERTRAND: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto North East (Mr. Baker). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR: I was paired with the hon. member for Brantford city (Mr. Ryerson). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. PERRAS: I was paired with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. COWAN (Port Arthur): I was paired with the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ST. PERE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Hastings (Mr. Tummon). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. CANTLEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ROBERGE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Ferland). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I was paired with the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Baribeau). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. McPHEE: I was paired with the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Embury). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Sullivan in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF MINES

Miscellaneous—To provide for payments in connection with the movements of coal under conditions prescribed by the governor in council and for the cost of administration thereof $2,000,000.

Mr. NEILL: At six o'clock I had not concluded my remarks on this item. This afternoon I urged upon the minister to develop or announce a policy which would in some measure tend to rehabilitate the decadent coal mining industry in British Columbia, and more particularly on Vancouver island. In reply to his request for some suggestions I made one or two which I shall briefly summarize under four headings. The first, and the one which I think holds best promise of a permanent solution of the difficulty, would be that of following the lead given by Great Britain along the line of development. If necessary, money should be spent, because money spent in that way would be used to better purpose than if it were spent for subventions. We would be enabled ultimately to be independent. The money would be spent in the development of methods of presenting the coal in what might be termed modern up to date forms. It could be processed in such ways as colloidal fuel oil, or as gas obtained from coal, so that it could compete with other fuels. As I indicated this afternoon, if such fuel could be used on government warships or government aeroplanes it would develop a great general demand. Secondly,—and this is only a temporary expedient—greater subventions should be granted in respect of the coal mined on Vancouver island. Such subventions should be in line with those granted to other areas in Canada. It is notorious that the subventions granted to Vancouver island are out of all proportion smaller than those granted to other coal areas in Canada. Third, I suggested that before the matter has gone too far, and before it has reached the status of an established industry with large sums invested, we should stop the development of trade with Great Britain on coal imported into British Columbia under the advantages of subsidies, low exchange and use as ballast. My fourth suggestion was that we might negotiate some form of reciprocity with the United States in connection with coal trade. I made the same suggestion in the house last year regarding coal and fish, but I did not receive much support from hon. gentlemen opposite. However, the idea seems more popular just now.

None of these suggestions is unreasonable, and if any of them would help they should be accepted. Half of them would, I believe, put the coal mining industry on its feet, so that it would not need to go cap in hand to the government asking other areas and industries to contribute to its support. Had the minister in his speech given us any suggestions along these lines there would have been some comfort for us in British Columbia. I specifically asked what hope he could hold out. However, anyone who reads Hansard will readily see that he had no solutions whatever to offer.

For a moment I should like to turn to another feature of coal mining in British Columbia, concerning a condition which obtains in a constituency I do not represent. On April 5, more than a month ago, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre asked if the attention of the Minister of Mines had been called to the serious condition of the coal industry at Fernie. The whole industry, in fact the whole town, was in the process of being wiped out, owing to the closing of the local mines. The minister replied that the question of what could be done, if anything, had been taken up with the government of British Columbia, upon whom responsibility rested, if there were any responsibility. He went on to say that if it were possible for the government to assist, of course that assistance would be given. The suggestion that the responsibility rested upon the province of British Columbia would apply only to taking care of relief. The minister overlooked, however, or did not seem to realize, the greater responsibility resting upon the dominion of adopting a policy to take care of the situation, especially, as I shall proceed to show, it was the policy of this government which brought Fernie to the desperate point it has now reached. I say that at least in part—and I think a large part—the government policy brought about that situation. Hon. members from the east will understand better if I explain that Fernie is in that part of British Columbia bordering on the United States and practically ninety per cent of its coal output went to that country. The government's policy adopted last year of raising the duty on coal coming into Canada, which automatically raised the duty on coal going into the United States, resulted in the total loss of that foreign trade, which amounted to about ninety per cent of the total. I quote from a well known Conservative paper in British Columbia:

> The manipulation of reciprocal tariffs on coal, while beneficial to eastern Canadian coal operators, Fernie mines suffered severely as 90 per cent of its markets which were export, were completely shut off.

Another says:

> One of the contributing causes for the railroads doing this—

That is ceasing to take the coal.

> —may be assigned to the imposition of increased duty on coal going into the United States, which was put into force as a countervailing duty on Canadian exports. The application of this duty reduced the number of employees at Coal Creek to the extent of 300.

The town, which numbers some 4,000 inhabitants, is practically bankrupt. People will have to move away or be kept on relief, because it is just a one industry town.

Now we were told—until I was sick of hearing of it—on every platform in my riding during the last election, that it was not right to take the narrow view I was taking of looking after the interests of Comox-Alberni first. The electors were invited to take a broad national view; a broad national policy was the idea. I predicted at that time, with almost alarming accuracy as it has proved, that that would merely mean the sacrifice of the British Columbia miners for the benefit of Alberta or of eastern coal areas. That is exactly what has taken place. "Wide is the road and broad the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that walk therein"—principally I think because it is the easiest; they follow the line of least resistance. That is what happened in this case.

Mr. YOUNG: Did you say the other road is straight?

Mr. NEILL: I did not deal with the other road; I leave that to the member for Weyburn—I wish he were on it now. I do not say the result was the government's fault; they certainly did not do it deliberately, but as part of a national policy which may have secured great advantages for Nova Scotia and Alberta. I do not even say that the policy was wrong, but when they saw the situation that was likely to arise they should have acted on item 8, I think it was, of the policy of the Conservative party in the last election, and provided compensating adjustments. That could easily have been done by increasing the bonus on the Crowsnest coal so that it could have got into some of the central Canadian markets.

That then, is the situation. What are we doing about it? As far as I can make out, nothing. As far as I can make out, we are going to do nothing. The days are passing into weeks, the weeks into months and the months into years, yet we are dallying along the primrose path, taking the line of least resistance. We stop here and there and gather a flower of trite truisms or pick a posy of platitudes; we go on down the path of dolce far niente into the great Never-Never land where it is always afternoon, where the shadows are always long, where people live in a vague, misty haze, a narrow confined area surrounded by nebulous and unsubstantial hopes, where "man never is but always to be blessed." When I refer to the minister in this connection I do not know that that is fair, I should perhaps say his department; and even then I should limit it—I mean the

coal mines branch of the Department of Mines. They seem always to have the backward look; they are the apostles of precedent, ever looking timorously behind them for some precedent to guide them. But these are days of change; why do they not get out and make precedents? Instead of being, and leaving us to be, the victims of circumstances, why do they not seize the circumstances and compel them to serve their end and ours, compel them to produce a policy that will meet the situation? Why do they not make things happen? The Prime Minister on an occasion in his earlier career immortalized himself, pounded the desk, I am told, and said that either he or the government would make things happen. That is what we want done. To use a vernacular expression, the minister needs to shake up his department and tell them to get a move on. I suggest that his department requires a new motto, a new slogan. The motto should be "requiescat in pace," and the slogan: "yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep." Yes, and it needs only some sympathetic friend to put a lily in its hand; then the coal mining industry of Vancouver island would be in a position to say: Don't it look nat'ral? —and I might add, appropriate.

In my opening words this afternoon I did not go any further than ask the minister if he could give us any suggestion, any encouragement, any hope of any policy or any action in this regard. Had he done so I should have been satisfied and said no more. But anyone who will read the minister's reply will be compelled to admit that surely it is time someone butted in, that someone stirred up the stagnant waters, that—someone endeavoured to galvanize the Dead sea fruit of inefficiency and inactivity into energized action. I am not one of those who say I think the government ought to do something, but is unable to suggest what that something should be. I have suggested it.

What more can I say? I see the Prime Minister is in his seat; I will appeal to him. I wonder if he can hold out some hope of reciprocity with the United States that would help us. I know that any view to which he would give expression would not be an accomplished fact, it would be nothing more than a hope, but even hope, however slight and distant, would be better than the black despair which now hangs over the coal mining industry of Vancouver island and British Columbia generally. I am not speaking for the sake of attacking the minister; I have nothing to gain by that. I am only making an earnest endeavour to galvanize if possible the government into action, to impress upon the government—I wish I had greater power to express it—the desperateness of the situation, in case happily I might bring the government to a realization of the extreme importance of taking early and speedy action in this matter.

Mr. YOUNG: Can the minister tell us whether in addition to this $2,000,000 that is being provided by the tax payer for the moving of this coal, the railways contribute anything in the form of lower freight rates?

Mr. GORDON: No, there has been no contribution as far as lower freight rates are concerned with respect to coal.

Mr. YOUNG: The regular rate is applied. Can the minister tell us further if all of this money has been spent on freight rates or if some of it has been spent in other ways? How much has gone for administration? Has anything gone for research or any other kind of work?

Mr. GORDON: Out of an expenditure of $1,750,000 an amount of $15,000 has gone for administration.

Mr. YOUNG: And all the rest has gone to the railway companies?

Mr. GORDON: No, to the producers of the coal, but applied towards the reduction of the rate, of course.

Mr. YOUNG: I have listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni and the suggestions he made for improving the situation of the coal mining industry in western Canada. He made four suggestions: first that the government lend assistance to devising some way of processing the coal so that it will be more acceptable to the market. Something might be said in favour of that, but our experience with processing coal has not been very fortunate in the past. Some years ago the federal government in conjunction with the Manitoba government and the Saskatchewan government established a plant in southern Saskatchewan to experiment in the processing of lignite coal with a view to making it more marketable. I think millions were spent in that enterprise. Finally when they thought they had something accomplished they handed the whole plant over to a syndicate of capitalists—gave it to them for a dollar, I believe, the government withdrawing from the field. This syndicate, not satisfied with getting the plant for nothing, then asked the government to buy their output. I know the Saskat-

chewan government undertook to supply their public building with the product at a price profitable to the owners. But still they were not satisfied; I never yet knew any industry built on subventions and grants to be satisfied, and I doubt if anyone else in this country ever heard of such a thing. Feed them on pap, subventions, favours of one kind and another, and they always come asking for more.

The member for Comox-Alberni also suggested increasing the subventions. I say again, when can you satisfy an industry by increasing subventions? The more you give them the more they want. They seem to have only one word in their vocabulary; that is the word "more". No matter what you give them they always cry for more, and these industries are always in distress. Look at what has been done for the steel and coal industry in Nova Scotia, but has there ever been a session of this parliament when they have not been crying for more? Certainly there has not been such a session since I came here. Then the hon. member for Comox-Alberni also suggested that we might stop the importation of cheap coal from Great Britain.

Mr. NEILL: To the Pacific.

Mr. YOUNG: Why should we prohibit the importation of cheap coal from any country? When Great Britain became the leading industrial country in the world it was largely because she had the cheapest coal. When Germany became a great industrial nation one of the main reasons was that she had great coal deposits within her own borders. When the eastern central United States developed the same industrial enterprises it was also largely because they had cheap coal. Why should we deny our people this essential to the building up of industry? I think it would be folly in the extreme. If Great Britain sees fit to bonus her coal exports, so much the better for us; if she wants to tax her people in order to give us the cheap fuel we need, so much the better for us.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni made one suggestion, however, and because of that I am willing to forgive him all the rest; he suggested reciprocity with the United States with regard to coal. Think what it would mean to this country if we had reciprocity with the United States, even if it were only with regard to coal. Look at the great industrial portion of Canada just across the lakes from some of the richest coal deposits in the world. Coal can be brought in from the United States at a cost of a little over $1.50 per ton. Then look at the western coast where the coal deposits are on our side of the line and the natural market is on the other side. It is reported that the Prime Minister is going to arrange some sort of reciprocity treaty with the United States. One of the very best provisions he could include in that treaty would be reciprocity in coal.

Mr. NEILL: And fish.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes, and fish if you like. That would give central Canada the cheap coal from the United States, and it would afford the people of western Canada a market for their coal.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: In that case what would happen the coal mining industry of Nova Scotia?

Mr. YOUNG: In what condition is the coal mining industry of Nova Scotia at present?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: It would be wiped off the map.

Mr. YOUNG: The coal mines in Nova Scotia are on the seaboard. If we had reciprocity would there be anything to stop the exportation of coal to the United States?

Mr. GORDON: Certainly; they cannot land it in the United States to compete with their domestic coal.

Mr. YOUNG: Is it not true also that United States coal is more suitable for the purposes for which it is required?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: No.

Mr. YOUNG: Is it not true that the people of Nova Scotia burn United States coal in their stoves?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: No.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes, it is true; they prefer it. If the people of Nova Scotia persist in bringing coal from under the sea when they can get it cheaper somewhere else I do not know that it is the duty of this government to encourage them in that uneconomic practice. This afternoon the minister spoke of the high price he had to pay for United States coal at one time, and he said he did not want to bring about that condition again. I also paid those high prices, but I know—and I think the minister knows—that it was war time, and we were paying war prices. I can also tell the minister that while commodity prices have been going down the price of coal has not gone down to nearly the same degree.

Mr. GORDON: If I might interrupt my hon. friend to say so, the main reason is that throughout the world the wage scales of coal

miners have not been reduced, and I do not think the hon. member would suggest that they should be reduced.

Mr. YOUNG: Then the minister says that the coal miners are getting better wages, that they are the only basic producers whose wages have not been reduced?

Mr. GORDON: They have been reduced, but not to the same extent.

Mr. YOUNG: Why should they be reduced when we are voting $2,000,000 out of the treasury to assist that industry?

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps their wages have not been reduced but their working hours certainly have been cut down. In one case men have been working only three days in a fortnight, and I should say that was quite a reduction.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes, but perhaps if they were working at a lower rate they would get more work. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni spoke of hungry miners; that is what he is thinking of. I am thinking of shivering consumers, people who cannot buy coal in a country where they need it, people who cannot buy fuel and who do not know where to get the money with which to keep themselves warm. Here we are taxing ourselves to the extent of $2,000,000 extra in order to keep coal out of this country. The minister says he is afraid of a monopoly. What is he doing? He is closing one source of supply in the United States; he has closed another source in Russia and now it is suggested that he should close still another source in Great Britain and deliver us into the hands of the Canadian coal producers. This afternoon the minister made reference to an eastern and a western coal combine, but now his proposal is to deliver us into the hands of these combines. If he is afraid of a monopoly why deliver us into their hands?

Then there is another point to be considered. If we were getting in coal from the United States the boats carrying grain down the lakes could bring coal back; they would have a cargo both ways, and the result would be lower freight rates on wheat. But when you prohibit the importation of coal from the United States the boats have to come back light, so they must make enough going down to pay for both trips. The result is higher rates on wheat and higher prices for coal. Because of this legislation the farmers of the western provinces, and particularly the farmers of Saskatchewan, will have to sit at their doors and see trainloads of coal passing by going to the eastern provinces, on which they are paying the freight rates though they get no assistance in connection with their own coal, for which they have to pay the full rate.

The remarks of the minister this afternoon bring up the question as to how far it is the duty of a government to guarantee that industry shall never change. When new methods come into being or new commodities come on the market to compete with those we have been in the habit of using, is it the function or the duty of the government so to arrange things that these new commodities shall not have a chance, by forcing the people to continue to use the old? Let us consider for a moment what would have happened a country whose government always assumed the attitude that they must never allow any change or any progressive thing to happen. What would have happened to a country if, we will say, when printing was first invented they had promptly proceeded to bonus the old fashioned writers in order that the old methods might not be done away with? Supposing when the spinning jenny and loom were invented the same country had promptly proceeded to bonus the old fashioned method of making cloth by hand; what would have happened? What would have been the result if, when matches were invented, they had put a subvention or bounty on the manufacture and use of flint and steel? When steamboats were invented what would have happened if they had started to pay subventions or bounties on boats propelled by oars, or if when railroads were invented, in order to encourage the old industry they had granted subventions on ox carts in order to keep us travelling in that way? When electric lights were invented what would have happened if governments had said, "We will stick to the old tallow candles and force the people to use them"? Where would we be to-day if, when the binder was invented, the government had decided to pay bounties on the old scythes or if, when the thresher was invented, they had decided not to use this modern invention which might throw somebody out of work and had put a bounty on the old fashioned flail? What would have happened if a nation had consistently followed that policy? You may say it could not have happened, because no nation could have survived under those conditions, and that is quite true. Any nation that attempted to do so would have passed on its way long ago, like the mammoth and the dinosaur, and would have been replaced by something more modern.

So I ask the question, Mr. Chairman: Is it the function of the government to preserve the obsolete in industry and say to the people

that no matter what new thing may come along they will see that the existing industry is not harmed? Would it not be much better to say, "If you cannot compete with this new process your industry is out of date and you had better get out of it"? That is the only true law of progress and it is not the function of government to stand in the way of progress and perpetuate the obsolete. It seems to me that the only way to help any industry is to allow it to make progress and expose it to whatever competition the world provides.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Would that be correct with regard to the wheat industry of western Canada?

Mr. YOUNG: Yes.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Then you should have received better prices than you did receive in the past year.

Mr. YOUNG: Are you going to raise prices by your tariffs?

Mr. MACDOUGALL: We have raised them already.

Mr. YOUNG: You put on a duty of thirty cents and the price went lower than ever. For several years past every government in the world has been bending every effort to try to bolster up the price of wheat. The net result of all these efforts has been lower prices than ever. This afternoon I made a motion which I understand was out of order; I moved that this item be struck out entirely. I am now going to make one which is in order; I move that it be reduced to one dollar.

Mr. GORDON: I shall not take up the time of the committee at any great length in connection with this item but I would like to make a few observations on what the hon. member for Weyburn has said with respect to this industry. In the first place, the hon. member advocates the removal of duties on coal and claims that this action would result in Nova Scotia coal being burned in the eastern United States. I suggest that the hon. member look at the prices prevailing in the consuming markets along the Atlantic seaboard in the United States. He will find that it would be impossible for those states to provide a market for Nova Scotia coal. The hon. member then argued that by taking off the tariff the coal from British Columbia could go down to Washington, Utah and other western states and provide a solution for the whole problem.

Mr. YOUNG: No, I did not say that.

[Mr. Young.]

Mr. GORDON: An examination of the cost of producing coal at Bellingham will show that the general costs are much lower than those of British Columbia, including Vancouver island.

Mr. NEILL: The Seattle coal is very inferior.

Mr. GORDON: The Bellingham coal may be inferior but the Utah coal certainly is not. I have reviewed this matter and I feel sure that that market would not be available to us.

I do not know that I would care to quarrel very much with the theory advanced by the hon. member of making every industry and every vocation, public or private, stand upon its own feet and get along without assistance. When time has permitted, I have listened to the debates in this house and I have come to the conclusion that it all depends upon where a man lives or where his interest may be when it comes to deciding to what extent he will stamp with his approval an invasion of the public treasury. I did not hear the hon. member for Weyburn stand up—he may have done it—and deplore the paying of a bonus on wheat.

Mr. YOUNG: He did, though.

Mr. GORDON: If he did, then I compliment him upon his consistency. During the debates which have taken place in this house upon tariffs, bonuses and things of that character, there has been disclosed an attitude of silence by hon. members when such matters touch their particular geographical locality or something in which they are interested.

Mr. YOUNG: I might tell my hon. friend that we have coal deposits in my constituency.

Mr. GORDON: Yes. I understand the Truax Traer property is located in my hon. friend's constituency. We find the hon. member for Comox-Alberni impeaching the government for everything it has done with respect to the assistance given to the coal industry on Vancouver island.

Mr. NEILL: For what they have not done.

Mr. GORDON: I do not expect anything else because that has always been his attitude ever since I have had anything to do with the administration of the Mines department. From year to year I have had occasion to examine into the difficulties facing this industry and, as I have said before, I realize that there is a limit to which the government can go in giving assistance to the coal or any other industry. As I said a moment ago, I am not quarrelling with those who condemn the

bonusing of industries and things of that character, but we must realize that there are industries which are vital to the life of this country, particularly during times like these. If these industries cannot prevail without something more than sympathetic interest on the part of the government, if they are left to get along on their own at a time like this, then I would fear greatly for the tens of thousands of workmen who are dependent upon them for their livelihood. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni has always adopted a consistent attitude with regard to these matters. Perhaps that is his duty, occupying the position he does in this house. I have discussed this question with those most vitally interested, with those who have huge investments on the island and although it may not be the fault of those at present in control of the industry, the fact is that the past history reveals that the expenditures and expansions which have taken place were not to be commended. I have had many conferences with those in control of this industry. Is it possible that they are not interested in their mines? Of course they are. Is it possible that they are not doing their best to make their mines pay? Of course they are. But it is equally true that in common with the rest of the world, Canada's consumption of coal has been going down for almost four years. However, as I said this afternoon, the figures disclose that Canada has not suffered as much as other countries. I had a conference with the operators of Vancouver island over three years ago. They asked for certain assistance which would enable them to maintain their men in employment. That assistance, which may be in definance of the theory advocated by the hon. member for Weyburn, was granted by the government. Unfortunately they did not properly forecast the future, and the consumption of coal fell off. As everyone knows, they again approached the government asking for further assistance and this was granted with respect to bunker and export coal. The export market is mainly in South America because in order to ship in the United States they would have to meet the same duty which we impose. It was the considered view at the time of those in charge of those operations on Vancouver island that the assistance given by the government to those mine owners would enable them to keep their workmen employed and to maintain that industry on its feet. Again consumption fell off and to-day they are having an extremely difficult time.

When I made reference a few weeks ago, when this item was before the committee, to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, I did not do so or intend to do so in a way that would cause him to feel aggrieved; if I did, I am indeed sorry for it. But when this matter was engaging the attention of the Canadian Collieries Limited and myself, I received unsolicited a letter from the general manager. I shall not place it on Hansard, but it was a letter to which I made reference before. In the view of those who are in charge of the coal mining industry on Vancouver island, the efforts of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni were not helpful and they so state in their communication to me. They may be wrong and his efforts may have been very helpful, but that was their opinion. I have it from the producers of coal on Vancouver island that as a result of the assistance which the government has given them, they have been able to keep their miners working at least on part time. It is true that they are having great and serious difficulties.

So far as the importation of British coal is concerned, that has amounted to only some 9,600 tons. That in itself is not of any great importance.

Mr. NEILL: In two months.

Mr. GORDON: Yes. I do not care to dwell on that any further.

Since I have come into the house the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has not dealt with me in any particularly friendly way in connection with any of these coal matters. On almost every occasion, with his facility of expression and his subtlety in debate, he has turned his attack on me and he has never failed, when matters in connection with the coal industry have come up, to go the whole length in condemning anything the government sought to do. I have no doubt this industry and the predicament in which the workers find themselves are close to the heart of the hon. member, but not more so than to my own. I am just as keenly interested as he is in these workmen or in any other workmen in this country who under the stress of the times find it difficult properly to maintain themselves and their families. I do not think there is in the house a member who has not been and is not giving his earnest attention to all these questions which are so baffling; and I do not believe it comes with good grace from the hon. member for Comox-Alberni to arrogate to himself every possible suggestion of sympathy towards those who may be suffering. I listened, of course I had to listen, to his sepulchral address to-night; and he did extremely well, but so far as I am concerned

I intend to continue to pursue the present course, which is that this government, as need arises, will to the best of its ability give such support as it can to the maintenance of the coal mining industry and the miners at work in it.

Mr. YOUNG: I have a suggestion to make to the minister. I want to suggest that he carry his policy to its logical conclusion. He argues that he can increase employment by taking money out of the pockets of the taxpayers and paying it to men to mine coal, when we could get just as good or better coal elsewhere at a lesser price. I have not the slightest doubt that he can take money out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country and pay it to a certain class, thereby keeping that class employed; but what would be the effect on the whole of Canada? Will $2,000,000 in the hands of the coal miners give any more employment? Will it create any more purchasing power when it is in their hands than it would in those of the people from whom the minister takes it? It will not; in fact, that purchasing power will thereby be decreased by $15,000 because it takes $15,000 to distribute that amount.

But if the minister can do that, can he not do this: Let him build a roof over the whole of Canada and shut out the sun, because the sun is the greatest competitor of our coal miners; from the sun we get heat and light free. He could employ every man, woman and child in this country building such a roof and after this was done every Canadian coal miner would be working overtime to keep us warm. In this way the minister would have solved the unemployment problem; but what would be the standard of living of the people of Canada? This is only giving them any kind of useless work the government can invent for them to do. But what we want is fuel to keep us warm, houses to live in, clothes to wear and food to eat. The minister is taking money out of the pockets of the people who need it and who know better than he does how to spend it, and putting it into the pockets of some other people who should be in some other industry. Is it any kindness to any man to keep him engaged in an industry at public expense when that industry will not support itself? Certainly it is not. The man will always have to come to this parliament with his hat in his hand asking for a handout. It is no kindness to a man to maintain an industry on that ground. The minister cannot do better than accept the amendment I have moved that this item be reduced to one dollar.

Amendment (Mr. Young) negatived.

Item agreed to.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Post Office—Outside Service—Salaries and allowances, $15,381,845.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $14,161,500.

Miscellaneous, including $5,000 to provide for payment of compassionate allowance to employees injured while in the performance of their duties or to other persons injured while performing duties in any way connected with the postal service or in protecting His Majesty's mails, or to the dependents of such employees or other persons who may be killed while so engaged, payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, and payment of $205 to S. R. Kirk, $1,076,030.

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask the hon. Postmaster General a question?

(Translation): Would the hon. Postmaster General be so kind as to inform the house whether he has brought a sample of Mr. Amédée Lesieur's rural mail boxes?

Hon. ARTHUR SAUVE (Postmaster General) (Translation): The proper sample to place on the table of the house is this one. I, therefore, deposit a photograph of these boxes.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, this seems to me more like a picture. I shall therefore broach another subject. I shall be brief.

On May 5, 1933, "Le Droit" published the following speech of the hon. Postmaster General, which was also broadcasted, on that date, in Montreal:

All agree that Society and the State have never been so much in need of leaders and organizations directed by men, peace makers, having a true conception of the national spirit and requirements. It is in the hour of need that the country must depend on the patriotism of its citizens.

The Minister continues:

To serve other interests than those of the bonne entente existing among the citizens linked by birth to Canadian traditions, would mean, the prostitution of its fundamental conception and the proclamation of its unworthiness. This entente can only be reached through a correct interpretation of what constitutes mutual respect, right and justice; by contact with one another and congenial means, by mediation well planned, an opportunity well chosen, an honesty of purpose and then with a firmess favourably impressive.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Quite so.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Let us proceed as quickly as possible. I have here a few notes in which are summarized a large num-

ber of questions asked in connection with what transpired at the Post Office Department within the last two years, as well as the answers given. Various means have been resorted to since then, in order to dismiss postmasters.

Proceeding No. 1: The minister as a letter-writer:

Since August 1930, the Post Office department notified 662 postmasters (374 in Quebec and 288 in other parts of Canada) that complaints of political partizanship had been lodged against them. As a consequence of these circulars, only 19 postmasters sent in their resignations (6 from Quebec and 13 from the other provinces). (Order of the House, November 16, 1932. Laid on the table, January 31, 1933. Ref. No. 95; S.P. 207a).

Proceeding No. 2: The minister as a turnkey. Since August 1, 1930, 606 post offices have been closed, 321 new post offices have been opened, of which only 117 met their expenses. Fyle S.P. 164; Ref. 21, November 14, 1932; Hansard, p. 4359, April 19, 1933.

Province—	Closed	Opened
Quebec	133	80
Ontario	71	51
Nova Scotia	123	8
New Brunswick	66	6
Prince Edward Island	4	..
Manitoba	27	14
Saskatchewan	74	51
Alberta	67	86
British Columbia	41	24

(Hansard p. 751, October 31, 1932 and p. 4359, April 19, 1933).

Proceeding No. 3: The minister as a surveyor. 96 postmasters lost their position, in every province, since August 1930, owing to the change of post office sites, ordered by the Postmaster General.

Heading the list:	
Quebec	33
Ontario	4
Nova Scotia	25
New Brunswick	16
Manitoba	2
Saskatchewan	6
Alberta	6
British Columbia	4

April 19, 1933. Ref. No. 109, S.P. 205).

Proceeding No. 4:

The Minister as an inquisitor.

Since August 1930, 287 postmasters were dismissed for political partizanship in Quebec and 235 in the rest of the country (Hansard p. 751, October 31, 1932 and p. 4392, April 20, 1933.)

Since August 1930, 25 employees of the Post Office department have been dismissed for political partizanship in provincial elections.

Quebec	9
Prince Edward Island	1
Alberta	1
Saskatchewan	2
New Brunswick	8
Nova Scotia	4

(S.P. 173, Ref. 94, November 18, 1932.

Since August 1930, in 197 cases a postmaster charged with political partizanship has been replaced temporarily or permamently by the person who made the charge or gave evidence against him. (Hansard, p. 1000, November 8, 1932 and p. 4392, April 20, 1933).

The following is the cost of inquiries for political partizanship since Mr. Bennett assumed power S.P. 148, November 10, 1932.

(a) Throughout the Country, Quebec included

Departments	Number		Amounts	
Agriculture	12		$ 886 90	
Fisheries	2		5 00	
Immigration and Colonization	4		237 74	
Indian Affairs	4		536 22	
Interior	1		20 00	
National Defence	3		248 84	
National Revenue	35		3,742 25	
Pensions and National Health	11		1,583 38	
Public Works	10		976 00*	
Railways and Canals	4		1,133 66	
		86		$ 9,370 08
Marine (Mr. Duranleau)	143		9,431 24	
Post Office (Mr. Sauvé)	519		35,067 81	
		662		44,499 05
Total		748		$53,869 13

* Account still unpaid.

(b) In the province of Quebec only

Departments	Number		Amounts	
Agriculture	6		$ 418 45	
Immigration and Colonization	2		167 08	
Indian Affairs	3		312 51	
National Defence	2		180 04	
National Revenue	9		1,507 56	
Pensions and National Health	2		221 13	
Public Works	9		976 00	
Railways and Canals	2		559 28	
		35		$ 4,342 05
Marine (Mr. Duranleau)	109		6,889 17	
Post Office (Mr. Sauvé)	316		21,026 29	
		425		27,915 46
Total		460		$32,257 51

The minister as a business man.

The last yearly total revenue (gross) of the post offices where inquiries were held in connection with political partizanship of postmasters, since August 1930, amounted to $289,-630.17;—their last yearly net revenue—after deducting salaries of postmasters, allowances and expenditure for mail transportation—was nil (sic). (Order of the House, November 21, 1932.—Laid on the table January 30, 1933. Ref. No. 104; S.P. 203).

The sum of $44,499.05, which is the cost of the inquiries held for political partizanship, has therefore increased the actual deficit of these post offices. Problem: On how many bags of sugar will the tax of $2 have to be paid to cover said amount?

Let us summarize: voluntary resignation or dismissal after receipt of threatening letter, 19; post offices closed, 606; change of site, 96; dismissal for political partizanship, 522. Total of those beheaded since May, 1930, 1,243.

Mr. DUGUAY (Translation): I trust that yours is still on your shoulders.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am luckier than my hon. friend, the member for Lake St. John, because he has no head.

I often heard the hon. Postmaster General state that he was a follower of Macdonald. I hardly can credit this statement because in answer to an inquiry from my hon. friend the member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Thauvette) he said he had dismissed a Mr. Adélard Ménard, of St. Justin Station, who had been appointed by Sir John A. Macdonald. Since he dismisses a postmaster appointed by Sir John A. Macdonald, how can he contend to be his disciple?

I wish to point out another fact. After that we shall examine a very interesting case in which His Majesty, King George V, the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett), the hon. Minister of Pensions (Mr. MacLaren), the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Sauvé) play a part, and also with reference to future appointments by the Civil Service Commission.

I was greatly interested in an article published by a Quebec newspaper, with reference to the different part that was played by the hon. Postmaster General and his predecessor.

The first question I wish to put to the hon. Postmaster General is whether he will state what was the total amount of postal stamps sold in connection with excise?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I understand that the hon. member for Temiscouata has further remarks to make; I shall answer after, if possible, the questions he may ask.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): At present, Sir, I am putting a serious question to the minister, and, in order to proceed with method, we must advance step by step; I need beacons.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

For the last two years the act in connection with excise stamps has been changed. Previously, we were obliged to use special excise stamps; now the act permits us to use postal stamps. I beg of the hon. Postmaster to kindly inform the house what has been the increase in the revenue of his department since the act was changed, namely, since we are allowed to place postal stamps on cheques, promissory notes, etc.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): We have no statistics in that connection, it is impossible to keep any. The quantity of excise stamps sold by the Post Office department is unimportant. The sale of these stamps takes place specially in rural post offices. In Montreal very few excise stamps are sold in post offices. The hon. member has had too much experience and is too anxious to show his good will and intelligence to make such a statement.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The question of stamps is most important. If the hon. Postmaster General had not the sale of stamps under his control he could not show any returns. It becomes a most important question when one contends that the hon. Postmaster General deserves a great deal of credit because he has succeeded in making both ends meet, while I wish to prove to the house that what he has gained in the sale of excise stamps the department of National Revenue has lost. I shall not insist any further as the hon. Postmaster General does not seem willing to answer.

There is another very important question. I know that the hon. Postmaster General will admit that there are now fewer employees in the Post office department. Will the hon. Postmaster General corroborate this statement that there are now fewer employees than in the past?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I did not catch the question.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Will the hon. Postmaster General inform the House whether there are fewer employees now in his department than there were in July 1930?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Since the horizontal cut of 10 per cent, does the Post office department pay less in salaries than in July 1930?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): As the committee is aware, we pay 10 per cent less.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Then, sir, if the hon. Postmaster succeeded in balancing

his budget, this year, it is because, he sells, to affix on cheques and promissory notes, postal stamps which replace excise stamps and that the revenue which the department of National Revenue would receive is now collected by the Post Office department. Secondly, there are fewer employees than in July 1930, and, thirdly, it pays less in salaries. That is why the hon. Postmaster General is able to balance his budget, at present.

Mr. SAUVÉ (Translation): The hon. member is aware that the department, this year, has reduced its expenditure by $1,122,725; he will not deny the fact.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I do not wish to contradict the hon. minister; I simply wish to put questions to him.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): We have reduced expenditure by $1,122,725.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Will the hon. Postmaster General inform the House whether that amount comprises the cut in salaries and the other expenditures?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes, it includes the cut in salaries and the other expenditures.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): What does the cut in salaries amount to and what do the other expenditures also amount to?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member postpone this question until to-morrow; I shall then be in a position to give him these details.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): As long as the hon. minister will give me these details, to-morrow, I shall be quite satisfied. His request is only fair and I shall be very pleased to wait for this information.

The hon. Postmaster General, sir, made a grand speech at the Viger Hotel, on September 9, 1932. I shall read the report of "Le Devoir" of that date. The incident took place after last session and his idea was to explain the change made in the Civil Service Act as it affected the Post Office department. The following is what he stated—he was right, and he told the truth that time:

> The only amendment provides that post offices with a revenue less than $3,000 shall come under the control of the Postmaster General, however it is still stipulated that preference must be given to veterans who, according to the inspector's report, receive 60 per cent or more of the marks for efficiency. It is the new Article 57a of the act as amended.

A very prominent newspaper from Toronto, the "Globe", for which I have great consideration, published the following excerpt, on October 21, 1932:

Mr. Sauvé Still Dumb

Hon. Arthur Sauvé has not yet chosen to tell parliament, the Canadian Legion, or the country at large why he permitted, or perhaps perpetrated, a gross injustice in the case of the Shelburne postmastership.

A war veteran, Mr. James Hill Kennedy, was appointed postmaster at Shelburne after regular examination by the Civil Service Commission. He was later ordered by the Post Office Department to report for duty on a specified date. Naturally, he resigned his civilian job in order to take up his duties at the post office. Mr. Kennedy's employers filled his old position. But two days before the date he had been ordered to start work the Post Office cancelled its instructions. To this day no explanation has been made for the crude actions by Mr. Sauvé's department. A resolution passed by the provincial convention of the Canadian Legion was ignored.

There is, of course, no mystery about the matter to those who know what actually occurred. Mr. Sauvé cannot tell parliament that a war veteran was cheated out of the appointment because the hungry hounds of patronage had once again put decency to flight.

Apparently it is nothing to Mr. Sauvé that the laws of Canada were flouted at Shelburne. Apparently his philosophy is that when the law interferes with machine politics the law should be treated as a mere scrap of paper. Apparently, also, it is a matter of no importance that the lawlessness by the Postmaster General's department not only deprived Mr. Kennedy of his public appointment, but deprived him of his private position as well. At least, Mr. Sauvé has not stopped halfway.

I do not wish to insist, sir, on the Shelburne case which seems very interesting although sad; however, I came across certain information in questions passed as orders for returns on November 2, 1932, and tabled on January 31, 1933, order of the House No. 69 S.P. No 219:

> Returned soldiers who have applied for positions of postmaster since August 1, 1930, 335, of whom 282 were successful, and those appointed number 208.

That means 74 returned soldiers were not given positions or were replaced by civilians. The Sully case is especially an interesting one. It is the case which I alluded to a short while ago where reference is made to His Majesty, George V, the Governor General for Canada, the right hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Pensions and the hon. Postmaster General. I have a number of questions to put to the hon. minister in this respect. The drama comprises a number of scenes. To depict the first scene one would have to go back to the days of the great war; we would have to view, on the walls of the House of Commons, the paintings hanging in the Upper Chamber, the red chamber as the Senate is called. There we witness scenes of Flanders; we discover soldiers in the woods of Flanders; it is on that battlefield that King George V went to raise the spirit of Canadian soldiers

Among them, was to be seen a brave soldier by name, Isidore Jean, who had done his bit in the trenches. He bore the regimental number 2245410. One amongst the hundreds of thousands that were there. When His Majesty, the King of England reviewed the Canadian troops, he smiled on Jean as he passed by, and Jean treasured this gracious act of His Sovereign as a token of good luck. On his return to Canadian soil, Jean reposed his faith in the hon. Postmaster General and the right hon. Prime Minister; this induced him to put in an application for the position of postmaster. His file contains numerous documents:

S.P. 142, March 1, 1932; S.P. 142A, April 4, 1932; S.P. 142B, April 4, 1932; S.P. 172, November 21, 1932; S.P. 172B, March 15, 1933; Total 173 pages.

We shall go no further back than March 15, 1933, because it is the date the last return was tabled. There are so many extraordinary things in that file that I will request the hon. Postmaster General to kindly give us some explanation, shortly. Two candidates aspired for the position of postmaster at Sully, a charming parish located in the county of Temiscouata, close to the borders of New Brunswick and Maine.

Andria Tardif, postmaster (temporarily from January 20, 1932, and permanently since October 20, 1932) is a labourer who has not done his military service. (S.P 142A, p.4). Nothing in the files tabled proves that he has a better education than the veteran Isidore Jean. According to the reply of Mr. Sauvé (Hansard, page 334 October 18, 1932), Jean and Tardif have received the same education.

The only difference is that Tardif is a civilian and Jean a returned soldier. I am not going to repeat the excerpt taken from the speech delivered at Place Viger Hotel, last year, by the hon. Postmaster General. What first strikes us in these returns, after recalling the service of Jean at the front and the solemn statement of the hon. Postmaster General, at the Place Viger Hotel, in Montreal, is that the department replied, on various occasions, to Jean that the appointment would have to be made by the Civil Service Commission.

On October 24, 1931, there was an inquiry held over the charges of political partisanship lodged against the postmaster J-B. Plourde, of Sully.

On November 4, 1931, the Deputy Minister acknowledges receipt of a letter from Mr. Isidore Jean, attached to it were letters of recommendations by the parish priests of Sully and Rivierè-Bleue, which were referrred to the department by the secretary of the Minister of Pensions and in which Mr. Jean applies for the postmastership at Sully. Mr. Gaboury adds:

The recommendations on your behalf have been noted by the department; however, as you are aware, no doubt, the permanent appointment in this case is entirely under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

On November 4, 1931, the Postmaster General submitted to the Governor General in Council a memorandum recommending the dismissal of Mr. Plourde.

On November 10, 1931, Mr. C-E. Dubé, of Rivière-du-Loup, writes to Mr. Sauvé, as follows:

When the appointment is made permanent, should Mr. Jean be chosen by the Commission, I shall conform myself to the decision graciously.

On November 23, 1931, Mr. Gaboury again writes to Mr. Jean:

I have noted your application, however, I must inform you that if a vacancy occurs in that post office, the permanent appointment of the new incumbent will be entirely under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

The deputy minister again reiterates that the appointment is entirely under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. There is something very strange about this matter, sir, and you will hardly be able to repress a smile. On January 20, 1932, Mr. Underwood writes to Mr. Green as follows:

The Postmaster General has authorized the suspension of Mr. J. B. Plourde, postmaster of Sully, who, according to the findings of an inquiry, was guilty of political partisanship during the last Dominion election.

He is found guilty, but he is not punished, he is simply suspended. You will note why he was suspended instead of being punished.

The District Superintendent is instructed to place the office in the temporary charge of Mr. Andrea Tardif, on the usual understanding that his temporary employment will not give him any special claim to the position when it becomes vacant.

The permanent appointment will rest with the Civil Service Commission.

Another official of the Post Office department repeats the same thing. May I inquire, sir, from the Postmaster General why the previous postmaster, after being found guilty, was simply suspended instead of being dismissed?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I first wish to state that when I said that the Sully case came under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. I simply stated the truth. The hon. member for Témiscouata well recalls the fact that in the course of last session an amendment to the Civil Service Act was adopted by the house, placing under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General all post offices with revenues not exceeding $3,000 per

year; the Sully post office came, therefore, under the jurisdiction of the Postmaster General. It is then, acting under representations made by citizens of Témiscouata, also of Sully, with reference to Mr. Jean, I authorized the Inspector General of post offices—not the local inspector—to examine the candidate, Mr. Jean, and a report was received that he had not the required education and qualifications to fill the post of postmaster. That is why he was not appointed postmaster.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is not the question that I put to the minister. He goes much further than my question, he robs me of the facts of my case. I wish to inquire from the minister why Mr. Plourde, the late postmaster was suspended and not dismissed. There are 1,200, 1,300 or 1,500 postmasters who were dismissed. I wonder why Mr. Plourde was suspended instead of being dismissed. That is the direct question which I put and I should like to have some explanation from the minister.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The reason was, it was asserted, that the inquiry held by Mr. Achille Jolicoeur, on October 24, 1931, was not complete. It was pointed out that certain charges had not been proved against the accused, namely, that the postmaster had participated in a political triumph, in 1931; that he had made use of his official position to actively favour the liberals. It was asserted that these charges had not been proved against him.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is not satisfactory. Does the hon. Postmaster General assert that he did not take an immediate decision with reference to Plourde? Does he contend that he suspended Plourde without finding him guilty? We have here a letter from Mr. Underwood to Mr. Green which states:

> The Postmaster General has authorized the suspension of Mr. J. B. Plourde, postmaster of Sully, who, according to the findings of an inquiry held, was guilty of political partisanship during the last Dominion election.

He was found guilty and suspended. Why did he suspend Plourde after finding him guilty? Did this happen in many cases?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I have no further details. If there are others I shall be very pleased to give them to-morrow to the hon. member.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is my second question. I would request the two officials here assisting the hon. Postmaster General to kindly make a note of the information required as I have no doubt that the hon. minister will endeavour to answer my questions, to-morrow.

On November 4, 1931, the hon. Postmaster General submitted his memorandum to the council, to the effect that Plourde had been found guilty of political partisanship. Why did the Postmaster General not get immediately in touch with the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I beg pardon, I did not quite catch the hon. member's question.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): On November 4, the hon. Postmaster General submitted his memorandum to the council, to the effect that Plourde had been found guilty of political partisanship. Why did the Postmaster General not get in touch with the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member for Témiscouata will admit that we have not only one case to deal with in a department where there are over 12,000 postmasters. Naturally, we seek our information from the various officials, either inspectors or district superintendents. We are obliged to consult these officials, heads of districts, previous to arriving at a definite decision.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is so, however, on the other hand, I wrote to the secretary of the hon. minister on April 25, to request him to produce certain returns, and I added: "Moreover, the day the hon. Postmaster General submits his estimates, kindly request him to bring to the house all the returns relating to postmasters of the county of Témiscouata, especially those of Sully, Notre-Dame-du-Lac and St. Arsène."

To-day we are discussing the Sully affair. The hon. Postmaster General knew that I would bring up this matter. We wish to find out how his department is managed and whether a uniform policy is followed in connection with postmasters. It should be an easy matter for the hon. minister to give me an answer without obliging his officials to work all night in order to concoct an answer for the following day. It seems to me that the hon. minister who was notified that we would discuss these cases to-day, should be ready to pass the test and answer the questions submitted to him. He should be in a position to justify his acts from A to Z.

Is the minister going to reply or will he have an answer prepared by others, for to-morrow, to the third question which I put to him and to which he gave no satisfactory answer—he admitted, himself, that he was unable to give an answer.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall give every explanation possible.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Plourde was found guilty of political partisanship; he was suspended. Why was he not dismissed? The answer is very clear, it is because one of the candidates to the position, a person by the name of Jean, was a returned soldier, and the hon. Postmaster General did not care to submit the case to the Civil Service Commission, because he feared that Jean would be appointed in preference to Tardif. That is why he did not notify the Civil Service Commission of the vacancy existing in that post office. If Mr. Plourde was suspended instead of being dismissed, it is because the hon. Postmaster General did not wish to submit the case to the Civil Service Commission. He will have no need of replying to this question to-morrow; that is the answer he would have given, had he answered candidly and sincerely this evening.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sullivan) (Translation): I would request the hon. member to withdraw the words he has just uttered.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, what are the words I have uttered and which you find unparliamentary?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sullivan) (Translation): The last words uttered by the hon. member are unparliamentary.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): What are those words?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sullivan) (Translation): Ask the stenographer to read them.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall tell him, sir. I contend that I am not a dishonest man and it is not the member for Témiscouata who can tarnish my reputation here this evening.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If my utterances are not parliamentary, I withdraw them graciously. I will say: that is the answer which the hon. Postmaster General would have given had he taken the trouble of examining the returns before coming to the house. Is that not parliamentary, sir?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member for Témiscouata accepted my offer, namely, that I would furnish him with all information to-morrow. Why does he further insist? Is it to insult me?

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Poor martyr! Aurora, the child martyr!

Mr. LARUE (Translation): Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I shall say something very unpleasant to the member for Matane (Mr. Larue) if he persists. I shall put him in his place, it will not take long.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): Very well, fire away.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): First, I shall point out, Sir, that I had no intention to tarnish the reputation of the hon. Postmaster General. I never had that intention no more than to show disrespect for the rules of the House; however, we are entitled to know what is transpiring at the Post Office Department, and it is not because a member, whose voice is never heard, pounds the cover of his desk that I shall desist.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): That desk cover may, perhaps, have more intelligence than the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I shall be very lenient towards the hon. member, because it is his maiden speech.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): That is not so. Silence is more impressive than your utterances.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): We shall have to deprive him of his nipple: "Baby wants his Castoria."

Mr. LARUE (Translation): I would prefer to have a nipple than to show a lack in intelligence.

Mr. COTNAM (Text): Address the chair.

Mr. POULIOT (Text): I am speaking to the chair all the time.

(Translation): On January 30, 1932, Mr Gaboury writes to Mr. Jean:

I am instructed by the hon. Mr. Sauvé to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of the 29th renewing your request to be appointed postmaster of Sully.

May I state in reply that the arrangements made are of a temporary nature and that the permanent appointment comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Gaboury again reiterated to Mr. Jean, returned soldier, that the permanent appointment came under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission and this took place in January, 1932.

Pursuant to the usual practice, this vacancy will be advertised in the near future, at Sully, the applications of candidates should reach the office of the Postal District Administrator of Quebec within the time limit specified on the notice.

On February 1, 1932, Mr. Green, Postal Superintendent, writes to Mr. Underwood:

Postmaster Plourde of Sully suspended. Departmental authority 20th January asks transfer to Andrea Tardif be deferred pending discussion of partisanship with Postmaster General. Stop. Are we to proceed nevertheless?

On February 1, 1932, replies to Mr. Green:

With reference to his telegram of the 1st February the District Superintendent is requested to proceed with the temporary transfer of the Sully post office to the charge of Mr. Andrea Tardif as instructed.

Document 172, November 21, 1932: On May 18, 1932, an order in council (P.C. 1178) dismissed J. B. Plourde as postmaster, four months after being suspended, on January 20, 1932, in order that the case might not be submitted to the Civil Service Commission.

Hansard contains the following, page 3413, May 20, 1932:

Mr. Pouliot (Translation): I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General a question in connection with the Sully post office. I have been told that the postmaster in charge there had not been dismissed but suspended. I would like to know whether the hon. Postmaster General intends reinstating Mr. Jean-Baptiste Plourde as postmaster at Sully?

Mr. Sauvé (Translation): I understand a returned soldier by the name of Jean is a candidate. His name is before the Commission.

Note.—I am addressing myself directly to you Sir—that the hon. Postmaster General stated on May 20, 1932, that the name of Jean was before the commission.

Mr. Pouliot (Translation): I would also ask the hon. Postmaster General and if his answer is favourable that will be my last question in connection with this file, if the Commission is aware of the vacancy, if the Commission published the necessary notices so that the appointment of the postmaster be made with the least possible delay.

Mr. Sauvé (Translation): Certainly.

On June 1, 1932, that is ten days later, Mr. Foran, Secretary to the Civil Service Commission, writes to Jean-François Pouliot, M.P.:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated the 30th of last month—

Ten days after the hon. Postmaster General had made his statement in the House.

—and in reply I wish to state that the Postmaster General did not request the Civil Service Commission to fill the vacancy in the post office at Sully.

That is the hon. Postmaster General states in the House, on May 20, that the name of Jean is before the commission, and on June 1, ten days later the secretary of the Civil Service Commission states that the name of Jean was never submitted to the commission. Why did the hon. Postmaster General not state in the House, on May 20, 1932, that Jean-Baptiste Plourde had been dismissed by an order in council, two days before, instead of leaving the House under the impression that he was still suspended? I beg of the hon. minister to explain.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): If I gave that answer, at the time, it is because I had not the information mentioned by the hon. member. Sometimes, an official information in the department only reaches the minister a few days after it is received. I had no intention to induce the hon. member in error, he may be certain of that. I gave the information which I had at the time.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Why did the hon. Postmaster General state, in the house, on May 20, 1932: "I understand that there is a candidate by the name of Jean, who is a returned soldier." His name is "before the commission" since the secretary of the commission admitted that the hon. Postmaster General had not requested the Civil Service Commission to fill the vacancy of postmaster at Sully for which Mr. Jean had put in an application?

I would ask the hon. Postmaster General whether Mr. Foran, the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, lied or whether Mr. Foran told the truth when he stated that the name of Mr. Jean had never been submitted to the commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am not called upon to state whether Mr. Foran is a liar or whether he states the truth. What I state is that when I made this statement, I was so informed and I had no intention to mislead the house at the time, because my statement was based on the information received, on the notice received. I had been notified that the name of Mr. Jean was before the commission. If it were not, in no way did I interfere.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Would the hon. Postmaster General inform the committee who told him that the name of Mr. Jean was before the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The officials of the department I presume. The incident took place over a year ago, surely the hon. member will not urge that I should remember the names, because there are numerous officials, numerous persons who communicate with the minister.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General, I presume, does not contend that Mr. Foran did not tell the truth when he stated that the name of Mr. Jean had never been submitted to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I do not wish to accuse Mr. Foran, I would not want to show discourtesy towards him.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I have no doubt as to the hon. Postmaster General's great courtesy.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am not in the habit of doing so.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I do not doubt that the hon. Postmaster General is the essence itself of politeness; however, I wish to put the question in another way: Does the hon. Postmaster General state to the committee that Mr. Foran for one reason or another, perhaps with the very best intentions, did not state the truth when he said that the case was never submitted to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): That is not what I mean.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): On May 24, the hon. Postmaster General had, however, written to the member for Temiscouata, the following letter:

> Your letter of May 21, received in connection with the post office at Sully. I wish to inform you that the question of the permanent appointment of the new postmaster is now under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. I issued orders to advise the commission to that effect.

That is, four days after the statement which the hon. Postmaster General had given to the house and the country, he wrote to me personally that he had issued orders to submit the question to the Civil Service Commission.

On what date, sir, did the hon. postmaster issue such orders? Has the hon. minister that date before him?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member must have it.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I have not the file, I have only the returns tabled in the house. It is quite different.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member will recognize that it is impossible to bring all the files of the department in case questions might be asked. There are more than one file.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is not what I alluded to. I say that I wish to have the complete returns in connection with Sully, Notre-Dame-du-Lac and another which I mentioned in a letter. The hon. Postmaster General has no excuse for not having these returns here, inasmuch as his secretary gave me to understand that these returns would be brought down.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): What secretary.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I have no complaints to make against the secretary. I simply state what transpired between the Post Office Department and myself. When the hon. member for Berthier Maskinonge (Mr. Barrette) becomes a minister, we shall also have questions to put to him.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Thank you.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is quite possible.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Or Senator.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Or Senator. Immediately after prorogation, I shall request that favour for the hon. member.

Mr. ST. PERE (Translation): What luck!

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Was the order issued by the hon. Postmaster General transmitted to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): What order?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The order to submit the case of the Sully post office.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Probably.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Probably! That is not what Mr. Foran says. He states that he never heard of it.

On May 31, 1932, Mr. Coolican notifies Mr. Plourde that he is dismissed. Yet, Mr. Plourde, suspended since the preceding autumn, was not notified before May 31 of his dismissal.

On June 12, 1932, Mr. Jean wrote to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett):

> I have a letter from you, dated October 5, 1931, which informs me quite clearly that as regards the application in question, returned soldiers have a preference over all other candidates, pursuant to the Act. I depend on your kindness for protection.

This is a letter bearing the heading of the Prime Minister's Office and dated Ottawa, October 5, 1931. In the left corner, there are the following words: (Text) To be brought to the minister's attention please. (Sgd) A. W. Merriam, Private Secretary.

(Translation)

Mr. Isidore Jean,
Sully, Témiscouata, P.Q.

Evidently a copy was forwarded to the Postmaster General.

Dear Sir,

I am instructed by the Prime Minister to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated September 25.

You are aware no doubt that the position of postmaster comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. The vacancy for such positions are announced by the Commission and the candidates must address their requests within the limit of time specified in the notice. Returned soldiers are always given preference over other candidates, pursuant to the Act.

The Prime Minister confirms exactly what the hon. Postmaster General stated himself, and which is, moreover, perfectly true.

I would therefore suggest that you address yourself directly to the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, at Ottawa and the Postmaster General, who has complete juridiction over his department.

At all events, I am immediately forwarding your request to him.

Sincerely yours.

(Signed) A. W. Merriam,
Private Secretary.

Fyle 142B.
April 4, 1932.

So that the attitude taken by the Prime minister's secretary on the former's instructions, was perfectly correct. He informed Mr. Jean of two things: the first, was that returned soldiers were given preference, and, the second, that these appointments were under the control of the Civil Service Commission.

Let us see what happened. At the request of the right hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Postmaster General appointed Mr. Jean, returned soldier. On June 21, 1932, Mr. Merriam wrote to Mr. Sauvé:

(Text) The Prime Minister has directed me to forward to you the attached letter addressed to him by Mr. Isidore Jean and which is self explanatory.

Mr. Bennett has promised to bring it to your immediate attention.

(Translation)

Here we have the Prime Minister who instructs his private secretary to write to his colleague, the hon. Postmaster General, and cites the case of Jean, returned soldier, which is self explanatory. And the secretary adds that the Prime Minister has promised to bring the case to the immediate attention of the Postmaster General.

On June 30, 1932, reply of the hon. Postmaster General to Mr. Merriam:

I duly received your communication of the 21st of June enclosing a letter from Mr. Isidore Jean, returned soldier, who has applied for appointment to the vacancy at Sully, P.Q.

As the Civil Service Act gives preference to returned soldiers in the matter of these appointments, I have given instructions for the transfer of the Sully post office to the charge of Mr. Isidore Jean.

That was very good. It was done under the personal instruction of the Prime Minister himself, given through his secretary.

On June 30, 1932, Mr. Underwood notifies Mr. Green, Post Office Superintendent, at Quebec, of the resignation of Mr. J.-B. Plourde and the appointment of Isidore Jean, returned soldier.

On July 2, 1932, Mr. Green writes to Mr. Tardif to notify him of the appointment of Mr. Jean. The same day Mr. Green writes to Mr. Jean:

I have received instructions to put you in charge of the post office at Sully, county of Témiscouata.

I would ask you to inform me when you will be ready to take charge of the post office, so that an inspector of the Postal service may be sent to effect the transfer.

The preceding letter is very important. On July 4, 1932—this letter also is very important—Mr. Jean replies to Mr. Green:

In reply to your letter of the 2nd inst., relating to the transfer of the post office at Sully, county of Témiscouata, I shall be ready to take charge of it on July 9 of this week.

Then, this recommendation of June 30, is confirmed, Mr. Jean is notified by the superintendent of Post Office of his appointment, the letter inquires when he will be able to take charge of the post office, and Mr. Jean replies: I shall be ready at the end of the week. What happened? On July 4, 1932, the Postmaster General writes to Mr. C. E. Dubé:

As you are aware, the recent amendment to the Civil Service Act, places that post office (Sully) under the jurisdiction of the department, however, at the same time, it strictly instructs the department to give preference to veterans of the Great War.

In connection with the Sully case, there is on fyle an application of Mr. Isidore Jean and as the latter seems sufficiently qualified...

The minister finds him qualified.

I cannot do otherwise than to authorize his appointment conforming to the stipulations in the Act. I have given instruction to that effect and the transfer will take place in the course of the present month.

All is well, up to then; but the hon. Postmaster General is like Louis XIV, who said: "I feel two men in me." "There is the good man and then there is the bad man. I have just referred to the good one, and the other, it is not precisely the bad one, it is the easy led one, one who has not the back bone to put his foot down and resist people who wish to lead him astray." He thinks that it is not the proper thing to do, and intends to resist. He sides with one and then another, finally he finds himself in a mess.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): He is a good fellow.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Nevertheless, here is an important statement made in the presence of the minister to the effect that Jean is sufficiently qualified. It is very important. Two days later, after the letter Mr. Sauvé had written on July 4, 1932, something very strange happened, and a memorandum from the Postmaster General to his Deputy Minister is discovered:

(Text) Re Sully. Please suspend all action towards transfer to Isidore Jean pending further instructions.

(Translation): He also is suspended; it is the post office of suspension: Mr. Plourde, the ex-postmaster is suspended; Mr. Jean is appointed, he also is suspended; everybody connected with that post office is suspended.

Why has Mr. Sauvé suddenly decided to suspend all action towards the transfer of the post office to Isidore Jean, contrary to the Civil Service Act and the recommendation of the Prime Minister?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I wish to thank the hon. member for Temiscouata for his last kind words. He will admit that I acted in good faith, that I wish to give to the returned soldier Jean all his possible rights. I recognized that he should be given preference. However, as to his qualifications he did not fulfil the necessary requirements, since later on, the inspector of the department reported that he was not qualified. However, my desire was to appoint him and the hon. member has well brought out that point. If he was not appointed after all the means I took to do so, it is because, I repeat it, people with a serious turn of mind, of whom some are known to the hon. member, made representations to me, asserting that the returned soldier Jean was not sufficiently educated or qualified to hold that post. Furthermore I did not rely only on the reports of the district inspectors to obtain my information, but I sent the Chief Inspector, Mr. Fortier, who is well known on both sides of the house for his qualifications in such matters, in order to ascertain whether the returned soldier Jean was qualified to take charge of the post office at Sully. The report, I repeat, was not favourable to Jean, and I therefore acted accordingly.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The hon. Postmaster, sir, is again robbing me of my statement; he is in too great a hurry. All that I wish to find out from the minister is what happened between July 4, the date of the appointment of Jean, and July 6, the day he suspended Jean, and why he suspended him before receiving the report of Mr. Fortier, to whom he referred just now?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): After the representations made to me, I wished to find out, before putting him in charge of the post office, whether he had the necessary qualifications.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Then, why did the hon. Postmaster General write to Mr Dubé, on July 4, 1932, as follows:

As the latter seems sufficiently qualified, I cannot do otherwise than authorize his appointment, pursuant to the stipulations in the Act.

The hon. Postmaster General has a too serious turn of mind to state of a candidate that he is sufficiently qualified when he is not.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): That was my opinion at the time.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): But that opinion must have been based on some fact?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The chief inspector convinced me to the contrary by his report. I was first of the opinion that he was qualified and I therefore wished to be fair to Jean—not only conform myself to the act but also be fair towards him. And the hon. member proved this point just now. It was only after representations were made to me by persons from Temiscouata, stating that they knew well the returned soldier Jean, the hon. member and the people of that beautiful county, that I thought it proper to send the Chief Inspector. That covers the whole case.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is, at the time the hon. minister suspended the transfer to Jean, he had no knowledge yet whether Jean was sufficiently qualified or not, and when he wrote that Jean seemed sufficiently qualified he was hesitating what action to take. Is that what the hon. Postmaster General wishes to convey?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No that is not what I mean—hesitating what action to take. My intentions were of the best, only, when I stated that I thought him qualified, I was in good faith, I really thought he was.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Why did the hon. Postmaster General cease to think so, two days after?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): It was because the Chief Inspector had reported that he was not.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The report of the Chief Inspector is dated July 22, and this took place on July 6, 16 days before. The

hon. Postmaster General could not guess what the report would contain before the Chief Inspector had interviewed Jean, at Sully.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Previous to July 22, I repeat it, representatives were made to me and the hon. member for Temiscouata is aware of the fact—

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am not aware of it.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): —that representations were made by persons worthy of belief and respectable, it was then that doubt must have entered my mind as to his qualifications; it was also at that time that I decided to send the Chief Inspector.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Since they were persons worthy of belief and respectable, I hope the hon. Postmaster General will have no objection to giving their names.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Among others, Mr. Dubé, mayor of Rivière-du-Loup, a candidate at the last election, who is a highly thought of gentleman, enjoying the confidence of the citizens of the county of Temiscouata —and the hon. member has often borne witness to this fact.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): It is not a question of discussing the personal qualities of an individual, the point is to find out how this affair happened. Now, we know. The cat was let out of the bag. The fact is that the minister, after writing to Mr. Dubé, on July 4, 1932, that he had decided to appoint Mr. Jean because he was a returned soldier and sufficiently qualified, after receiving a letter or telégram from Mr. Dubé, on July 6, to the effect that he should not be appointed, suspends him. I wish to thank the Postmaster General for his explanations. They are perfectly satisfactory. I was aware that those were the means resorted to, however, they were not on file. The moment the hon. Postmaster General completes the returns by his explanations, I am quite satisfied.

On July 6, 1932, telegram from Mr. Coolican to Mr. Green:

(Text) Re Sully: Suspend action on transfer to Isidore Jean. Wire reply.

That was most pressing, things had to be done by telegrams.

On July 6, telegram from Mr. Green to Mr. Coolican:

(Text) Re Sully: Transfer will be deferred as directed.

Things are moving fast. The Chief Inspector of the Post Office department is more exacting than the Postmaster General. The Chief Inspector in going to Sully had a duty to fulfil. He thought: I shall do my duty conscientiously. That is, I shall see that Jean fails, I shall follow my orders. He had received instructions before leaving Ottawa. That he had received instructions, is less astonishing to me, because the minister heretofore has explained what transpired.

Since August 1930, the Chief Inspector of the Post Office department has received instructions, in only two cases, to verify the qualifications of candidates applying for positions of postmaster, and in each of these cases, it had reference to returned soldiers residing in the province of Quebec. He reported on the case of Isidore Jean, of Sully, on July 22, 1932, and on that of L.-A. Champagne, of Action Vale, on July 28, 1932 (Hansard October 31, 1932, and November 8, 1932.)

I shall now point out to the hon. Postmaster General how very sad it is to note that the people who are ill treated by his department are French Canadians from Quebec and moreover, returned soldiers.

The only two candidates that were ill-treated, in the whole of Canada, are two French Canadian returned soldiers of Quebec, whom he had examined by the Chief Inspector of his department and, with special instructions to see that they failed in their examination for the position of postmaster.

I think that it is most regrettable. As a French Canadian it rouses me. I repeat it, I think it pitiless.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Do not laugh at it yourself!

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That does not prevent me to state that I think it is, nevertheless, very sad.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Do not shed tears.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. M. H. Fortier, Chief Inspector, contends that Mr. Jean is not educated enough to take charge of the post office, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Sauvé had written to Mr. C. E. Dubé, on July 4, 1932, that Mr. Jean seemed to him sufficiently qualified. (Letter cited on page 39 of returns).

Report from Mr. Green to Mr. Sauvé, February 20, 1933.

Upon receipt of his appointment Mr. Jean... further hired the services of Miss Irene D'Auteuil, a clerk in a local store, who for that reason lost the former position and could not secure employment since and is living with the Jean family.

(Translation): No answer from the minister. On July 26 Mr. Green writes to Mr. Sauvé:

Re Sully, P.Q.: With reference to departmental letter of the 30th ultimo, appointing Mr. Isidore Jean to the postmastership of the above named post office, the District Superintendent quotes hereunder a telegram, received yesterday, from Mr. Isidore Jean:

(Translation)

Will you be kind enough to inform me whether there has been any change since you notified me to prepare the post office? It has been ready for the last three weeks.

(Text): This telegram was not acknowledged. That is, Mr. Jean had been appointed postmaster of the post office at Sully; Mr. Green notified him and asked to be informed when he would be ready. Mr. Jean answers: I shall be ready. No news. Mr. Jean again writes and Mr. Green notifies the Postmaster General that he did not answer him. Most likely Mr. Green expects an increase in salary for his action.

In his report, July 20, 1932, the chief inspector of the Post Office Department states that he examined Mr. Jean and the Post office in charge of Mr. Tardif.

First, is it true that Mr. Tardif attends to the post office himself? I am putting the question to the minister.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member for Témiscouata was entirely satisfied of my answers just now. Does he wish to start over again?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General replies differently, while I proceed step by step. Mr. Fortier, the chief inspector of the Post Office Department states that he submitted Mr. Jean to a test and that he examined the post office in charge of Mr. Tardif. What I now wish to know is whether Mr. Tardif, himself, attends to the post office.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I believe that he attends the post office himself, because the chief inspector reports on his administration and states that he is quite qualified to carry on.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is not what the inspector states; he said that the post office was well taken care of. That does not mean that it is Tardif who attends to it. I wonder whether Tardif is really in charge.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I believe so.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Was it Tardif who did the work?

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am certain, because Tardif is the postmaster.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General has been misinformed. The minister requires from Mr. Jean the "necessary qualifications to personally attend, efficiently, to the post office affairs." (Letter from the Deputy Minister to Mr. Jean, November 17, 1932, S.P. 172-B, P. 24).

Why did the Postmaster General not give instructions to the chief inspector to also make a complete report on the qualifications of Mr. Tardif, like in Mr. Jean's case? Did the chief inspector put Miss Irène d'Auteuil to a test? He makes no statement on her qualifications.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member for Témiscouata is a brilliant lawyer, an author, and he knows perfectly well that it is Mr. Tardif who is responsible for the administration of the post office at Sully.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am pleased, sir, to hear that Mr. Tardif is responsible for the administration of that post office. However, he is not the one who attends to it; he hardly knows how to read or write.

Moreover, it is not a question as to whether they hold a university degree or are doctors, both are poor country folks who have had an elementary education, and the only difference between them is that one went to the war and the other did not; therefore, the Postmaster General acted contrary to the Act. That is all what the returns show. Now, the Postmaster General feels uneasy. On July 28, 1932, Mr. Underwood writes to Mr. Green:

Was the transfer stopped by telegram or by correspondence, and will the District Superintendent please send to the department a copy of the telegram or communication forwarded to Mr. Jean, as well as a copy of any correspondence you may have received from Mr. Jean in reply.

Their conscience began to prick them; things did not seem above board, everything was going wrong.

On July 29, 1932. Mr. Green replies to the minister:

When the Assistant-Deputy Postmaster General's telegram was received, on the 7th of July, Postal Inspector Beauchamp was on his way to make the transfer. He was reached by telephone at St. Pascal and told to defer proceeding to Sully; and, that is all. Nothing was written to Mr. Jean other than our memorandum of the 2nd July.

This happened when he had been informed that he was appointed postmaster and had prepared himself.

On July 30, 1932, Mr. Green writes to the Postmaster General:

With reference to our memorandum of yesterday's date, I have to advise that Mr. Isidore Jean has just been in this office and inquired, respecting the telegram, as to when he is to get the office and was told that the matter was under consideration at Ottawa.

Jean had already been appointed since July 4, he wanted information. No news! This letter was written one week after the Chief Postal Inspector had found that Mr. Jean's education was lacking, and twenty-six days after Mr. Sauvé had written to Mr. Dubé that he thought Mr. Jean sufficiently qualified. On October 4, 1932, the acting deputy minister wrote to the member for Témiscouata:

Re Sully: The Chief Postal Inspector was recently instructed to examine the qualifications of Mr. Isidore Jean, a veteran of the great war, who is a candidate for the position of postmaster at Sully.

According to the report of this official, Mr. Jean has not the necessary qualifications to properly take charge of the administration of this post office and would have to depend on his assistants.

Under the circumstances, in making the appointment, at Sully, the minister intends to leave in charge the present incumbent, against whom there are no complaints.

Would it not be fitting to have a chief inspector of ministers, who would judge their qualifications to these high offices and who could make a thorough investigation of the Post Office department itself, reporting to the Canadian Press.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): That is not included in the report.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): No, it is a passing comment which I am making—it is a note at the foot of the page.

On October 17, 1932, the Rev Mr. David Roussel, parish priest of Sully, wrote to the hon. Postmaster General:

Mr. Isidore Jean, of Sully, has the necessary qualifications to take charge of the post office.

During all that time Jean remained under the impression that he was postmaster, he had been preparing himself.

On October 20, 1932, the deputy minister replied to the parish priest the Rev. Mr. Roussel:

At the request of the hon. Mr. Sauvé, I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated October 17, recommending Mr. Isidore Jean for the position of postmaster at Sully. In reply I wish to state that your representation on his behalf have been noted.

They were so well noted that the same day, October 20, 1932, a memorandum was sent to the general superintendent, as follows:

Go ahead with permanent nomination at Sully, Mr. Tardif as postmaster.

(Sgd.) L. J. Gaboury.

Instructions were forwarded on the same day by Mr. Underwood to Mr. Green. Eight days later, October 28, 1932, Mr. Jean writes to Mr. Sauvé:

It is very strange indeed, that after preparing the post office four months ago, I am still waiting for the transfer.

The other person had been appointed but Jean was unaware of the fact.

After being found qualified and relying on your promise, I firmly believe that you will keep your word. After the numerous outlays to which you have put me—being very poor. To answer my country's call, I have given the best of my strength and courage and, then, when the question of reward comes up, I am forsaken. After giving your word, I do not think that the absurd fancies of a few persons will change your mind. Anxiously waiting. Please have the transfer made.

My last letters remained unanswered, I would therefore request you to reply to this one.

Three weeks later, the deputy minister notifies Mr. Jean—at the request of Mr. Sauvé—that the Postmaster General found it necessary to make another appointment. From June 30, to October 20, 1932, the returned soldier Isidore Jean was postmaster, at Sully, without, however, performing his duties or drawing a cent of salary; on the other hand, he was only notified on November 17 last that the post office would not be transferred to his house.

That is, from June 30, to November 17, he was put to considerable expense in order to take over the post office.

Mr. MERCIER (Translation): Was he reimbursed for the expenses incurred?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I do not know. We shall soon learn.

Since section 10 chapter 40 of the Act, 1932, has been passed, to the effect that the provisions of the Civil Service Act—with the exception of the preference to be granted to returned soldiers—are not applicable to positions of postmaster whose post offices do not show a yearly revenue exceeding $3,000, the appointment to these positions are no more made by the Civil Service Commission, neither are the dismissals by order in council, pursuant to section 52 of the Civil Service Act. Does the department interpret the terms of the Act as meaning net or gross revenue of post offices?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): How?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Does the department interpret the Act which places post offices whose yearly revenue does not exceed $3,000 under the control of the Postmaster General, according to the net or gross revenue of these post offices? Must a post office bring

in a net revenue of $3,000 to come under the jurisdiction of the minister in connection with appointments and dismissals or is it only a gross revenue of $3,000 that supplies the basis?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Net revenue.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That means more post offices.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): And a well dusted post office.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Can the hon. Postmaster General prove that Tardif is better educated than the returned soldier Jean and, if so, on what does he base himself?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I rely on the report of the Inspector General.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The Inspector makes no mention of it.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Nowhere does he refer to the personal qualification of Mr. Tardif. I shall send over the report to the minister and if he finds in that report something to that effect—

I shall read the whole report:

Ottawa, July 22, 1932.

Conforming with oral instructions received I proceeded to Sully, last week, in order to find out whether Mr. Isidore Jean, returned soldier, and a candidate, had the required qualifications to fill the position of postmaster of the post office herein under mentioned.

Mr. Jean informed me that he had no experience in office work, his occupation having always been that of a labourer. At present he is employed as sexton in the church here. I prepared a simple test consisting of addition and multiplication problems, and I ascertained that Mr. Jean, who left school at the age of 12, found it very difficult to solve these problems. After working almost five minutes to add seven amounts varying from $8.72 to $973.11, I found that his addition was wrong.

As to the multiplication test Mr. Jean found it difficult to multiply 13 by 10. He informs me that should he be appointed he would secure the help of his sister in law, Miss Irène Dauteuil, 17 years old, who, up to 10 months ago, was a domestic servant. Since then she has been employed in a general store, at Sully. Her occupation, however, consists in selling goods; she has never had any experience in bookkeeping or office work.

Owing to the little education of Mr. Jean, most of the important office work, such as making up cash accounts, statements in connection with post office orders and probably also issuing cheques, would have to be done by the assistant. He, therefore, cannot be considered as qualified for the position of postmaster and the result of the test shows that he would be unable to verify the work of his assistant and could not discover errors which might be made through negligence or otherwise on the part of his assistant.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

I took advantage of my visit to Sully to examine how the post office is kept by Mr. Tardif, and I can state that I found everything in good order.

He, however, does not state that it was Tardif that kept it that way or that he was qualified. That is, it was Tardif's wife who was responsible for the good order of the post office. The report was concocted to prevent Jean from being appointed and have Tardif take his place. It is shameful that the Postmaster General should stoop to persecute such unfortunate people of the province of Quebec.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member stated that there was no report against Jean; that is one.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is not what I stated. I inquired on what the hon. minister based himself to state that Tardif was better educated than Jean.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation) All is included in the report: Jean is not qualified and cannot take charge of the post office; the other is in charge of the post office and no complaint is made that his post office is badly administered. I therefore, concluded that he was better fitted for the post than the other.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): He is a sexton recommended by the parish priest.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Jean?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Yes; he is a sexton recommended by the parish priest.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If Jean found it difficult to solve the problems which were set for him by Fortier, it is possible that Tardif would have been unable to find that 2 and 2 make 4.

On November 16, 1932, Mr. Jean writes to His Excellency the Governor general that the department refuses to reimburse him the large amount he spent and for which they were responsible since they had made him prepare premises for a post office. On December 27, Mr. Sauvé writes to Mr. Jean that His Excellency the Governor general forwarded to him his letter of December 16 in connection with the position of postmaster at Sully. He adds:

As to the question of reimbursing you for the outlay you made in preparing premises for the post office, I wish to state that if you will forward a detailed account of this outlay, I shall see what can be done.

Now, the postmaster general was disposed to look into the matter.

Mr. Jean writes to His Majesty the King George V:

I beg of your Majesty to see that justice is done to me, and you will have an opportunity of discovering how brutally the Canadian government treated me.

He now places his grievance at the foot of the Throne.

Hoping Honourable Majesty, that you will take an interest in my case as you did when you visited our regiment.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Did he write that?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Certainly, he wrote that. He is far better educated than Mr. Fortier, the chief inspector.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I think that it is from the pen of another author.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I would then like to know who wrote it. That young man is capable of writing such a letter; yet, the inspector says that he is not qualified! On January 7, 1933, Mr. Jean forwards to Mr. Sauvé, the detailed account of his expenditure, and adds:

I purchased a house for which I paid $650; at present no one will offer me $400 for it. Moreover, I hired a girl to look after the office, whom I have been paying $10 per month, for five months. $50 is quite an amount.

Detailed account for the post office at Sully:

2,675 feet of wood at $20 per m. ft.	$53 50
2 windows at $7	14 00
1 glass door	10 00
Paint	2 50
Nails	5 00
5,000 shingles at $2.50	12 50
Roof paper and wainscoting	14 00
Labour, salary	42 00
Interior	
Purchase of Office fixtures	30 00
Paint and varnish	7 25
1 table	2 75
A letter box in the door	1 00
Total	$194 50

(Signed) Isidore Jean,
Sully.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Was he reimbursed for this outlay?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I do not know. That is what I wish to find out from the minister. Will the estimates of the hon. Postmaster general be further considered tomorrow?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Certainly, if they are not passed this evening.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Not on your life. I should like to receive answers to the questions I put to the minister. Even were I agreeable to it, I could not possibly allow them to carry, because the minister promised to answer my questions, to-morrow.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I could give these answers to the hon. member, just the same, to-morrow. This practice has often been followed. There are precedents.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): No, no. The reason I have brought these facts before the house, is because I want French Canadians in Quebec to have fair play; in order that the rights of my compatriots in Témiscouata be recognized throughout Quebec and Canada; in order that all be placed on an equal footing; in order that the poor devil who has incurred expenses, for which the Port Office department is responsible, be fairly dealt with by the minister; moreover, in order to guard the minister against those who call themselves his friends.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): You will admit, sir, that expenses were incurred, a transfer agreed upon, which later was cancelled. This man was put to expenses. Was that amount reimbursed to him? It would only be fair, because after all, having received instructions that the transfer would be made, he had his premises fitted up.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): As far as I can remember a certain amount was offered to Mr. Jean and he accepted it. I think the question is being settled.

Mr. ST. PERE (Translation): He compromised.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Quite agreeably.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): This is an era of compromise.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Bennett the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, May 10, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PENSIONS—CASES REVIEWED BY PENSIONS BOARD

Mr. FACTOR:

1. How many pensions have been reviewed or reboarded by the Board of Pension Commissioners from September 1, 1932, to May 1, 1933?
2. In how many of the cases so reviewed has the rate of pension been increased?

3. In how many of the cases so reviewed has the rate of pension been decreased?
4. In how many of the cases so reviewed was the previous rate of pension confirmed?
5. In how many cases so reviewed was the rate of pension changed as a result of error: (a) on the part of the headquarters' staff of the Board of Pension Commissioners; (b) on the part of the unit doctors of the Board of Pension Commissioners?
6. In how many cases so reviewed was the change made as a result of faulty diagnosis?
7. In how many of the cases so reviewed was the decision of the headquarters' doctors different from the unit doctors?

Mr. MacLAREN: Pension statistics are made up quarterly, consequently it is not possible to give figures for the period requested; the figures quoted below are for the nine months' period July 1, 1932, to March 31, 1933:

1. 16,441.
2. 2,031.
3. 2,130.
4. 12,280.
5, 6 and 7. No statistics have been kept.

INCOME TAX STATISTICS

Mr. COOTE:

What was the amount of incomes of individuals assessed for the purpose of the Income War Tax Act in the fiscal year 1930-31 in each of the following income class groups: (a) $10,000 to $15,000; (b) $15,000 to $20,000; (c) $20,000 to $25,000; (d) $25,000 to $30,000; (e) $30,000 to $50,000; (f) $50,000 and over.

Mr. RYCKMAN: (a) $10,000 to $15,000, $91,252,856.22; (b) $15,000 to $20,000, $51,844,-021.21; (c) $20,000 to $25,000, $28,970,945.98; (d) $25,000 to $30,000, $20,413,111.67; (e) $30,000 to $50,000, $40,161,303.59; (f) $50,000 and over, $52,128,925.30.

TAX-FREE BONDS

Mr. FERLAND:

1. What federal government bonds are tax-free?
2. What are, (a) their dates of issue; (b) their dates of maturity; (c) what is the total amount of such bonds?

Mr. RHODES: 1 and 2.

Loan	Date of Issue	Date of Maturity	Outstanding May 1, 1933
1915-35 New York	Aug. 1, 1915	Aug. 1, 1935	$ 874,000
1917-37 War Loan	Mar. 1, 1917	Mar. 1, 1937	90,166,900
1917-37 Victory Loan	Dec. 1, 1917	Dec. 1, 1937	236,299,800
1918-33 Victory Loan	Nov. 1, 1918	Nov. 1, 1933	169,971,850
			$497,312,550

In addition to the above loans, the 1931-58 conversion loan is tax exempt to November 1, 1933, and thereafter taxable. Amount outstanding May 1, 1933, $276,687,600.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

FARM STATISTICS

Mr. FERLAND:

1. What is the total valuation of cultivated farms in each of the provinces of Canada?
2. What is the amount of the mortgage debts of the farmers in each of these provinces?

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Mr. FERLAND:

1. Are any official documents or publications of the federal government issued in the English language only?
2. If so, how many such documents or publications are there?
3. What are their titles?

CIVIL SERVICE STATISTICS

Mr. FERLAND:

1. How many civil servants, temporary or permanent, whose salaries are paid by the federal government, were employed in Ottawa, August 7, 1930?
2. How many civil servants, temporary or permanent, are presently employed in Ottawa?

[Mr. Factor.]

3. How many civil servants in the departments at Ottawa, temporary or permanent, resigned or lost their positions since August 7, 1930?
4. How many Ottawa civil servants were superannuated and receive a pension from the government since August 7, 1930?
5. What was the total cost in 1932 of the pension or superannuation paid to this class of civil servants?
6. How many newly appointed civil servants, temporary or permanent, work in Ottawa who were not in the employ of the government on August 7, 1930?
7. Are all such civil servants British subjects?
8. If not, how many are not British subjects?

GOVERNMENT LOAN, $750,000,000

REDEMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS AND PURCHASE OF UNMATURED SECURITIES

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee tomorrow, to consider the following proposed resolution:

That the governor in council be authorized to raise by way of loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, an amount not to exceed in the whole the sum of seven hundred and fifty million dollars, for paying or redeeming the whole or any portion of loans or obligations of Canada, and for purchasing and withdrawing from circulation unmatured securities of Canada.

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

Motion agreed to.

BANK INTEREST RATE REDUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance after quoting a few lines from a Canadian Press dispatch in the Ottawa Citizen of yesterday. Referring to the reduction of interest rates by banks on loans, under the heading ' No conference held," the dispatch states:

> Another high banking authority who did not wish to be named said the matter of lowering interest rates was a question for each individual bank. There had been no conference between the banks, he said, and no uniform action planned.

Further on, it states:

> Question of applying the reduction is left with the individual banks, it was explained, each bank taking action on individual cases.

What guarantee is there that borrowers are going to be treated on the same basis and all get a reduction of one-half of one per cent interest?

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): I would prefer not to answer the question offhand. I shall note it in Hansard and give an answer to-morrow.

PROPOSED TARIFF TRUCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): May I ask the Prime Minister whether Canada is a party to or interested in the proposal for a tariff truce which has been made by President Roosevelt and which is being negotiated at the present time between him and the Prime Minister of Great Britain? If so, what is involved in the proposal? Does it mean that there will be no tariff changes at all until after the world economic conference, or that trade treaties may still be negotiated downwards?

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): As I understand the matter, the tariff truce as suggested by the President of the United States involves an undertaking that there will be no increases in tariff until after the conclusion of the world economic conference.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Are we a party to the undertaking?

Mr. BENNETT: I have explained that as our budget for the year has been presented to the house and the imposition of taxation takes place by act of Parliament, necessarily we fall within that class.

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): Will it apply to increases in valuations?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will the Minister of National Revenue please listen?

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Antigonish-Guysborough): In view of the press reports that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister MacDonald have entered into a tariff truce I would ask the Prime Minister if he would give the house an opportunity to debate the resolution standing in my name as No. 39 on page 13 of the order paper, regarding a reciprocal trade arrangement between Canada and the United States? I should like to know if any arrangement has been made for continuing the debate on this resolution and having a vote on it before the house prorogues.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I hope that an opportunity may be offered the hon. gentleman to deal with the matter next session.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I think the Prime Minister promised an opportunity would be afforded this session.

Mr. BENNETT: I think not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He said the debate would be resumed at a later stage but that the resolution could not be passed in the form in which it appeared.

Mr. BENNETT: The Prime Minister made no such statement. He said the debate could be resumed at a later date, and if it was not that is not his fault.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is his fault.

WHEAT CONFERENCE AT GENEVA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Melville): The question I am about to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce may be taken as a notice for reply to-morrow. I see by this morning's press that two prominent gentlemen have been sent to Geneva in connection with the wheat conference there; they are the High Commissioner for Canada and Mr. Riddell. I was wondering whether any expert for Canada, for instance, Mr. McFarland, were going to assist the other capable men, because the matter requires very competent men who know all the intricacies of the situation, or, if Mr. McFarland cannot act, I was wondering whether Mr. Smith, who is, I think, a former pool representative in London or somewhere, were going.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): The conference that is meeting at Geneva with respect to wheat is for the purposes of making a survey of the situation under the auspices of the League of Nations. I discussed the matter with at least one of the representatives of the United States and they are being represented at that conference.

Mr. Morganthau and two members I think of the American wheat board have gone over for that purpose. We are in communication by cable with our representative at Geneva and with the High Commissioner and it is believed that every purpose that can be served by this conference so far as this country is concerned will be served by the representative that is there especially in view of the conference that was held at London some months ago and later resumed at Rome.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

SALARIES OF JUDGES AFTER ATTAINING AGE OF SEVENTY-FIVE YEARS

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Acting Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 84, to amend the Judges Act.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): The provisions of this bill appear to violate contracts between the crown and members of the judiciary. Perhaps my hon. friend would explain to us on the second reading whether that is the case or not, and if it is the case, on what grounds he justifies the measure at all.

Mr. DUPRE: This bill does not interfere directly or indirectly with the tenure of office or the salary of judges. It has to do entirely with the capacity of judges to earn their salary after they have been appointed. It has long been recognized by parliament that tenure of office during good behaviour can only be enjoyed by judges who have the capacity to perform their duty. Already we have in the Judges Act a provision whereby a judge who by reason of age or infirmity becomes incapacitated or disabled from the due execution of his office shall cease to be paid or to receive or be entitled to receive any further salary. That is in section 28 of the Judges Act, chapter 105 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927.

The present amendment does not deal with total incapacity, and it expressly provides that it shall not modify or affect the operation of the provision which I have just mentioned. What is dealt with in the bill before us is partial incapacity. I think the only real question of policy arising for discussion is the old one of what may reasonably be done in the public interest to prevent a judge whose

capacity is undoubtedly diminished by advancing age from continuing to hold office and to draw the same emoluments as are being drawn by his younger brethren who are carrying the burden of the work. As hon. gentlemen know, parliament has already acted upon the principle that the judges whose tenure of office is within the jurisdiction of the dominion shall cease to hold office when they attain the age of seventy-five. This provision with regard to county judges will be found in section 26 of the Judges Act. With regard to the judges of the supreme court and of the exchequer court there was a long debate in this house in 1927 in which my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) participated, and this same provision I mentioned as applying to the judges of the supreme court and the exchequer court will be found in subsection 2 of section 24 of the Judges Act, and in sections 30 and 38 of the Judges Act, which is chapter 105 of the statutes of 1927.

In the year 1927 there were three measures proposed dealing with the judiciary by my hon. friend from Quebec East, as Minister of Justice, namely, a bill to amend the Supreme Court Act, a bill to amend the Exchequer Court Act, and a bill to amend the Judges Act, so as to provide for the retirement of judges at the age of seventy-five. At that time the opinion was expressed that the good administration of justice depends not only upon the integrity and right sense of justice of the high officials who sit on the bench, but also on their capacity to carry on their duties. It has been said that when a man has attained the age of seventy-five he may not have the mental and physical endurance that is demanded in the exercise of his duties. It is a debatable question whether seventy-five years, or eighty or seventy-eight is the right age, but the general consensus of opinion seems to be that seventy-five years might be the limit.

Mr. DUPUIS: Would the minister permit me a question? According to this bill, is the age limit fixed at seventy-five or does it rest with the minister or the government?

Mr. DUPRE: No. Under the bill now before us, seventy-five years is the age limit.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): For all of them?

Mr. DUPRE: Yes. Every one of them.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): According to the last part of the bill, section 2, a judge, who has not reached fifteen years' service, may draw his full emoluments, if he is seventy-five years of age, or even more than eighty years old.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Unless the hon. gentleman who is addressing the house is willing to be interrupted, hon. members should not interrupt him.

Mr. DUPRE: I shall be very glad to answer my hon. friend.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): According to section 2 of the bill a judge who has not fifteen years' service is allowed to sit after the age of seventy-five years to complete his fifteen years to allow him his pension.

Mr. DUPRE: I shall be glad to answer my hon. friend when we are in committee.

In 1927 my hon. friend from Quebec East, as Minister of Justice, presented the amendments to which I referred a moment ago, and in introducing his bill to amend the Judges Act said:

This resolution precedes the introduction of three bills; one to amend the Supreme Court Act, another to amend the Exchequer Court Act and the third to amend the Judges Act. The first clause of the resolution provides for the granting of a salary for one additional judge of the Supreme Court of Canada. The two other clauses of the resolution, which have been prepared by the officers of the house from copies of the bills which have been supplied to them, provide for the retirement of the judges of the Supreme court or of the Exchequer Court of Canada when they have reached the age of seventy-five years. These are the financial arrangements to supply them with a pension to which they would otherwise be entitled.

Mr. Boys: Is that voluntary retirement?

Mr. Lapointe: No, they would cease to hold office at the age of seventy-five years. These two changes are made for the same reasons. The Supreme Court of Canada is the highest tribunal of the land and it is of the utmost importance that it should have and retain the confidence of the people and be maintained in the highest state of efficiency.

These words are to be found in Hansard of March 10, 1927, at page 1079. Then, on the following page the ex-Minister of Justice added:

There is another consideration which applies to the provision making retirement compulsory at seventy-five years of age. Members of the bar come to argue cases before the Supreme court from distant parts of the country, and the court must be complete and well organized in order to hear these cases when counsel come to Ottawa for that purpose. Such cases cannot be adjourned except at considerable expense and to the disadvantage of the litigants and the members of the bar as well. These considerations apply as well to the other clauses of the bill making the retirement of the judges of the Supreme court and the Exchequer court compulsory at the age of seventy-five years.

We subscribe to that principle. The present bill does not affect the federal court but only those judges sitting in the superior courts of any province or of the Yukon territory. The argument I may present to the house was presented by the ex-Minister of Justice when at page 1081 of the same volume he said:

I was reading in the library that in the country to the south they have the same conditions with regard to their federal courts. The constitution of the United States enacts that the judges of these courts shall be appointed and remain in office during good behaviour, and the government has never been able, although it has tried, in many instances, to make their retirement compulsory. The United States has endeavoured to deal with the situation by giving a pension equal to their full salary to judges who, having been in office at least ten years and reaching the age of seventy, desire to be superannuated. That was an invitation to them to retire, because they would have a pension equal to their salary; but experience shows that most of them preferred to remain on the bench, even though they were given the right to a full pension when they reached the age of seventy. Fortunately we have not the same obstacle to meet as far as our federal courts are concerned, and I have come to the conclusion, having not only consulted with but received suggestions from the members of the bar and I might even say from members of the judiciary themselves, that this is a good provision to enact. That is why I am introducing these bills.

Then, answering the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) on March 25, 1927, the ex-Minister of Justice is reported at page 1562 of Hansard as follows:

I am sorry the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George does not agree with me on the age limit; I will admit that there is ground for a difference of opinion in that matter. I can assure my hon. friend that only after serious consideration and after having discussed this matter with many people who have a deep interest in strengthening the Supreme Court of Canada, did I take it upon my responsibility as Minister of Justice to introduce this Bill. I quite agree with my hon. friend that there are eminent judges who are wholly qualified to act as such after they have reached the age of seventy-five years, but as the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Bennett) has said, they are rather the exception. May I quote to the house the words of a man who has been Secretary of State in the United States, Mr. Chief Justice Taft, concerning this very question. In a book entitled Popular Government at page 158 he writes:

And this is our argument, too:

"Congress has passed a law providing that all federal judges may retire after a service of ten years, upon attaining the age of seventy. The law is in form not compulsory because I presume it was thought doubtful whether Congress had any power to retire judges, even though they continue the full salary as a life pension."

The constitution of the United States makes the tenure of office of a judge there during good behaviour, and congress has no right to make it compulsory.

Mr. Cahan: That applies to federal judges only.

Mr. Lapointe: To federal judges only. Chief Justice Taft goes on to say:

"I think the absence of power in Congress to do this is a defect. There is no doubt that there are judges at seventy who have ripe judgments, active minds, and much physical vigour, and that they are able to perform their judicial duties in a very satisfactory way. Yet in a majority of cases when men come to be seventy, they have lost vigour, their minds are not as active, their senses are not as acute, and their willingness to undertake great labour is not so great as in younger men, and as we ought to have in judges who are to perform the enormous task which falls to the lot of Supreme court justices. In the public interest, therefore, it is better that we lose the services of the exceptions who are good judges after they are seventy and avoid the presence on the bench of men who are not able to keep up with the work, or to perform it satisfactorily. The duty of a Supreme court judge is more than merely taking in the point at issue between the parties, and deciding it. It frequently involves a heavy task in reading records and writing opinions. It thus is a substantial drain upon one's energy. When most men reach seventy, they are loath thoroughly to investigate cases where such work involves real physical indurance.

That is not all. In 1922 a bill concerning the province of Saskatchewan was presented in the Senate. At that time Senator Bennett speaking on the bill quoted the words of the Hon. Mr. Perron. They are found at page 184 of the Debates of the Senate for that year and are as follows:

In this matter, he said he was in absolute harmony with Premier Taschereau in idea and ideal, and if it was that justice was delayed through the inability—owing to ill health—of certain judges, and if they did not realize their responsibilities and resign, then "it would be the painful duty of the bar to seek legislation that would meet the contingency".

Speaking on that bill the Hon. Mr. Dandurand, then leader of the Senate and a member of the government, added the following words:

The great problem is to find within the terms of the constitution a way to bring to the attention of the judges the necessity for their retiring without recourse being had to the very solemn process of an address by both branches of this parliament.

These words are to be found at page 189 of the Debates of the Senate for the year 1922. Later, on the 12th of May of the same year, Hon. Senator Barnard speaking on Bill No. 19, an act to amend the Judges Act, made the following proposition, which I would call to the attention of my hon. friend the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe):

The governor in council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice that any judge has by reason of his age or infirmities become unable to properly perform his duty and upon three months' notice does not retire, may order that the salary of such judge shall be reduced to $1 a year from a date to be named, and thereafter such judge shall until he retires be paid no more than that amount, but on his so retiring he shall be entitled to the retiring allowance which would have been paid to him had he retired immediately before such order was made.

Then speaking of this amendment the leader of the Senate, a member of the then government, the Hon. Mr. Dandurand, added the following words which will be found on page 214:

I confess that my first impression was that this proposed legislation should rather be embodied in a separate bill to amend the Judges Act, because it would then be taken up with more solemnity and would attract the attention of all members of this chamber and would receive due consideration.

And he then said:

I am in sympathy with the ends sought to be attained, and will do nothing to prevent its adoption. If this chamber thinks we ought to proceed immediately with the adoption of this amendment, attaching it to the present bill, well and good. We may conclude, however, that it is better to make the amendment a separate bill.

Therefore in moving this bill we present to this house less drastic legislation than that which has already been proposed by the former government.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) has quoted extensively from remarks I made in the house in 1927 on the bill relating to federal court judges. Modesty precludes me from adding that the best part of his speech is the quotations which he made.

Mr. BENNETT: And the best part of the hon. gentleman's speech in 1927 was his quotation from Chief Justice Taft.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not say it. But I would suggest to my hon. friend that he might have read another three or four lines from that address of mine when that resolution was introduced in 1927, on page 1080. He came very close to that sentence but he stopped there. Here is what I stated:

The sections of the British North America Act dealing with the judicature are Nos. 96 to 101. Section 99 states that the judges of the superior courts shall hold office during good behaviour, but shall be removable by the Governor General on address of the Senate and House of Commons. According to the enactment, the tenure of the judges of the high courts of Canada is really a life tenure—

Mr. BENNETT: We all agree with that.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

—and this parliament has no right to retire them compulsorily at any time during good behaviour.

The difference between that position and that of judges of the federal courts which were constituted by this parliament is quite apparent, because there was nothing in the constitution which prevented us fixing an age limit for their tenure of office. Not so with the judges who will be affected by the present bill. I have quoted in extenso section 99 of the British North America Act applying to judges who will come under the provisions of this bill.

My objection to this bill is that again, as on previous occasions, it is sought to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. The effect of this bill will be to say to the judges: We cannot retire you, under the constitution you are appointed for life, but we will starve you out of office when you are 75 years of age by reducing your salary. Mr. Speaker, I will also quote a few words from a prominent gentleman, which a thousand times more apply to the present bill than to the one which was discussed in 1927, because at that time we were doing something which we had the right to do under the constitution. Possibly my hon. friend will also say that this will be the best part of my speech. I think it will be an effective part of my objection to the present bill. When that bill to retire the judges of the supreme court and of the federal courts generally was before this house for the first time the right hon. Prime Minister, who was then the member for Calgary—I do not know whether he was leader of the opposition—made a speech in which he raised the question of the contract which came into existence between the judges and the state when they accepted their appointment to office on the judiciary. That was on March 25, 1927, at pages 1556-7. I will quote only one sentence. The right hon. the present leader of the government said at that time:

> What we are now doing involves a breach of the contract between the individual who holds office at the present time and the state, because his patent of office declares that he shall hold office during life or during good behaviour. He is still alive.

And then my right hon. friend suggested that if the bill becomes law we should at least provide that the judges who were then in office, who would come under the law, should be paid their full salary during their lifetime. My hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) the present Secretary of State, took also a very strong stand on the bill then before the house, very strong indeed. He reiterated these objections the following year. On May 29, 1929, as reported at page 2951 of Hansard, when I as Minister of Justice moved the second reading of a bill to amend the Supreme Court Act, my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) spoke as follows in the course of his remarks:

> In case a judge has been appointed for life it is a serious breach of contract when that judge is compelled to retire at an age and at a time when he is thoroughly equipped physically and intellectually for the performance of his judicial duties, and especially in view of the fact that his compulsory retirement necessitates his taking a pension which is very considerably less than the salary which would otherwise be paid to him under his contract with the state.

On the same occasion my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) also spoke and he said, as reported at page 2951:

> That judge undoubtedly has a contract with the state which entitles him to receive a salary for life or until such time as he resigns.

And at page 2952, the right hon. gentleman said:

> I think the government would be well advised to consider whether or not, in all cases of this kind where a contract has thus been amended, the judge should receive full salary.

On the same page my right hon. friend added:

> I think we must have regard to the terms and conditions under which the original contract was made. Although it may seem out of the ordinary that a judge should draw full salary when he is retired compulsorily, nevertheless, good faith and morals—

I call the attention of the house to those words:

> —good faith and morals, in my judgment, impose upon us that obligation, and it is an obligation which we should not lightly disregard.

Later on he said:

> I do not believe that the Canadian people would approve of our departing from the general principle that the government must, as in times past, have respect for the sanctity of a contract made between a servant of the crown when he entered the employment of the state.

We are hearing a good deal these days about the sanctity of contracts, but it seems to apply only to bondholders who do not pay taxes to the country. But in the very words of the present Prime Minister, there was a contract, and the words which are used to-day with regard to those who loaned their money to the state were used at that time—sanctity of contract.

Mr. DUPRE: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but may I ask him how he reconciles his view with the one expressed by the Hon. Mr. Dandurand, a former leader of the Senate, when he said that a judge after seventy-five years might receive a salary of only $1 a year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would suggest that the hon. gentleman address his question to the Hon. Mr. Dandurand. Really, I do not see why he should interrupt my speech to ask that question. Now, sir, this principle, which was so strongly adhered to by members of the present government a few years ago they still adhered to last year. Take the debates of last session on the bill to reduce the salaries of civil servants, and there you will find the words of the Prime Minister giving as a justification for not having included the judges in that legislation the fact that there was a difference and that there was involved the question of contract as between them and the state. And in order to reach them the government had to take another course, whereby they increased the income tax of the judges so that they should be compelled to pay that ten per cent, because the constitution, and the principles which seemed to have been accepted by the Prime Minister and by everyone, precluded any other course than that being taken.

In the strong battle waged by my hon. friend the Secretary of State and by the Prime Minister, and after I had received communications, verbal and otherwise, from various members of the bar in Canada, I made up my mind that we should accede to the request that was made, and an amendment was adopted by this house covering the case of those judges who had been appointed before the new law was enacted, so that they should receive their full salary after retirement. This has applied to Mr. Justice Mignault. At the time this bill became law the hon. member for Mount Royal (Mr. White) asked whether it would apply to Mr. Justice Mignault and on my replying yes, he said he approved heartily but he regretted that it had taken so long to perform this elementary act of justice. Other judges who have been retired under this law are also receiving their full salary; I might cite the instance of Mr. Justice Audette, who is drawing his full salary.

This bill affects judges who, under the constitution, mind you, not under the law but under the British North America Act, are appointed for life, and we do not even provide for payment to them of their full salary as this parliament has done for the judges of federal courts who came under the law which my hon. friend has quoted as his authority for the present bill.

Now, as to the advisability of judges being retired when they have reached the age of seventy-five, I quite admit that personally I believe there are pros and cons on the proposition, and I would rather think that there are more advantages than disadvantages. If this could be done in a direct, honest, straightforward way, I would not be prepared to say that I would vote against the second reading of this bill; but I am opposed to this roundabout, indirect way of doing what parliament cannot do directly. My hon. friend said: Well, we want to pay judges who are over seventy-five years of age reduced salaries because of their reduced capacity for earning. Let me remind him, and he knows well that in our own city, our own district, it was possibly the oldest judge who, for many years after he had reached the age of seventy-five, was, until quite recently, when he was stricken by illness, most active and doing the greatest amount of business on the bench.

Mr. DUPRE: I quite agree with that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The same condition exists in many provinces. I could cite names in Ontario, Saskatchewan and elsewhere and, mentioning Saskatchewan let me say that this morning I received a letter from members of the bar of that province protesting against this bill as affecting a man who was not, before his appointment to the bench, a political friend of mine, but who is a great jurist there, and who unfortunately, like many other men of the legal fraternity, has not been favoured with much wealth on this earth.

If this bill applied only to future appointments, it would not be so objectionable. If judges to be appointed would know, when they accepted the office, that when they reached the age of seventy-five years if they continued in office they would receive a reduced salary, a principle would still be involved, but such a course would be less objectionable. But to apply this to judges who under the constitution have been appointed for life, is a vicious principle and should not be accepted by the house.

My hon. friend quoted my remarks about what happened in the United States. Under the constitution of the United States, supreme court judges are appointed for life; they cannot be forced to retire, and because of certain objections which were raised there as some objections are being raised in this country, the United States congress enacted legislation permitting the retirement voluntarily, because they could not make it compulsory of judges of the supreme court at seventy-five years of age on full salary. This was supposed to be an inducement to judges to accept retirement. But the late Chief Justice Taft, in his book on the matter, said that this had proved illusory and, I think, all credit should

be given the bench, because they preferred to work for the money they were receiving and did not take advantage of that amendment which would have permitted them to receive their salary without working for it. At the time Mr. Taft wrote his book, not a single case could be mentioned of a judge who had taken advantage of that legislation.

Why this bill at the present time? Surely it is not for purposes of economy. It will increase expenses because every judge who will be retired will receive $6,000 and the man who will replace him will get $9,000, so that the state will pay $15,000 instead of $9,000. Therefore this is not for the purpose of economy. What is the purpose? Why should my hon. friends opposite do to-day what they described three years ago as a violation, breach of contract, an action against the sanctity of contracts, when the constitution did not prevent us from doing what was being done then? I am free to confess that I believe the purpose is to create vacancies for the appointment of new judges. I know the difficulties of my hon. friends opposite. A great, very close friend of the government told me a few months ago, before a vacancy was filled on the bench of the superior court of Quebec, that there were fifteen candidates for the appointment. I know the troubles and difficulties of the administration but I do not believe the government should have recourse to this expedient for the purpose of doing, I repeat, indirectly what the constitution prevents them from doing directly.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): It has been my privilege in this house to listen to many addresses from the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), but I have never before found him labouring under such great difficulty as he has been under to-day to accommodate his present attitude to his past. When I have finished, I shall have pointed out to the house that the government is merely accepting the legislation which he himself was responsible for passing and adding to it the provision which is embodied in the bill now before us. In 1927 the hon. gentleman introduced into the house a bill which had the effect of depriving two gentlemen of their office on the bench of the Supreme Court of Canada. I pointed out in the house at that time that the then government had the complete power to do this and as regards limiting the age to seventy-five years I expressed the view that I had grave doubt whether seventy-five or eighty years should be the governing and controlling age. But I accepted the view expressed by the hon. gentleman that after all seventy-five years should be the controlling age and that in this country there was no doubt litigants lost confidence in judges who were over that age. I pointed that out as agreeing with the position put forward by the then Minister of Justice.

The hon. member did not favourably consider the position taken by some members of the opposition at that time to provide that those who retire should receive full pay; that was not done until another year. He was asked to do it and declined. I find in the reports in Hansard that I referred to the fact that he mentioned the matter to me; I had given it some thought and I expressed the view that as this action constituted a breach of contract, some provision should be made by way of compensation, namely, to continue the salaries which the judges had been paid before the breach was made by parliament. It was the exercise of its power by parliament to deprive of his position without compensation a judge who had been appointed to office and in whose patent it was provided that he should hold office during life and good behaviour. He was removed from office by that statute and received his retiring allowance in accordance with the provisions of the act. But the hon. gentleman reconsidered his position and, as he says, Mr. Justice Mignault received the salary attaching to his office. Mr. Justice Idington, against whom the statute at that time undoubtedly was directed, only received his annuity when the legislation was passed at a later time, at the instance of the hon. gentleman, after he had departed this life. The fact is, therefore, that the former Minister of Justice introduced into parliament and had passed an act that deprived of their offices, at the age of seventy-five, the justices of the supreme court who had attained that age, and during the course of the discussion it was pointed out that there was thought to be no power to limit the age of superior court judges because of the provisions of the British North America Act. I am bound to say that I looked through the decisions after that and I observed that Lord Atkinson said that the provisions embodied in our statute, which are taken from the Act of Settlement, in reality do not refer to legislative but rather to executive power. However, that issue does not arise at the moment.

That was the position taken by the former Minister of Justice, who has just taken his seat. If it had ended there his defence would be fairly complete, for he could say with all propriety that the present Prime Minister

had pointed out in the house that such provisions could not validly be enacted against superior court judges. Undoubtedly that is my conception of the law, but the hon. gentleman has overlooked the essential fact that his government placed upon these statute books section 28 of the Judges Act, being chapter 105 of the revised statutes. I am going to read that section to this house so that there may be no misapprehension as to what is the existing law with respect to these cases:

28. Any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court in Canada, or any local judge in admiralty of the Exchequer Court of Canada or any judge of a county court, who is found by the governor in council, upon report of the Minister of Justice, to have become, by reason of age or infirmity, incapacitated or disabled from the due execution of his office, shall, notwithstanding anything in this act contained, cease to be paid or to receive or to be entitled to receive any further salary, if the facts respecting the incapacity or disability are first made the subject of inquiry and report in the manner hereinafter provided, and the judge is given reasonable notice of the time and place appointed for the inquiry and is afforded an opportunity by himself or his counsel of being heard thereat and of cross-examination of witnesses and of adducing evidence on his own behalf.

2. The governor in council may, for the purpose of making inquiry into the facts respecting the incapacity or disability of any such judge, issue a commission of inquiry to one or more judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or to one or more judges of any superior court in Canada, empowering him or them to make such inquiry and report, and may by such commission confer upon the person or persons appointed full power to summon before him or them any person or witness and to require him to give evidence on oath orally or in writing, or on solemn affirmation, if entitled to affirm in civil matters, and to produce such documents and things as the commissioner or commissioners deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which he or they are appointed to inquire; and the commissioner or commissioners shall have the same power to enforce the attendance of such person or witness and to compel him to give evidence as is vested in any superior court of the province in which the inquiry is being conducted.

3. Nevertheless His Majesty shall by letters patent under the Great Seal of Canada grant unto any judge who has been so found by the governor in council to be incapacitated or disabled by reason of age or infirmity as aforesaid, and who resigns his office, the annuity which he might have received if he had resigned at the time when he ceased to be entitled to receive any further salary.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: Then paragraph 4:

4. Nothing in this act contained shall prevent the governor in council from granting to any judge so found to be incapacitated or disabled as aforesaid leave of absence for such period as the governor in council, in view of all the circumstances of the case, may consider just or appropriate, and if leave of absence be granted the salary of the judge shall continue to be paid during the period of leave of absence so granted.

That was passed in 1922 and, as I say, is the revision of section 2 of chapter 29 of the statutes of that year. Has the true significance of that statute become apparent to this house? It provided a method, now charged to be indirect, of dealing with a situation that had caused much criticism throughout the Dominion of Canada, which was referred to by Senator Dandurand in the Senate and which has been referred to in many parts of this country as constituting little short of what one eminent man described as a public scandal. Observe the language. No one charged the hon. gentleman then with endeavouring to do indirectly what he could not do directly; no one then charged that political reasons were responsible for this action, which gave the governor in council the power to terminate the contract, to say that he should receive no salary at all—not that he should receive two-thirds of his salary but that he should be deprived of all salary—unless he resigned. That is the law we find to-day upon the statute books. We did not make it, but confronted with a situation which in my judgment had to be dealt with, the only manner in which it could be dealt with was what? First, we could issue a commission to inquire as to the fitness, by reason of age, of men whom this high court of parliament had declared should not discharge their functions longer if they were seventy-five years of age, a limitation which we said made it impossible for a county court judge to continue in office, and which compelled a justice of the highest court in Canada to retire. Now because we endeavour, by the use of decent methods, to accomplish directly what this statute was endeavouring to accomplish indirectly, it is charged that we are being actuated by political motives.

Does the house understand and appreciate the difficulty with regard to complaints that are made with respect to men who continue to hold judicial office but who are only capable of giving concentrated attention to an argument for two hours a day or less? Does the house understand what is involved by continuing those men in office, while litigants complain vigorously because there is no method by which the situation can be met? If they decline to accede to polite requests what is left to this parliament to do? Are we to be charged with political considerations

with respect to a matter of this kind when a statute such as this was placed upon the statute books of this country by the government of which the hon. gentleman was a member? That is most unfair. There is the statute; it provides for a commission of inquiry to determine the fitness of the judge. Listen to these words; the commission is to determine his fitness to discharge his duties, by reason of disability, age or infirmity. Those are the words incorporated in the statute by my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, by the government of the day, of which he was a member. What was the contract made by the state with the men who were appointed to the bench? It was that they should give their unremitting time and attention to the discharge of their duties, and they were to be paid for service, not for disability, incapacity or over-age. That was what the state promised to pay them for.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): That was dealt with in the amendment that was introduced two or three years ago.

Mr. BENNETT: This statute provides that if by reason of age or infirmity the judge is unable to carry on his functions he shall be retired, and since then we have said that the age limit shall be seventy-five. Who did it? The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat.

Mr. LAPOINTE: For the federal courts.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that seventy-five is good enough to govern in the one case and not in the other?

Mr. LAPOINTE: You have no right to do it.

Mr. BENNETT: I am pointing out that we have.

Mr. DUPUIS: He left on full salary.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not, but afterwards he did because he adopted the reasoning that was presented to him—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why does not my hon. friend adopt the same reasoning to-day?

Mr. BENNETT: That is just what I am doing. Let me proceed a step further. There is a statute, and age in 1922 was said to be a factor in determining fitness for judicial office, and what did this high court of parliament at the instance of the hon. gentleman subsequently enact? That seventy-five was the testing age. No longer a case for inquiry. Seventy-five was definitely and positively the age, and when that age was reached the office was vacant. That is not our act. We are not responsible for that. I said when that act was before the house that I had grave doubts about whether the age should be seventy-five or eighty, but after listening to what was said and reading the authorities, including Mr. Justice Taft's view, I concluded that seventy-five was a reasonable age to fix.

Now, confronted with that situation, and without going into detail, trying in every sense to avoid the discussion of personalities in this parliament with respect to the men or the age of the men who hold office, trying to eliminate all that, I put it to the house, in view of that legislation and the difficulties that the then Minister of Justice had, and the reasons that influenced him to declare by statute in 1927 that age, which is the word used in 1922, should mean seventy-five years, whether this government is not just and fair and equitable in every sense of the word when it says that when a judge attains the age of seventy-five he shall be paid in accordance with his reduced capacity, namely, two-thirds of his salary? There is no violation of contract there. The implied term of every contract is that as long as he is fit he is to be paid, and being unfit he is not to be paid, and that has been embodied in the terms of a statute that was passed not under this government, but under the government in 1922. Now we are applying the principle of that and are merely saying, arbitrarily if you will: When you have reached the age of seventy-five in a provincial court your salary shall be two-thirds of what it was when you were at your high point of efficiency. Hon. gentlemen will realize that there is a vast improvement in that over what the provisions of the statute provide. Section 28 of the existing Judges Act says that if the inquiry determines that by reason of age he is unfit to give that close attention to his duties which their importance demands he shall receive nothing at all. That is the law which my hon. friend's government saw fit to enact, and there are people who say they have no reason to quarrel with that, and I am not quarrelling with it at the moment.

Now is it desirable in view of the attitude taken by this parliament in fixing seventy-five as the age at which judges of the Supreme Court of Canada are declared incapable of discharging their duties effectively and efficiently—

Mr. FACTOR: They should go off the bench.

Mr. BENNETT: Precisely.

Mr. FACTOR: But not by reducing the salary.

Mr. BENNETT: But if they go off the bench they draw their full annuity under the bill now before us.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, their pension.

Mr. BENNETT: Their full pension; that is what I say. The hon. member for Toronto West Centre (Mr. Factor) said that they should leave the bench, and I say certainly they should. They should be prompted by that high sense of public responsibility and duty to the state that placed them in a high position and gave them not only a good salary as things were when the salaries were fixed, but which in my judgment is inadequate under present conditions, and as well an annuity, against which there is much criticism in these days by many people. If under those circumstances, having attained that age, which is the age fixed for the Supreme Court of Canada, they are not willing to retire from office, we simply say to them: You will be treated from the salary standpoint as having reached that point where you are incapable of giving that one hundred per cent efficiency to the discharge of your duties, and you will be paid 66⅔ of your former salary.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Will the Prime Minister explain how section 2 accords with his argument?

Mr. BENNETT: Section 2 is to provide for the case—there is one case in this country at the moment—of a judge who will have attained the age of seventy-five by the first of July and will not have served fifteen years. He is protected and will get his annuity. That is what the section is for, to provide against any injustice being done by reducing to nothing the pay of a judge who has attained the age of seventy-five and has not put in the full fifteen years. But there is something more than that. The effect of this bill will be to prevent men over sixty being appointed to the bench of the superior courts, and every member of the profession knows that that is not only desirable but essential. It will ensure that men of vigour at least in the profession will be appointed to the bench. It means that unless they are under sixty when appointed they will not have served the fifteen years to entitle them to secure the pension at seventy-five.

In Great Britain, where they have imposed an age limit with respect to county courts much less than ours, they have no age limit with respect to their judges, and there have been eminent men who past the age of seventy-five have discharged judicial duties, notably in the courts of appeal. One of the most eminent who retired not long ago after he had passed the age of eighty said once very frankly, "If there is any question ever raised in the House of Commons with respect to my remaining and discharging judicial duties I shall of course feel that I have outlived my usefulness and shall retire." It was mentioned in the house, and he retired.

There was criticism made in the House of Commons with respect to the judicial committee and the age of its members, and if anyone will take the judicial committee as at present constituted he will find how young in years are the men who constitute that committee.

I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is most unfair to suggest a political motive behind this bill. I am perfectly willing to be charged with political considerations in some matters, but in a matter that affects the profession to which I myself belong I claim that I have been influenced by no consideration other than the public weal. What is more, I know what the judgment of litigants is who have to have their cases considered and adjudicated upon by men past the age of eighty years, and who in the very nature of things have not the physical stamina to concentrate their powers in such a way as to enable them to grapple with the problems that arise for consideration by courts of justice. If I had purely political reasons behind the judgment which I have formed in this matter, and which arises solely because of circumstances to which I could but will not refer, and which must be present in the mind of every one responsible for law and the maintenance of law and order in the country and the holding up to high place in the minds of the people of the judicial tribunals in Canada—I say that every man who gives any thought to it at all must realize that the same purpose is in the mind of the government that has endeavoured to do this which I believe was honestly in the mind of the government that passed section 28 in 1922. I never for a moment have thought that political considerations influenced the government in 1922 when they said that if because of age a man is unfit for his duties or is not discharging them properly he shall thereby forfeit any further pay. No one for a moment

charges that; no one suggested it. It is because this parliament has decided that age means seventy-five years that further trial should be unnecessary. But if it is necessary it only drags into disrepute the very institutions which men charged with a sense of responsibility should themselves realize first of all. They should be the first to realize conditions with respect to a matter of this kind.

I think on consideration—nay, I feel certain that on consideration the hon. member for Quebec East who gave such attention to this matter in days gone by and who made such statements in the house in 1927 when the government of which he was a member enacted the legislation to which I have referred, will acquit this government of any sense of political responsibility in dealing with this matter. For I say to him this, that if he will study the appointments which have been made to the bench since this government has assumed office he will see, at least, that no consideration—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: I say that,—that no consideration was too high. The interests of the public are sometimes influenced by geographical considerations which mean—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, because there has grown up in this country a custom which cannot lightly be disregarded namely, that we must not select all members of the bench from the larger centres of population, but that smaller communities should have consideration given them when selections for the bench are under review. For, after all, some of the most eminent judges of this country have been country practitioners before they went to city communities to establish themselves in their profession.

I do commend this bill to the house for the reasons I have indicated, and desire to assure my hon. friend that but for the legislation which now exists I would not regard it as possible to introduce this measure. But, we have accepted the principle that fitness is determined by age, and that the age limit shall be seventy-five years with respect to the county court on the one hand and the Supreme Court of Canada on the other, and that when that age is reached there should be a diminution in the compensation paid in keeping with the terms of the statute to which I have referred.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (West Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I desire for a few moments to protest against this legislation. Before dealing with that section of the legislation which I believe is particularly objectionable, may I refer to some of the remarks which have been made both by the minister in charge of the bill (Mr. Dupré) and by the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett). First of all may I say that I deprecate the introduction by the minister, of reference to the necessity for this legislation arising on account of the incapacity of certain judges to perform their duties and earn their salaries after they were appointed—

Mr. BENNETT: After seventy-five years of age.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Well, the minister used the expression "after they had been appointed;" I made a note of his words. However whether it be after seventy-five years or after they are appointed, the reference should not have been made unless particulars were given. Coming from a province in which we have a number of judges affected by this act, who have been a great ornament to the bench, and who have been on the bench for many years, I feel it my duty to oppose the measure. Anyone who is familiar with the bench of the province of Ontario must admit that a number of the very best, the most capable and the most active judges we have are beyond the age of seventy-five years. Reference has been made to the chief justice of the province of Quebec, and to the chief justice of the province of Saskatchewan. I believe members of the profession as well as hon. members in the house will agree with me that perhaps the keenest, the most able and the most active judge on the Ontario bench, and the one who has lost the smallest amount of time in the last ten or fifteen years, is the oldest judge on the bench of that province.

If there are men on the bench who have not the capacity to perform their duties, they are dealt with by section 28 of the act. The difference between dealing with the matter under section 28 of the act, and dealing with it in a summary manner provided by the legislation now under consideration is that in one case the man has a chance to go before some tribunal and show whether or not he has by age, incapacity or infirmity become disabled to perform his duty.

Mr. BENNETT: Not in the supreme court.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I am not going to argue the question of the violation of contract, because apparently it is agreed on both sides

of the house that this is a violation of a very solemn contract entered into at the time of appointments. Why has the bench of Canada attained its present eminence? It has attained that position because of the type of men they were able to obtain by the assurance given to prospective appointees that if they accepted the appointments they would remain secure in their position for the remainder of their lives.

Mr. BENNETT: Whether they were fit or not.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Whether they were fit or not, my right hon. friend says. They were appointed for life. No one knows better than the Prime Minister that many men are now on the bench at a great financial sacrifice. Their remuneration on the bench, while it looks high to a great many members of the profession, is very small when compared with what several men on the bench of the various provinces were earning at the time of their appointments. Further than that, at the time of their appointments they were assured of the permanence of their positions. That is now sought to be taken away from them. The Prime Minister spoke about age or infirmity. I remind him that a man does not come under section 28 of the act because of age alone; it is on account of infirmity. I believe the Prime Minister knows perfectly well that a great many—

Mr. BENNETT: I should like to correct the hon. member. Age, specially, is the factor; it is age or infirmity. It is not "and"; it is age "or."

Mr. ELLIOTT: Let us pay attention to the argument of the Prime Minister. Does he say that under section 28 either age or infirmity is a ground?

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly I do.

Mr. ELLIOTT: If he states that, I shall satisfy him in a moment that that is not what the statute says. These are the words of the statute:

> Any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or of the Exchequer Court of Canada or of any superior court in Canada . . . who is found by the governor in council, upon report of the Minister of Justice, to have become, by reason of age or infirmity,—

Not seventy-five years old.

> —incapacitated or disabled from the due execution of his office.

He is not put out for age but for incapacity.

[Mr. Elliott.]

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly, because his age renders him incapable of doing his job. That is what the statute states.

Mr. ELLIOTT: A moment ago the Prime Minister stated that either age or infirmity, under section 28, was a ground for retirement. That is not so. Age alone is not a ground.

Mr. HACKETT: The statute says it is.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Age is not a ground for termination of salary.

Mr. BENNETT: The statute says it is.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No, if my hon. friend would look at the statute he would see it does not.

An hon. MEMBER: Not always.

Mr. ELLIOTT: In the case of a man under 75 the factor to be considered is incapacity. Incapacity may be due to age or infirmity, but age of itself alone does not bring him within the ambit of section 28. May I point out also that in the province of Ontario, as I said before, a number of our most active, able and capable judges would be affected by this act. One member of a commission that was appointed not long ago to perform very difficult and onerous duties, involving a great deal of work and requiring great ability, was one of the judges who would be affected by this act. He was appointed not by a government of his own political complexion; he was selected on account of his ability, his physical strength and his capacity for work, as well as for the wide experience gained at the bar and on the bench.

The violation of contract feature has already been referred to; I do not intend to labour that. The fact that this is an attempt to do indirectly what cannot be done directly has also been referred to. The great objection to this proposal is that it is a breach of faith as well as a breach of contract. These men are entitled to the benefit of the act as it stood at the time of their appointment. They hold office unless they have become incapacitated, that is the present state of the law. I submit that this is the kind of legislation that should not be passed at any time, and it is particularly inappropriate at this time, as it would impose a further great burden upon the treasury of this country, by making each of those positions from which a judge is retired pay $15,000 a year, or practically so, whereas if he were not retired it would pay only $9,000. We cannot afford at the present time to increase the expenditure of the government in any way that can be avoided. So I submit that if ever it were excusable this is

not the time it should be done. If it is the wish of the government to make this provision applicable to future appointees that is quite fair. It is no breach of faith. Those appointed take the appointment knowing the conditions. This, however, is a direct change of the law as it stood at the time of their appointment. In Ontario it operates against I think seven or eight of the most eminent judges we have ever had in the province, all of whom are now active on the bench. I cannot protest too strongly against legislation that deals so unfairly with men who have given to this country the kind of service that those men have given upon the bench.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (St. Henri): Mr. Speaker, I am astonished to see such legislation presented to the house, having in view the legal ability and knowledge of the Prime Minister. He knows perfectly well that he is putting before this house a bill, which had he been leader of the opposition instead of Prime Minister, would have drawn thunderbolts from him. I take his own argument in the case of the bill relating to the Supreme Court of Canada; why do again in this house by special legislation what is provided against by the statute? Section 28 of chapter 105 of the revised statutes of Canada has been passed and must be applied. If a judge by his conduct or through incapacity comes under investigation under this act he is in the same position as any other person. Let the government then investigate, and if justified impeach him if he does not resign. Our judges when appointed were, under the constitution, appointed for life. They abandoned everything when they went on the bench. The bench of Canada is composed of able and honest men. If there were exceptions I would not care to mention them, but I do not think they exist. When they are appointed they have to cut themselves off completely from business life, leave their career behind them, give up their legal practice. If they were placed on the bench by the leader of their party it was because they were able men qualified to adorn the bench. They can no longer hold appointments as testamentary executors, they cannot be executors of companies. They go on the bench and to the best of their ability administer the law of the country. They have no friends, they are completely apart in the community if they are doing their duty. The statute says that after so many years they are entitled to retire on pension; they are not obliged to go, but they may go if they want to. We cannot suppose that a person qualified to be appointed a judge would remain on the bench if unable through sickness or other disability to discharge his duties; such an assumption would be contrary to common sense and to the opinion that all citizens have of a judge. I think the Prime Minister will agree that the judicature is one of the four powers of the state, these powers being the sovereign, the executive, the army and the judicature. Whether legislation enacted in the past relating to judges was wise or not, if we alter it now we destroy public confidence in the bench. Judges should not be interfered with because they compose the tribunals established to administer justice. If this House of Commons does not abide by its contracts, how do we expect any individual in Canada to respect his contract? What this bill proposes is an expropriation of right, and if it came before a court of justice any judge would dismiss such a case. The constitution is there; you cannot act against the constitution. Of course not exactly on political grounds, but on a very ingenious ground you take for your own purpose the argument used by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), the ex-Minister of Justice, in reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. In this House of Commons there may appear to be some inducement to accept such a bill, but in the country at large and in the light of the statute, you cannot do what you propose. The law protecting judges was so written in a fundamental way that even on the income tax you could not touch them. In the statute of 1906, reproduced in the revised statutes of 1927 is section No. 29 just following section 28, which says:

> (3) The salaries and retiring allowances or annuities shall be payable by monthly instalments, and the salaries and retiring allowances and annuities of the judges who are now by law entitled to receive the same free and clear of taxes and deductions imposed under any act of the parliament of Canada, shall continue to be paid free and clear of such taxes and deductions.

That meant that when they were appointed they had a salary fixed by statute, and no deductions could be made from that salary by any act of parliament. Are we to say now that a man seventy-five years of age is not fit to carry on as a judge? What if a son were to say to his father, "You are seventy-five years old now; you are too old to conduct your business. Get out of the store; I will take everything over." The father would say, "This belongs to me; I bought it and I am going to stay here." According to their contract with the state the judges can remain on the bench as long as they can discharge their duties properly, and it should be left to their

own judgment to decide when they should retire. We name a man to the bench because he has a conscience; it cannot be otherwise. If he is unable to carry on beyond the age of seventy-five he will say, "I cannot discharge my duties according to the law and in fairness to the citizens who come before me." I should like to refer to section 2 of this bill, which says:

> This act shall come into force on the first day of July, 1933, but in the case of any judge who, on the day when he attained the age of seventy-five years or on the first day of July, 1933, whichever is later, has held office for less than fifteen years, the operation of this act shall in his case be postponed until he has continued in office for fifteen years, and shall thereupon have its full force and operation.

Thus a man appointed at the age of sixty-two or sixty-five—and there have been a few such appointments—will go beyond the age limit of seventy-five. What will happen in his case? This clause as it stands cannot pass; it will do an injustice to those who must retire when they reach the age of seventy-five. Those who have not completed fifteen years on the bench will serve beyond the age of seventy-five and you will be keeping on the bench a judge who, according to your own words, is not fit. After he reaches the age of seventy-five we will be paying him $9,000, though you will be retiring those with greater experience who have completed more than fifteen years service. So I say if this section is passed in its present form it will work a grave injustice on those who are obliged to retire on reaching the age limit. In the case of Mr. Justice Mignault the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) simply said, "Well, according to the sacredness of contract Mr. Justice Mignault is entitled to compensation; we will give him his full salary as a pension, since he is compelled to leave the bench at the age of seventy-five. So Mr. Justice Mignault is getting his full salary, and there are no deductions made from it by way of income tax or anything else, since a pension is not taxable.

We have a contract with these judges, and I think at first it would be well for the state to pay them their full salaries if they are to be retired. But during these times of distress and depression, when the finances of the state are so heavily burdened, why not postpone this bill for four or five years in order to have time to settle everything? Time is a great healer, and everything will work out eventually. In the meantime, why tax the people of the country in order to pay a new judge a salary of $9,000 while at the same time we must pay the retiring judge a gratuity of $6,000? If that retiring judge has been twenty-five years on the bench he will receive $7,000, so that we will have to pay $16,000 instead of $9,000 in order to replace a man who may be quite able to carry on.

Mr. BENNETT: What about the interests of litigants, whose counsel has been presenting an argument? The judge, an hour and a half behind the argument, says, "What did you say"?

Mr. MERCIER: (St. Henri): But very often the lawyers are to blame; sometimes they are all mixed up in their arguments, and they have not their cases prepared. In addition it seems to me that we are interfering in provincial affairs. This does not apply to Quebec, because there the judges are not fortunate enough to be able to increase their salaries, but often in Ontario judges receive extra remuneration for giving extra service for the benefit of the province. Why should we say to a judge that if he sees fit to remain on the bench after the age of seventy-five he shall receive in salary only the amount of the pension to which he is entitled, and if he receives $1,000 from the province he will only receive $5,000 from the Dominion? This is another way of pushing them off the bench or, to use the expression of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), to starve them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: The statute of 1928 did that.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Hon. gentlemen should not laugh, because we are discussing a very important question. More than that, when people begin to laugh at the bench they are laughing at one of the corner stones of the nation.

Mr. SAMUEL FACTOR (Toronto West Centre): Mr. Speaker, the broad principle of retiring judges at the age of seventy-five is a debatable question. There is a large body of opinion which holds that at seventy-five, with the maturity and wisdom that he has attained, a judge is perhaps more fit to discharge his duties on the bench than is the case with younger men. I believe the consensus of opinion throughout this country is that a judge should retire at the age of seventy-five, but if a judge of the federal court or of the county court should retire at that age there is no reason why a judge of the supreme court should not retire in the

same way. I should say, however, that the government is not accomplishing its object by this legislation. The Prime Minister just asked my hon. friend from St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) with reference to the judge who, after listening to an argument for an hour and a half, asks the lawyer, "What did you say"? I say that in all probability this same judge will accept the two-thirds of his salary to which he is entitled and will remain on the bench, so you will not succeed in the object you have in view.

Mr. BENNETT: Then he will work for nothing.

Mr. FACTOR: I do not think this legislation will meet the situation; these men who are supposed to be incapable of discharging their duties will continue to sit on the bench but will receive a lower salary.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And if I know them well they will remain on the bench.

Mr. BENNETT: Then that shows that they are not starving.

Mr. FACTOR: I hate to acknowledge that parliament, because it is unable by constitutional methods to retire judges after they have reached the age of seventy-five, has to resort to a financial scheme or arrangement such as is proposed in this bill. I believe that the time has come when the broad question of amending our own constitution should receive the attention of parliament. If under present conditions we are unable to amend the act so as to pass legislation which will facilitate the retirement of judges, a principle in which I believe, it is high time that parliament adopted legislation to enable us to do that. I would ask the Solicitor General and the Prime Minister this question: How do they expect by this legislation to get rid of those judges who are incapable or incapacitated and therefore cannot attend to their duties? The mere fact that a judge is over seventy-five years of age should not be a reason for his being removed from the bench, but if by reason of age or infirmity he is incapacitated and is unable to discharge his duties, the procedure is provided by section 28 of the Judges Act, and you do not have to—

Mr. BENNETT: But he does not go off the bench; his pay stops.

Mr. FACTOR: That is a good way of getting him off.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I wanted you to say.

Mr. FACTOR: The Prime Minister says that, under the old section 28, if after due inquiry a judge is found to be incapable by reason of age or infirmity his pay is reduced or cut off. In that case he goes off the bench.

Mr. BENNETT: No; he stays on if he wants to.

Mr. FACTOR: Well, there will not be many judges who will stay on without salary, whereas under this legislation you are retaining the judge and paying him two-thirds of his salary.

Mr. BENNETT: The same option exactly.

Mr. FACTOR: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Excuse me, it is the same option exactly, only in one case he gets two-thirds and in the other nothing.

Mr. FACTOR: In other words, there will be an incentive for the incapacitated judge to remain on the bench because he will get two-thirds of his salary. That is the net result of the legislation. The Prime Minister may laugh, but I should like him to meet that argument. Is there not an incentive for a judge, knowing that he will get two-thirds of his salary, to remain on the bench?

Mr. BENNETT: If there is such an incentive it is itself an indication of the unfitness of the man to be on the bench.

Mr. FACTOR: But there is nothing in this legislation to remove him, and I submit that it is high time some method were evolved, whether by amending the British North America Act or by some other means, to go about this matter in a direct fashion under proper authority.

Mr. BENNETT: Why did you not do that in 1922?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because we had no right to do it.

Mr. BENNETT: You had the same right that exists now.

Mr. FACTOR: The fact that it was not done in 1922 is no excuse for adopting a method of camouflage now to give a judge two-thirds of his salary. I think the government should take into serious consideration the principle involved in this matter. I am thoroughly in agreement with the governmen's intention of removing any judge who is incapable of discharging the duties of his office after the age of seventy-five. Further than that, I agree to the principle that every judge of the supreme court should retire at the age of seventy-five. I submit however that the proper method is not being followed.

The government are acknowledging that they are unable to do it by legislation, but they are attempting to do it by a cheap scheme. That is all it is—a cheap scheme which is tantamount to saying to a judge, "if you stay on the bench you will get two-thirds of your salary." The result will be however, as an hon. member suggests, that the scheme instead of being cheap may be expensive, because if the judge does not retire a new judge will have to be appointed and the additional salary will have to be paid.

Mr. VINCENT DUPUIS (Laprairie-Napierville): I believe the intention of the government is sound so far as unfit judges are concerned, but it seems to me that this bill as it is drafted is too drastic. No door is left open to those judges who are still capable, and if there is one class of our Canadian society to whom we should do no injustice it is our judiciary. I have in mind judges in Montreal who are in the neighbourhood of seventy-five years of age or over and who are most capable, some of them being perhaps the best judges we have in the whole country. Now, what will happen? Not only will the judges affected by this bill be deprived of their salaries, which is a matter of comparatively small importance, but lawyers who are accustomed to plead before such judges will suffer, and most of all the people who seek redress before our courts; they will be deprived of the wisdom of such eminent members of the judiciary. If it were possible for me to name such judges I would name them, and I know that the Prime Minister and the members of this house would bear me out in that regard.

I do not quite understand how this government could bring in legislation of this sort in such an indirect way to attain an end which will never be reached. They will not get rid of unfit judges. There is section 28 of the act which, if the government were willing to apply it, would accomplish the same purpose, with this distinction, that the government by section 28 have the discretion to apply it to those who are unfit, either by reason of ill health or by infirmity or otherwise, leaving on the bench those judges who are capable. May I here interject this parenthesis in answer to what the Prime Minister said, putting a question to the hon. member for St. Henri. He said, "What about those judges who, after listening to a lawyer for an hour and a half, ask him what he has said?" I may ask the Prime Minister whether in his experience as a lawyer he found that it was only those judges above seventy-five years of age to whom that remark could apply.

[Mr. Factor.]

Mr. BENNETT: I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DUPUIS: I am asking the Prime Minister whether, in his experience as a lawyer, he has found that only judges above seventy-five years of age could suddenly ask him, after listening to him for an hour and a half, what he had said? I believe that even those who have not attained that age sometimes find themselves under that necessity.

Mr. BENNETT: I have no doubt; I would refer to the hon. gentleman himself as one of them.

Mr. DUPUIS: It may happen in this house that when some hon. members on the other side are discussing certain subjects members on this side may appear to be asleep, but they are not.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. DUPUIS: Mr. Speaker, before recess we were discussing the advisability of passing Bill No. 84, to amend the Judges Act. I contend that the aim the government is seeking to attain will not be reached by this legislation. They say that they intend to oblige judges who are unfit to take their pensions. presumably they believe, from their experience, sometimes judges are bad judges of themselves, and although incapacitated by ill health or otherwise, they do not seem to realize the fact. That may be true. It is because of this that, I believe, in 1922 or thereabouts, this question was brought up in the house by the previous government and Senator Dandurand, presented an argument to that effect and piloted the discussion of the bill which is now on the statute book as section 28 of the Judges Act, chapter 105 of the revised statutes of Canada. The argument then advanced by Senator Dandurand was to that effect and cannot be applied as an argument in favour of the present bill, because the then administration was faced with the situation that some Canadian judges were repeatedly asking and obtaining leave of absence for six months. There was only one way to oblige them to take their pensions and that was to pass legislation to reduce their salaries to naught. But it applied only to those who were unfit, whereas the bill now before us applies to all judges who reach the age of seventy-five years.

Is it necessary that I should remind the house of many instances not only in the judiciary, but in many other walks of life, of people over seventy-five years of age whose services the country is still pleased to retain? What would have happened in England during the time of Gladstone if they had applied to public men legislation such as this? Where is the Englishman who is not proud of what Gladstone did for his country even in his later years? What would have happened in Canada if such legislation had been applied to public men in the case of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and many others who, on account of their experience and capabilities, were of immense value to this country? In the judiciary to-day, as I said before, we still have judges of advanced years who render eminent service to their country and their countrymen. Therefore I believe this legislation should either be amended or dropped; it is so drafted that it reaches the limit of despotism. The government will say to a judge: When you reach the age of seventy-five years, whether you are able, whether you have large experience, whether you are physically and mentally fit, you must get off the bench; we want to put a younger man in your place. That reminds me of a conference of United States medical men held in New York some years ago when one of them gave a lecture stating that every United States citizen who reached the age of seventy-five years should be put out of existence with strychnine or some other poison; that he was a nuisance to the people of that country. That gentleman was laughed at. One is not obliged to look with a searchlight to find in any land men who, after they reach that age, are still useful citizens.

The purpose of this bill is to retire on pension members of the judiciary after they have reached the age of seventy-five, by reducing their salary to the amount of their pension. The Prime Minister, with the gesture of an offended virgin, said: We have no political motive, and the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) is not speaking by the book when he contends we have a political motive in the back of our heads. I am ready to admit, because the Prime Minister said so, that he has no political motive, but I would ask him and hon. members opposite: What is the motive? Although they know many members of the judiciary of seventy-five years of age or over are still rendering eminent service to their country, they are obliging them to retire against their willingness to continue to fulfil their important duties. What is the purpose of this legislation? It is to put younger men in their place, and I use the words of the Prime Minister. He does not want to name any judge over the age of sixty to any court. He wants to appoint younger judges. If it is not done from a political motive, the consequences at all events will be political in that when the judges reaching the age of seventy-five are retired, regardless of their capacity, the positions will be given to younger men, political friends who will stay on the bench for many, many years after this government has passed away.

I heard the hon. member for Quebec East use the argument that this is a breach of contract. I am of the same opinion. I believe that it is an absolute breach of contract with these judges who have abandoned their practice as lawyers, and generally speaking they were lawyers with a good practice, and some of them derived from their practice much more than the salary of a judge. Through a high spirit of service to the country they gave up their practice to accept nomination as a judge, with the absolute assurance of a solemn contract that they would receive a certain salary, and that no one, not even the government, would be able to deprive them of such salary. If to-day the government by this legislation puts them out of office, where is the hon. member of this house who will not call that a breach of contract? It is a breach of contract to put out of office very capable judges in order to appoint younger men. And what will be the consequence? Will that save money to this country? Quite the contrary. The result will be that the judge who is pensioned will receive two-thirds of his salary, let us say $7,000 a year, and in some cases $6,000, and the new judge who will be appointed will receive $9,000 a year, so that every retirement will cost the country $16,000 a year. I therefore see no reason in the world why the government should insist on this legislation. It seems to me that in justice to those judges who are capable and in justice also to those who were at the head of the government when section 28 was passed, this government should have the courage to apply section 28 and use their discretion in putting out of office those who are really unfit and allowing to remain those who can efficiently perform their functions.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the principle of this bill. Having practised for a period of something like thirty-nine years, perhaps my opinion is worth something. What I do not like about this measure is what I might call the retro-

activity of it. Outside of that I think it is a very proper bill and it is carrying out the theory of the act which was passed in 1927, and for which we claim the credit I remember that immediately after the passing of that act in 1927 a judge of the Supreme court of Canada was retired, Mr. Justice Mignault, I believe. We omitted to provide for his pension, and that matter was not taken care of until the present government—

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was looked after by the old government.

Mr. HACKETT: Time flies.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, it always does.

I was always in favour of the scheme whereby pensions would be provided for judges retired in this particular way. Mr. Justice Mignault made the point that he was named under a contract mentioned in the statutes and that the government had failed to carry out the terms of the contract. In the present case, however, as I understand it, constitutional objections have been made and are recognized that the bill cannot go through as did the bill of 1927 because at that time we were dealing with federal courts, and the present bill, is a hang-over from the period prior to 1867 when we took over from the provinces the legislation affecting judges.

There is another objection that I see to a wholesale retirement of judges. Many of them have now reached the age mentioned in the bill. I should say that probably thirty or forty of them would be compulsorily retired under its provisions. That would amount to about a quarter of a million dollars for annuities for these judges. That is a tidy sum of money at the present time when we are casting about in every way to get money in order to carry on a hand-to-mouth existence. Just now I think it is a luxury which might well stand over until the years to come which we hope will be brighter than those we have gone through in the past three or four years.

Why should a judge be permitted to remain on the bench for more than the period allotted to men by the psalmist? Three score years and ten was considered to be the span of man's allotted life on this earth.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): And then the Senate.

Mr. JACOBS: The Senate is a horse of another colour. We ought to give these judges time to prepare themselves for their Maker, and if they are on the bench every day rendering judgments, what chance have they when they go into the next world? I have a good deal of respect for the bench. I can speak a little more freely now than when I practised before them, but I also recognize that judges have their failings, and I think it will be generally admitted that a man under seventy-five years of age generally speaking is a better man than one over seventy-five. It is the most natural thing in the world that a man should have passed the zenith of his power previous to seventy-five years of age. Even in the days of Shakespeare it was recognized that a judge on the bench must be in the full vigour of physical and mental attainment. I think Shakespeare places the judge in the fifth stage of man's life: He talks of the justice.

. . . . . .
In fair round belly with good capon lined,
With eyes severe, and beard of formal cut.

I have that beard of formal cut. But when he gets into the sixth stage he talks about—

. . . the lean and slipper'd pantaloon,
With spectacles on nose and pouch on side,
His youthful hose well saved, a world too wide
For his shrunk shank; and his big manly voice,
Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
And whistles in the sound.

That is the sixth stage. We wish to place all our judges in the fifth stage, so as not to have them in the condition which Shakespeare describes in stage six. After all, when a man is seventy-five years of age it does seem to me that $6,000 a year is a fair salary. Where could he get more than $6,000? It would be impossible. No doubt his family will have grown up. He has not the obligations that as a younger man he would have had. Altogether I think he ought to be satisfied with the smaller amount.

Another reason is that there are others trying to reach the bench. It is not fair or right that a position of such importance which is held out to eminent members of the bar who have worked and toiled upward in the night while others were enjoying life, should wait until the kindly hand of death removes the eminent judge. I do not consider it just to the other lawyers. What I do not like, however, is the wholesale appointment of thirty or forty men, all selected from one particular party at this particular time. The thing should be done with decency and decorum. It is not fair that such a thing should be perpetrated or practised upon the community just now.

Some suggestion was made during the debate about the eminence of learned judges, and that we would be deprived of their talents. Well, I think we have men at the bar to-day who are as eminent as men found on the bench. I

believe every one will agree with that. The Prime Minister referred to a case—I do not know whether it was hypothetical or actual —where a judge asked an attorney after listening. "What did you say?" or "What were you saying? I well remember a case in which I was engaged where, shortly after we returned from lunch we found that the judge was asleep on the bench.

An hon. MEMBER: How old was he?

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know what his age was, but that did not interfere with his sleep.

Mr. DUPUIS: That is a good argument.

Mr. JACOBS: I put a question to the witness to which my opponent objected. There we were, with the judge snoring peacefully, waiting to see what would happen. Finally when we saw that the judge was not likely to awaken for some time I said, "Well, seeing that the question is not important I shall withdraw it." I lost my case. Whether it was because the judge merely had his eyes closed and was listening to me or whether he actually did not hear what I was saying, I do not know. However that is an experience which may happen to anyone.

We know the story of the Duke of Devonshire who, while addressing the House of Commons on one occasion, yawned. He provoked some amusement at the time, and when a friend met him outside the building and said, "Is it true, that you fell asleep or yawned when you were delivering your address?" the Duke replied, "Did you hear the speech?" The reply was "No." "Well, then," said the Duke, "if you had heard it you would have known why." Little things of that kind do not amount to very much, but they all go to show that as a person grows older his natural ability does not improve. It is a stage of decadence. We are simply doing by legislation what nature has done before. I see my good friend the Minister of Railways and Canals still shows a little interest in medicine, although he is now far removed from it—we have railroaded him out of it.

Mr. MANION: I was wondering which one of the lawyers put the judge to sleep.

Mr. JACOBS: I hope the Minister of Railways does not expect me to answer something which could be used in evidence against me. That is strictly against the law.

I would suggest to the Solicitor General that the measure be changed in such a way that it would apply only for the future. Then every person will be satisfied, and this would be one of the very few measures before the house in the present session which would go through without objection. It seems so easy thus to please this side of the house, to please the future judiciary and to please the taxpayers who, in the last analysis, will have to pay a quarter of a million dollars extra. Generally speaking, it would be giving satisfaction to everyone throughout the country. I am strongly in favour of the measure; I believe it is one which will have the effect of strengthening the bench, a process which is, of course, creditable. In these days, when conditions are not satisfactory, we will be able to get men to take their places on the bench, who will reflect credit upon themselves and upon the government that appointed them.

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay this legislation, but I have one or two observations to add. I do not believe it necessary to reply to the accusation made by the hon. members for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) to the effect that political motives are behind this legislation. That accusation is unfounded. The only motive behind this legislation is that of securing high efficiency in the administration of justice. We have also to think of the taxpayers and litigants who are complaining because efficiency is not at its highest point. Everything enacted in the bill has already been enacted by section 28 of the act, which is chapter 105 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927.

If I may say so, the present legislation is nothing but a sort of alleviation or mitigation of the drastic legislation enacted by section 28. Deprived of its legal phraseology section 28 enacts that any judge who by reason of age or infirmity is incapacitated or disabled from the due execution of his office shall cease to be paid. We say that any judge who has attained the age of seventy-five will, if he wishes to do so, continue to hold office, but he will not receive more than the annuity to which he would be entitled. That is all we say.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is quite enough.

Mr. DUPRE: Section 28 is much more drastic; under it if he wishes to continue he will not receive any salary.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is after investigation.

Mr. DUPRE: My hon. friend is quite right, under section 28 there will be an investigation, but we believe that it is not desirable that judges should be subjected to the odium of such an investigation. We should bring to

their attention the necessity of retiring when they have attained a certain age. That is all there is to this legislation.

Motion agreed to on division and the house went into committee, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

On section 1—Salaries of judges in office after attaining the age of seventy-five years.

Mr. JACOBS: I move that the words in line 11 "heretofore or" be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): The amendment should be in writing.

Mr. BENNETT: The government cannot accept that amendment, because it negatives the bill. The existing difficulties about which the complaints have been made will continue.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It does not negative the bill, it merely takes away the retroactive feature which is the most objectionable part.

Mr. DUPRE: But we do not want to do that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I know, that is very apparent from the speeches delivered this morning. It would not serve the purpose of the government.

Without entering into a new argument on this bill I wish again to voice my protest against it. I may say that the right hon. gentleman in his laboured argument, to use his own words, has not attempted to reply to the objections which have been made on this side of the house to this bill. I say that a most undersirable situation will exist when this bill becomes law. We will have two classes of high court judges in Canada, some with a salary of $9,000, others with a salary of $6,000. Because I prophesy to my hon. friends opposite that they will not succeed in persuading the judges who are still fit to work to get off the bench to suit my hon. friends.

Mr. DUPRE: At least we are trying to do something.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We shall have two sets of high court judges.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): On the first of July next how many judges will attain the age of seventy-five? Could we have the figures by provinces?

Mr. DUPRE: The number is fifteen. In Ontario six; Quebec, three; New Brunswick, two; Manitoba, two; Saskatchewan, one; British Columbia, one.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What will be the total amount of money involved?

Mr. DUPRE: To superannuate fourteen judges when the act becomes effective will require $99,666.66.

[Mr. Dupré.]

Mr. JACOBS: Has the Solicitor General the list of next year's crop, those who will reach seventy-five next year?

Mr. BENNETT: He has not the list with him.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): May I point out to the hon. Solicitor General that when he was concluding the debate on second reading he intimated that this is, I think his words were, an amelioration of section 28 of chapter 105. If he will look at the marginal note—and frequently sections of statutes are construed by marginal notes—

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): —he will find it is:

Salaries of judges in office after attaining the age of seventy-five years.

They are not retired, they are remaining in office at two-thirds of the salary. That to my mind is a most vicious distinction. Judges are going to remain in office, yet it was the only argument for the bill that judges incapable of carrying on their duties should retire. But you are not necessarily retiring these judges under the terms of this bill. The only effective result of this legislation is to perpetuate them in office, if they so desire, at two-thirds of the salary they are drawing now. So if a judge at the age of seventy-five has the faults imputed by the hon. member he still remains, and all the imperfections of the present system absolutely continue in existence. Here we are in these times of depression when we are reducing the salaries of small people, going to impose upon this nation an additional burden of $100,000 during the first year, with probably a progressive increase as the years go on. I think the principle of this legislation is absolutely futile. If the house were in favour of retiring judges compulsorily at the age of seventy-five that is an entirely different thing, because then we would get rid of any incompetency such as is alleged by the Solicitor General in regard to certain judges. But this legislation does not cure that situation.

In the second place it establishes what I consider the very iniquitous principle of differentiation between judges; those with full salary up to the age of seventy-five, and others with two-thirds, if they decide to remain in office after this bill becomes law. To my mind, it is, if not intentional, at least in effect an attack on the judiciary of Canada. It is introducing a principle of differentiation in regard to service, and I think it is a very dangerous principle. The legislation is only

a continuance of policies we have seen in operation the last three years, the slighting of parliament, taking these matters from its control and, as we saw in the case of the railway bill, taking away from the executive council powers which it properly has as an arm of the government. Now we are going to the judiciary and establishing this pernicious principle of differentiation between judges.

Mr. FACTOR: May I ask the Solicitor General in how many cases he has received complaints about the incapacity of these fifteen judges?

Mr. DUPRE: I am sorry I cannot answer, because these complaints have been made to the Minister of Justice who is away just now. All I know is that we have received a great number of complaints.

Mr. LAPOINTE: From whom?

Mr. DUPRE: From different parts of Canada. I can assure my hon. friend that I know personally that we have received a great many complaints from the province of Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Did my hon. friend receive any communications from the bench itself?

Mr. DUPRE: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: From the judges?

Mr. DUPRE: Oh, from the bench? Well, no, not from the bench. Either from litigants or from lawyers.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Could not my hon. friend give that information to the committee?

Mr. DUPRE: No, I do not think I should.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If the Solicitor General has received any complaints I think we are entitled to know where they came from and what they were.

Mr. DUPRE: I do not think I should give that information. All I think I should say to my hon. friend is that in our own district in Quebec there have been complaints with regard to delays in the administration of justice, and those delays have been caused by the illness or incapacity of some judges. I think my hon. friend himself has complained in that regard.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend knows that some of the old judges are doing a good deal more work than is being done by some of the new ones.

Mr. DUPRE: I quite agree, but I may add that this morning my hon. friend said that up to a certain period one chief justice of the province of Quebec was a remarkable judge, but that now he did not have the same capacity for work that he formerly had. I agreed with that statement; if I have to name the judge I will say that Chief Justice Lemieux certainly gave a wonderful example of high efficiency on the bench for thirty-five years, I think. Lately, however, because of his age, I presume, his capacity for work has not been the same, but that does not prevent us from having great admiration and affection for Chief Justice Sir François Lemieux, in view of his record.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am pleased indeed to hear those words. Chief Justice Lemieux has been a most active judge; he has been sick for some time, but it gives me pleasure to inform my hon. friend that according to the press this afternoon Chief Justice Lemieux held court yesterday, and he seems to be in good health once more. I know my hon. friend will be glad to get that information and I know he will hope that even with the reduced salary which the government proposes to pay, Chief Justice Lemieux will be able to sit again.

Mr. DUPRE: All I can say is that I am very glad to hear that Chief Justice Lemieux is better.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): If there have been complaints with regard to delays in Quebec it has been because, until the last six months or so, the court calendars in the city of Montreal have been overcrowded. If the rural districts of Quebec have suffered it has been because of the centralization of judges. They should have been decentralized and placed where they were about fifteen years ago; if that had been done there would have been no complaints in Quebec.

Mr. DUPRE: I have great respect for my hon. friend's opinion, but this is rather a controversial question, and I do not think it should be raised just now. My hon. friend may be right, but he could find many lawyers who would differ with him.

Amendment negatived on division.

Mr. DUPRE: In view of the short delay that has occurred in connection with this measure I think it is advisable to amend section 1 by deleting the word "July" wherever it appears, and inserting instead the word "September." This will give a little more time to the people concerned.

Mr. BENNETT: I move that section 1 be amended by deleting the word "July" in lines 16 and 24 and substituting therefor the word "September."

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What is the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. BENNETT: The purpose is this: A number of hon. gentlemen have suggested that since on retirement judges usually have two or sometimes three months' leave. This amendment would postpone the operation of the bill until after the long vacation, making September 1 the operative day. Those affected therefore will have had the benefits to which reference has been made.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): And those who have never had any leave of absence may take a trip for once.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This amounts to a leave of two months.

Mr. BENNETT: I think it was said to be immediate execution previously.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, they were paid the full salary.

Mr. BENNETT: Not until the following year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In this case they never will get the full salary.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. DUFF: According to your ruling a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, the amendment must be in writing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Where it is a question of only one word it is not necessary to apply that rule.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where is that rule found?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): It has been the practice.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): If a judge is to retire on September 1 will he be paid for the months of July and August on the basis of $9,000 if he has been receiving that salary?

Mr. DUPRE: I should think so.

Mr. BENNETT: The act does not become operative until September 1, so there will be no interference.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): I now have the amendment in writing. Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Section 1 as amended agreed to.

On section 2—Coming into force.

Mr. BENNETT: I move that the word "July" in lines 27 and 29 be deleted and the word "September" substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Supposing a judge has been appointed—and I believe there are a few cases of this kind—who, in order to complete fifteen years of service, will have to serve until he is more than seventy-five years of age. Why should there be a different kind of treatment in his case? If other judges are obliged to retire and take their pension at the age of seventy-five, or to accept a reduced salary if they remain on the bench, why should this newly appointed judge remain on the bench at his full salary until he is seventy-seven or seventy-eight years of age?

Mr. BENNETT: There is one case, I believe, in which the appointee was at an advanced age when he was appointed. He has no retiring allowance until he has served fifteen years, and he will be over seventy-five when he has served for that length of time. It is desirable to take care of that case, otherwise he would be retired with no annuity at all.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): But according to the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite this morning he will be seventy-five years old, and he will be no good. Surely the rule must apply to all or none.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course it would be subject to the fact that he must be able to carry on.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But the section is general in its scope; it does not apply to only one man.

Mr. BENNETT: I think there is only the one case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend says he has one case in mind. Is he sure there are not others? The law is general there, and my hon. friend from St. Henri is perfectly right. The right hon. gentleman argued this morning that when a judge reached the age of seventy-five he should withdraw, being no longer qualified. Why should he be considered qualified if he has not served fifteen years by the time he reaches the age of seventy-five? If he is not fit to be a judge under those circumstances this should apply to everyone. If there is necessity for a special vote in one particular case, as my right hon. friend suggests, it would be better to have the house vote the salary to that one man. But why should we

embody in the law what is certainly a deviation from the principle expounded by my right hon. friend and by the Solicitor General?

Mr. BENNETT: I was careful to say that there might be doubts whether seventy-five should be made the governing age or not, but as a matter of fact, in looking through the cases, I believe the department discovered that at least one judge—there may be another case, but in the hurry of work one cannot say—who would be past the age of seventy-five before becoming entitled to his pension. The purpose is to ensure that he does not lose his rights by reason of the fact that he was over sixty when appointed. I think, when we are making operative an act of this kind, it is desirable to protect the interests of a judge in such a case, because he is otherwise subject to all the provisions of the act. If he is infirm or disabled he can be dealt with under the provisions of the statute that refer to cases of that kind, but this clause is intended to meet this particular case.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): My right hon. friend is trying to carry out the state contract with respect to this individual judge, making it possible for him to receive his pension. That is the position; you cannot get away from it. The endeavour is being made to respect his contract, affording that judge an opportunity to remain after the age of seventy-five years, so that he may obtain his pension. If this is done it will be a breach of contract, and if it is a breach of contract with respect to one judge or a few judges, the principle constitutes a breach of contract towards the other judges who have reached the age of seventy-five. The government might give to that judge, for the time he may have served over a period of thirteen years, a pension proportionate to the length of service he has rendered before reaching the age of seventy-five.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no provision in the law for it.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Then the law is against you.

Bill as amended reported.

Mr. DUPRE moved the third reading of the bill, and the house divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Halton),
Arsenault,
Arthurs,
Barber,
Baribeau,
Barrette,
Beaubier,
Belec,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bennett,
Beynon,
Bourgeois,
Bowen,
Bowman,
Burns,
Bury,
Cantley,
Carmichael,
Casselman,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Cotnam,
Davies,
Dickie,
Dorion,
Duguay,
Duranleau,
Ernst,
Esling,
Fortin,
Gagnon,
Gardiner,
Gobeil,
Gordon,
Hackett,
Hay,
Heaps,
Johnstone,
Jones,
Kennedy (Peace River),
Kennedy (Winnipeg South Centre),
Larue,
Laurin,
Lennox,
Loucks,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
Macdonald (Kings),
Macdougall,
MacInnis,
MacMillan,
MacNicol,
Macphail, Miss,
McGillis,
McGregor,
McLure,
Manion,
Mitchell,
Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon),
Morand,
Myers,
Nicholson,
Peck,
Perley (Qu'Appelle),
Pickel,
Plunkett,
Porteous,
Quinn,
Robinson,
Ross,
Ryckman,
Ryerson,
Sauvé,
Senn,
Shaver,
Simpson (Simcoe North),
Smith (Victoria-Carleton),
Smith (Cumberland),
Spankie,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Sproule,
Stanley,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stewart (Lethbridge),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Stitt (Selkirk),
Sutherland,
Swanston,
Tétreault,
Thompson (Lanark),
Tummon,
Turnbull,
Weese,
White (Mount Royal),
Willis,
Wilson,
Wright.—99.

NAYS

Messrs:

Ahearn,
Beaubien,
Blair,
Boulanger,
Bradette,
Brown,
Butcher,
Cardin,
Chevrier,
Denis,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Donnelly,
Dubois,
Duff,
Dumaine,
Euler,
Factor,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Fournier,
Golding,
Hall,
Hanson (Skeena),
Howard,
Hurtubise,
King, Mackenzie,
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre),
MacLean,
McIntosh,
McKenzie (Assiniboia),
McPhee,
Munn,
Neill,
Parent,
Perras,
Pouliot,
Reid,
Rhéaume,
Roberge,
St-Père,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Taylor,
Thauvette,
Totzke,
Vallance,
Verville.—48.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Baker,	Bertrand,
Bell (Hamilton),	Mercier (St. Henri),
Bell (St. Antoine),	Raymond,
Black (Halifax),	Dubuc,
Cahan,	Rinfret,
Cowan (Port Arthur),	Ilsley,
Cowan (Long Lake),	Irvine,
Dupré,	Ferland,
Edwards,	Elliott,
Embury,	Bothwell,
Garland (Carleton),	Goulet,
Geary,	Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Gott,	Rutherford,
Guthrie,	Lapointe,
Hanson (York-Sunbury),	Veniot,
Harris,	Jacobs,
Laflèche,	Girouard,
Lawson,	Gray,
MacDonald (Cape Breton South),	Urquhart,
MacLaren,	Fiset, Sir Eugène,
McDade,	Dupuis,
McGibbon,	Power,
Maloney,	Young,
Matthews,	Moore (Ontario),
Mullins,	Howden,
Murphy,	Stewart (Edmonton),
Perley, Sir George,	Marcil,
Pettit,	Bouchard,
Price,	Hanbury,
Rhodes,	Ralston,
Rowe,	Lacroix,
Short,	Heenan,
Simpson (Algoma),	Casgrain,
Smoke,	Cayley,
Spence,	Fraser (Northumberland),
Spotton,	Hepburn,
Stevens,	Malcolm,
Stitt (Nelson),	Weir (Macdonald),
Sullivan,	Brasset,
Thompson (Simcoe),	Jean,
Weir (Melfort),	Motherwell,
White (London),	Gershaw.

Mr. MURPHY: I was paired with the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MacLAREN: I was paired with the hon. member for Rimouski (Sir Eugène Fiset). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MERCIER (Outremont): I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto South (Mr. Geary). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BERTRAND: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto Northeast (Mr. Baker). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. SHORT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SPENCE: I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland, Ontario (Mr. Fraser). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SIMPSON (West Algoma): I was paired with the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Embury). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Ferland). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): I was paired with the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Stitt). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUPUIS: I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. McDade). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. WHITE (London): I was paired with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gershaw). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): I was paired with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Raymond). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SMOKE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Cayley). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BOYES: I was paired with the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): I was paired with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Urquhart). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MALONEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. EDWARDS: I was paired with the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I was paired with the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. PETTIT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Bouchard). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Bill read the third time and passed.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE BASED ON SPACE OCCUPIED BY ADVERTISEMENTS

The house in committee on Bill No. 98, to amend the Post Office Act—Mr. Bennett—Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

Mr. BENNETT: This bill has been reprinted and the question propounded yesterday by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) is now answered in the negative. This bill cannot apply to weekly newspapers because, first of all, it applies only when newspapers are transmitted for a greater distance than forty miles and then:

The newspapers and periodicals described in the immediately preceding subsection, upon any copies in excess of 2,500 copies, shall be subject to postage—

At such and such a rate, and in any event the advertising medium in any weekly newspapers the officials have any record of, does not exceed 50 per cent.

I have secured answers to the questions asked by the leader of the opposition. The first is that newspapers coming from the United States to Canada, come in free. The postage is paid there and by international arrangement the papers come into this country. On our newspapers we pay the postage here and they go into the United States. In that country the zone system prevails with respect to advertising and the rate is ten cents a pound on the advertising portion, so that Canadian papers, so far as that is concerned, do not meet with greater competition in that regard; that is, United States papers while coming in free, pay ten cents per pound on the advertising content as determined at Washington, plus the ordinary postage for the privilege of transmission.

The right hon. member asked whether this would affect the Saturday Evening Post. The answer to that is no. The Saturday Evening Post is dealt with by the legislation of 1931, under which it will be recalled that that paper falls within the category that pays the five cents a copy to this country. The revenue derived from that last year was very substantial. I cannot give the exact amount but it exceeded five thousand dollars a month. The other question which the right hon. gentleman asked was whether this effected any change with respect to rates payable other than those he mentioned, namely, to increase the rate of four cents on the advertising content in excess of the present figure. There is no change in that regard in the statute as it now reads.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RADIO BROADCASTING ACT

PURCHASE OF STATIONS—APPOINTMENTS TO STAFF

Mr. BENNETT: With the consent of the house I move that we revert to the order introduction of bills so that I may introduce the bill which has been printed in order that the house may have the opportunity of considering its position.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What bill?

Mr. BENNETT: The radio bill.

Motion agreed to, and the house reverted to the order introduction of bills.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 99, to amend the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act.

He said: This bill is to amend the Radio Broadcasting Act of 1932 in two particulars, one to deal with the acquisition of stations by lease and or by purchase, and the other with respect to the appointment of a staff, that it should be selected by the commission. That may be highly controversial, but at any rate I only say to the house as I said the other evening, that Mr. Murray has gone over the country unaccompanied by the commission and has made a report in which having regard to his experience in engaging artists and others who provide programs as well as technical officers he makes that recommendation. I do not propose to proceed with the second reading to-day. After the house has had an opportunity to consider the bill we will discuss it at more length.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The house will revert to government orders.

CUSTOMS TARIFF AMENDMENT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 93, to amend the customs tariff.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

On section 1—Rate of exchange on depreciated currency in computing value for duty of goods imported.

Mr. YOUNG: Would you mind reading the first sentence of subsection (9), Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): It reads as follows:

"(9) (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the governor in council may, from time to time and as occasion requires, order and direct, subject to such exceptions as may be made, what shall be the rate of exchange fixed for any currency in computing the value for duty of goods imported into Canada from any place or country the currency of which is depreciated, and in case a sum in Canadian currency less than the invoice value of the goods in the currency of the place or country of export, computed at the rate of exchange so ordered, be paid for in goods, the actual selling price of the goods to the importer shall be regarded as less than the fair market value of the goods when sold for home consumption, and the provisions of this section shall apply and special or dumping duty shall apply equal to the difference between the value of the invoice computed at the current rate of exchange or at the average current rate from time to time fixed by order of the governor in council, and the value of such invoice, computed at the rate of exchange for duty so ordered as aforesaid, or may be less than such difference as the governor in council may from time to time order and direct; and the governor in council may order and direct that in all cases of sales or consignments of goods imported into Canada, where the importer owns, controls or is interested in the business of the exporter, or the exporter owns, controls or is interested in the business of the importer, or the importer and exporter operate under a controlling or holding company, notwithstanding the expressed terms of the sale or consignment, the transaction shall be regarded as a sale and the actual selling price to the purchaser in Canada shall be taken to be the value of the goods in the currency of the place or country of export converted into Canadian currency at the current rate of exchange, or at the average current rate from time to time fixed by order of the governor in council, and shall be regarded as less than the fair market value of the goods when sold for home consumption, and the provisions of this section shall apply and special or dumping duty shall be deemed to apply equal to the difference between the value of the invoice computed at the current rate of exchange or at the average current rate from time to time fixed by order of the governor in council, and the value of such invoice computed at the rate of exchange for duty so ordered as aforesaid, or may be less than such difference as the governor in council may from time to time order and direct.

[Mr Speaker.]

Mr. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I should like to point out that there is a typographical error in line 17, where the word "in" should be struck out and the word "the" substituted, so that it will read: "be paid for the goods." I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. EULER: May I ask the minister what the clause that has just been read means?

Mr. RYCKMAN: If my hon. friend will follow the section I think he will see that we have just put into words what the department has been doing since September when England went off the gold standard. We provided by orders in council for the exchange value of the pound for duty purposes. We provided also for the exchange value of the pound for special duty purposes. Then, as exchange was moving up and down, and as stability or an attempt at stability was desirable, we passed orders in council from time to time fixing the average value of the pound for special duty purposes. Having done that we found, and this appears in the section, that in order to avoid the payment of special duty, no matter what might be the exchange value of the pound, there were some who were selling at the fixed value of the pound for special duty purposes, thereby avoiding the payment of any special duty. There were certain articles of trade, such as wool, which had a gold value, and it was necessary for us to make orders in council in reference to the trade in wool. The trade in wines bottled in England, a trade which had been in existence for many years and was on a gold basis throughout the world, had to be provided for. These different movements and others, if hon. members will accept this long sentence which is Gladstonian in its proportions, will develop just exactly the course of the department in handling the business. I hope that this lengthy explanation will be at least in a measure satisfactory.

Mr. EULER: Since the minister has stated that the object of the legislation is merely to put into statutory form a practice which has been followed by the department for some time, why is it necessary, if the practice was legal before, to put it now in the form of a statute?

Mr. RYCKMAN: That is of course a very proper question. When this was done in the first instance I was not in the country. I was in London, England, when gold took the flight. It was found that in an emergency in which quick action had to be taken a decision was

made which later had to be modified by order in council. Upon arriving home I canvassed the whole situation as carefully as I could. I was told, but not with emphasis, that the govenor general in council had done something which it had not authority to do. When I inquired what that was, I could not find out. However someone had set on foot the story that there was imperfection in the action taken by the governor in council, and in order to remove any possible doubt, I was anxious to effect a remedy. It is not proposed to go back and take the course of making merchants pay who have not paid but have been fair. The idea is to have the matter clear beyond peradventure. I may tell my hon. friend that the closest I could get to any definite statement as to what was done by the government which it had not power to do by order in council was that we had fixed an average for duty over fortnightly periods, and that it was necessary that the amounts so fixed should be the real exchange values of the pound on the particular dates. In order, as I say, to have some degree of uniformity we had fixed fortnightly values which obtained during the respective fortnights, action which it was suggested the government had not power to take. I think that it had. But if anyone wishes to challenge the action of the government I think this House of Commons, the final authority, ought to give the governor in council full power for what has been done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Who was it told the minister? Was it his colleagues?

Mr. RYCKMAN: No it was not. So far as I know my colleagues are of the opinion that their action was correct. But there was the idea abroad to which I have referred. When I tried to localize it and find out what the trouble was the suggestion was made that we had not the power to fix the average value for duty covering fortnightly periods. So, in order to remove all possible doubt we are asking this House of Commons to pass this legislation, remembering, if you will, that it was necessary to act quickly. I think that while some people may object, in the main the action taken was beneficial to the country.

Mr. EULER: The minister admits that there was some doubt as to the legality of what was done in the past, since Great Britain went off the gold standard. Will he say now that this bill will regularize what was possibly done illegally in the past? Is it retroactive?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, it is.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Yes. I say, as frankly as I can, that I believe the government had the authority. I believe that in the emergency the government should have had the power; I think all the chances are that it did. There is the view that improper or unwarranted action may be asserted. No one has done so thus far, but if such a contention should be advanced naturally the interests of the government and the revenue should be fortified. My answer to the hon. member would be that if this legislation is made retroactive from the month of September, when Great Britain went off the gold standard, we would be prepared for any threat on the part of any body in connection with the correctness of the action taken by the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Has any threat been made up to the present?

Mr. RYCKMAN: None that I know of.

Mr. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, if I understand the minister correctly, under this section the government are to be given power to fix the value of the British pound, and the value so fixed will be the value for duty. That is to say, if goods to the value of £100 are brought into Canada, and the value of the pound is fixed at $4.25, then the value for duty of those goods will be $425. Is that correct?

Mr. RYCKMAN: No, that is not correct. The hon. member may have got that idea from what I said. But in connection with duty upon the pound, may I say that the value of the pound was fixed at par when our tariff was made. The value for duty is still with the pound at $4.86⅔. But there is a special duty, and that special duty is levied or was a short time ago, because at the present time there is none. The value of the pound for special duty was first $4.40 and then it was changed to $4.25. The exchange value of the day, or of this fortnightly period, deducted from $4.40 at first, and later from $4.25, constituted the special duty or what is commonly known as the dumping duty.

Mr. YOUNG: Would the minister tell us where in subsection (a) he finds authority for saying that the value for duty would be $4.86⅔? It states here that the value for duty is the value they fix.

Mr. RYCKMAN: That was in the order in council, passed September 29, 1931, P.C. 2415.

Mr. YOUNG: What does it say?

Mr. RYCKMAN: It says:

By order in council (P.C. 2415) dated 29th September, 1931, it is ordered that in computing the value for duty of goods imported into Canada from Great Britain, the rate of exchange shall be fixed at $4.86⅔ to pound sterling being the par value thereof.

Mr. YOUNG: The section reads:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the governor in council may, from time to time and as occasion requires, order and direct, subject to such exceptions as may be made, what shall be the rate of exchange fixed for any currency in computing the value for duty of goods imported into Canada from any place or country the currency of which is depreciated, and in case a sum in Canadian currency less than the invoice value of the goods in the currency of the place or country of export, computed at the rate of exchange so ordered, be paid for in goods, the actual selling price of the goods to the importer shall be regarded as less than the fair market value of the goods when sold for home consumption, and the provisions of this section shall apply.

Mr. RYCKMAN: This legalizes that, if there ever was any doubt as to its legality.

Mr. YOUNG: When the minister fixes the pound at $4.25—that is the power given him in the first fifteen lines of this section, is it not?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would like to say that the minister does not fix the value, it is done by the governor in council.

Mr. YOUNG: Well when that is done, when the value of the pound is fixed at $4.25, and then when they fix the average current value, the difference between those two shall be the dumping duty. Is not that the understanding? "And the first value fixed shall be the basis on which the value for duty is computed."

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, the minister was absent when the rate of $4.40 was fixed. Our tariff is based upon the assumption that the par value of the pound is $4.86⅔. That is a statutory provision. When England went off the gold standard on September 21, 1931, it was concluded that there would be an immediate increase in commodity prices, that prices of raw materials would increase and that wages would increase in terms of the new currency. And a deputation representing large interests in the country waited upon me—the minister was not in the country at that moment, if my memory serves me correctly. I speak subject to correction in regard to that. At any rate I told them that I should like their suggestions as to what they thought would be a reasonable percentage to deduct from the pound in view of the fact that a depreciated currency usually results in increased commodity prices. They came back at the end of the time fixed, and we agreed that $4.40 would be a fair basis of value for that purpose. Ten per cent from $4.86 as you will observe leaves $4.38, but as a matter of fact we fixed on $4.40, which was regarded by all as being reasonable, including the representative of the British interests. That was predicated upon the assumption that by reason of England going off the gold standard the appreciation in the case of raw materials would be substantially ten per cent. The board of trade figures show that in fact that figure was slightly higher than the result indicated, the cost of raw materials did not rise in Great Britain as was expected, it stood around eight per cent in excess of the prices before September 21. Then the British exporters suggested that the figure was too high in view of the changed value of the pound sterling. The pound in this country fluctuated. In August, 1931, the high was $4·8798 and the low $4·8642; in September it fell to a low figure of $3.70, the high figure being $4·9686. In October the high figure was $4.52 and the low figure $4.26; in November it fell below $4, $3.92 and a fraction, the high figure being $4.25; in December the high figure was $4.31 and a fraction and the low figure $3.83.

It was not however until this budget was introduced that the figure of $4.25 was agreed to. There was constant pressure that the value should be reduced below $4.40, and also there were representations made by Canadians that the figure should be increased. But we let it remain at $4.40 until the budget was introduced, when it was reduced to $4.25. The dumping duty is the difference between the average market value of the pound sterling for a period of fifteen days and $4.40 up to the time the budget was introduced, when the figure became $4.25. As I say, an arrangement as to the average for fifteen days was arrived at after a conference with the representatives of importers and representatives of some exporting houses with myself. Variations of course took place from time to time with the fluctuations of the market quotations for the pound sterling. Now of course, at $4.25, no dumping duty is payable, the figure at the moment being, I believe, the high for this month $4.43 and the low $4.10. That I think is the explanation.

Mr. YOUNG: I can understand the average fortnightly value of the pound as arranged. I can understand the $4.40 or $4.25. But I do not see where $4.86 comes into the picture. That was the value of the pound originally,

that value disappeared, and it was agreed by this government that the value of the pound should be $4.40, and it says here "the value fixed by the minister shall be the value for duty." Where is the authority for $4.86?

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps my hon. friend from Weyburn did not follow me carefully. In the latter part of my observations I was dealing with special duties. The value of the pound sterling upon which our tariff duties were based is $4.86.

Mr. YOUNG: But you have changed that.

Mr. BENNETT: No, that has not been changed, it is the special duties that have been changed. But for duty purposes we have remained at $4.86⅔, being the par value of the pound sterling. And the 20 per cent tariff, which was the tariff made by this parliament in days gone by, was on $4.86 and not any other figure. Then the special duty is the duty to compensate for the depreciated currency at which the goods have been bought.

I take this illustration; I did not intend to use it, but I put it to my hon. friend. The duty is 25 per cent by statute. A purchaser acquires £100 worth of goods, $486 would be what he would pay for them before Great Britain went off the gold standard—there might be a fluctuation of a few cents—the duty would be $121.50. If he bought the same goods with the pound at $3.80 the 25 per cent duty would amount to $95 which, plus the $380, would make $475, which would be less than the face value of the invoice before Great Britain went off the gold standard. Then the special duty would become payable. Since my hon. friend says he quite understands the $4.40 and the average fifteen day quotations I shall not repeat what has been said in that regard. The special duties were payable, as I have indicated, to equalize as far as possible the position of the Canadian producer with relation to the British exporter, in terms of depreciated money.

Mr. EULER: Like my hon. friend from Weyburn I will admit that I have always had some difficulty in understanding why, since Great Britain has practically discarded the par of $4.86⅔, our rate of duty should be based on that figure.

Mr. HACKETT: That is what the tariff is based on.

Mr. EULER: I understand, and I have no fault to find with, the fixing of the exchange for an average of fifteen days, but I do not quite understand why both methods should be adopted for extracting a higher duty. If it be true that because of the depreciation of the pound you should remain on the $4.86⅔ basis, is it not true also, at least in theory, and I think to some extent in practice, that as the British pound depreciated it was impossible to buy the same quantity of goods for the same amount of money. I do not know whether I have made myself clear, but when the pound depreciated after Great Britain went off the gold standard did not commodity prices in Great Britain increase so that for the same money you bought a smaller quantity of goods?

Mr. BENNETT: That is what was expected, and that was why $4.40 was agreed upon by us all as being a fair price for the pound. It was expected that commodity values would rise about ten per cent; therefore, deducting ten per cent from $4.86 would give you some idea of what the value of the pound might be. As a matter of fact that was not exactly what happened. Perhaps the hon. member for North Waterloo has been reading the British trade journals. Nothing has been more surprising than the fact that instead of commodity prices rising with the depreciated currency, commodity prices actually decreased with respect to many basic commodities. There has been some increase during the last two weeks, but prior to that there was a steady decrease.

Mr. EULER: I have not checked it up, but in one of the financial papers, I think the Financial Post of Toronto, the statement was made that commodity prices did increase to such an extent that the imposition of the dumping duty on the basis of $4.40 was entirely unnecessary, because the rise in commodity prices was sufficient to offset that depreciation. I have not checked it up, as I say, but certainly that statement is made by interested importers in this country.

Mr. YOUNG: The Prime Minister tells us that the pound at one time was worth $4.86. A certain thing happened in England; the government met and they said the pound was no longer worth $4.86 but was worth $4.40, and to-day they have fixed the value at $4.25. If you say the pound is not worth $4.86 why impose duty at that rate? There is nothing in this bill to justify that.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am afraid my hon. friend is hardly correct. I would refer him to the order in council passed on September 29, 1931, which reads:

> By order in council (P.C. 2415), dated 29th September, 1931, it is ordered that in computing the value for duty of goods imported into Canada from Great Britain the rate of exchange shall be fixed at $4.86⅔ to pound sterling being the par value thereof.

Then:

By order in council (P.C. 2428), dated 29th September, 1931, it is ordered that in respect of goods imported into Canada from Great Britain, in case a sum less than $4.86⅔ in Canadian currency for each pound sterling of the invoice be paid for the said goods, the actual selling price of the goods to the importer shall be regarded as less than the fair market value of the goods when sold for home consumption and the provisions of section 6 of the customs tariff shall apply.

Mr. YOUNG: The minister has just read an order in council authorizing him to do certain things which he has been doing for the last two years. Now he says some doubt has arisen as to the legality of those things, and he brings in a bill to legalize what he has been doing.

Mr. RYCKMAN: No, it is to remove any chance of doubt. In my own mind I think council had ample authority to do what was done.

Mr. YOUNG: Then the minister wants this bill to contain ample justification for everything that was done, but it does not contain anything that would justify the order in council he read.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. YOUNG: No, it is not carried. I may say that I have received complaints about this regulation, and I should like to read a portion of a letter I received from a broker. Referring to another letter he had written he said:

My letter does not start with parliamentary language but expresses the exasperation felt by the vague meaning put into many of these regulations. It is quite possible there is a hidden meaning and I would suggest you ask that this resolution be explained.

This gentleman says he cannot find any meaning in the resolution and suggests that there may be a hidden meaning. I have read the resolution carefully, sentence by sentence, and I cannot find any hidden meaning at all; if it is hidden it is well hidden. I even read it backwards, and it makes just as much sense that way. Will the minister explain just what he means by a country whose currency is depreciated? Does he mean depreciated in terms of gold, in terms of American dollars, or in terms of Canadian dollars?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Currency is depreciated when it is at less than its recognized par throughout the world.

Mr. YOUNG: In terms of gold?

Mr. RYCKMAN: There might be a country where they traded jack-knives.

[Mr. Ryckman.]

Mr. YOUNG: That is a sharp answer. I have here the Commercial Intelligence Journal for May 6, showing the value of different currencies. I find that on that date the United States dollar was worth 88 cents in gold and the Canadian dollar was worth 74 cents in gold. Now I want to ask the minister whether United States currency would come under this clause. That currency is depreciated in terms of gold, but it is above par in Canadian money; the United States dollar is worth about $1.13 in Canadian money. Would United States currency be considered depreciated under this clause?

Mr. RYCKMAN: No.

Mr. YOUNG: Let us see how this will work out. If this applies to a country whose currency is depreciated in terms of gold but is still above Canadian currency, any advantage or supposed advantage which that country might derive from the depreciation of its currency would be more than offset by the further depreciation of the Canadian currency. In a case like that I ask the minister how he would justify the application of this section.

Mr. RYCKMAN: If the currency is at a premium of course the section would not apply.

Mr. YOUNG: I want to know whether that means at a premium in terms of Canadian money or in terms of gold. Here is a currency that is at a premium in terms of Canadian money and at a discount in terms of gold.

Mr. RYCKMAN: In the money market of Canada we have listed the currencies and their values; some are depreciated and some are appreciated, and we govern ourselves accordingly. The banks furnish the department, at eleven o'clock in the morning, the exchange rate in respect of any currency regarding which information may be asked.

Mr. YOUNG: I take it the minister means depreciated in terms of Canadian money. What will he do with respect to a country whose currency is above ours?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Frankly, I do not understand the question.

Mr. YOUNG: I want to know how the section will be made to apply.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The section does not apply.

Mr. YOUNG: Then I will ask this question. The United States is such a country: if we are buying goods from the United States does any currency dumping duty apply?

Mr. RYCKMAN: No, not when their currency is at a premium.

Mr. YOUNG: Then will the minister explain this. I have here an appraiser's note for a small collection on an electric lamp. The appraised value—not the invoice value—is $1.90; United States exchange 26 cents; advance for duty, 72 cents, making a total value for duty of $2.88. How is that value for duty arrived at?

Mr. RYCKMAN: That has nothing to do with the section under consideration.

Mr. YOUNG: I think it has quite a bit to do with it. I will ask this question, then. If an American exporter is sending goods into Canada, with the Canadian dollar quoted at 88 cents American funds, and he offers to take the Canadian dollar at par, what action will the officers take?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I do not know either that that question relates to this section. We require the United States money to be converted into Canadian value.

Mr. YOUNG: Will the minister say he will or will not impose a dumping duty equal to the difference in the currency?

Mr. RYCKMAN: It depends upon the manner in which payment is made. It must be the fair market value in the country from which the goods are imported and must have relation to our own currency, and if an American exporter takes Canadian money when the United States money is at a premium we charge the duty in that case.

Mr. YOUNG: Then the minister is charging the currency dumping duty against the United States as well as against other countries whose currency is at a premium. I can recall a report that appeared in the newspapers some time ago of a speech of the Prime Minister in which he seemed to resent the fact that Americans did not give us 100 cents for the dollar. But if the American did offer full value the Minister of National Revenue would not let him do it.

Mr. BENNETT: No, no.

Mr. YOUNG: He said so.

Mr. RYCKMAN: We insist on the fair market value for duty purposes. If someone tries to charge less we step in in the interests of the business of the country and insist upon a fair market value, and the transaction is carried out on that footing.

Mr. YOUNG: It amounts to this. You simply say to the American, "You must not give Canada one hundred cents for her dollar." Let us see what the section says in line 30:

> . . . in all cases of sales or consignments of goods imported into Canada, where the importer owns, controls or is interested in the business of the exporter, or the exporter owns, controls or is interested in the business of the importer, or the importer and exporter operate under a controlling or holding company, notwithstanding the expressed terms of the sale or consignment, the transaction shall be regarded as a sale and the actual selling price to the purchaser in Canada shall be taken to be the value of the goods in the currency of the place or country of export converted into Canadian currency at the current rate of exchange, or at the average current rate from time to time fixed by order of the governor in council, and shall be regarded as less than the fair market value . . .

Leaving out the second clause we find this. If a certain relationship exists between an importer in Canada and an exporter in Britain, then the goods shall be regarded as being sold at less than fair market value and the dumping duty shall apply. Is that what the minister intends to say?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I intended to say what the hon. member has read.

Mr. YOUNG: The minister intends to say this, that if a partnership or relationship of principal and agent exists between an exporter in England and an importer in Canada, then the goods shall be regarded as being dumped and as being sold at less than fair market value. Is that what the minister intended?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Yes, with this added—if the price is the value for special duty, because some have been evading the special duty. How? By using in the transaction the value that has been fixed as the value of the pound for special duty, so that there is no special duty payable at all. In some cases they have been willing to pay the merchant in England a higher price than they needed to pay him, in order to evade paying the special duty in Canada. If I have an affiliated company in England and if I am prepared to pay at a higher rate than the currency exchange rate I am simply taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other and not giving the government its fair share of duty.

Mr. YOUNG: Where is that contained in the bill? As I read it all that is necessary is that a certain relationship shall exist, that there be a partnership, and if they are partners, regardless of everything else, the dumping duty applies. That is the way I understand the bill.

Mr. RYCKMAN: If the invoice shows that it would be a case of dumping if they were not partners.

Mr. YOUNG: Where is that in the bill?

Mr. RYCKMAN: The hon. member read it; I do not wish to read it over again.

Mr. YOUNG: I cannot find it. I do not know who drafted the section, but here are 466 words all in one sentence, and for the life of me I cannot find the subject or the predicate of it. I do not know who drew it up.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I didn't think it was quite as bad as all that.

Mr. YOUNG: It is, for I have actually counted the words, and they are all in one sentence. The man who did it must have been working by the mile.

Mr. BENNETT: He must have been a free trader.

Mr. YOUNG: A correspondent suggests to me that there may be a hidden meaning in it. It has been said that language was given man as a means of concealing his thoughts; evidently that was the idea in the mind of the person who drafted this section. I suggest to the minister that he break it up into a number of clear, terse, concise sentences. When you want to draft a thing like this there are two principles to be observed: first, keep clearly in mind what you want to say and, secondly, say it.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Did my hon. friend ever think of applying that to himself?

Mr. YOUNG: I do the best I can. The minister wants to say several things here. If he will tell us what they are, we will try to say them for him. The first thing he wants to say is that the governor in council shall have power to fix the values of certain currencies. Why not say that in one sentence and stop there? Then make another sentence for the next thing the minister wants to do. He wants to say that the value for duty shall be based on the value of currency so fixed. Let him put that in another sentence. Then he can have another saying that the governor in council shall have power to determine every fortnight the average value of the currency in question. Let him have another sentence stating that in case the actual price paid for the goods at the average current rate of exchange is less than the value for duty so fixed, the goods shall be considered as dumped and shall be liable to dumping duty. Then he can have another sentence saying that when certain relationships exist between the importer and the exporter the transaction shall be considered as a sale and values shall be determined as in the former clauses of the bill. Let him put those different ideas in different short, terse sentences expressed in simple words. Then we shall understand the matter and be able to discuss it intelligently. At present the bill does not make sense.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The Department of Justice revised this section, and they did not have any difficulty with it. I must say I did not at first understand it as fully as I might have wished, but after reading it the second and third times, for I have read it a few times, I think it is plain. I do not believe my hon. friend would have to read it three times to understand it.

Mr. YOUNG: If the Justice department drafted it they may be quite capable of understanding it, and the minister may also be capable of understanding it, but it has to be understood by ordinary mortals in business and they do not seem to know what it means. Even the officials of the department do not seem to understand it. I suggest that it be put into simple language so that the man in the street, even the hon. member for Weyburn may understand it.

Mr. BENNETT: If they all understand it as well as he does, there will be none who do not understand it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Carried.

Mr. YOUNG: No. We want it redrafted. Does the minister not think it should be redrafted and simplified?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Frankly, I think not. The difficulties have been caused by the complications in the working out of business, the fluctuations we have had; by reason of changes in exchange values a dumping duty may be shown one day and none the next. It is these things that cause difficulty, but anyone in the trade who will follow it, will understand it. I can appreciate the fact that a layman might find some difficulty on reading this over for the first time, but I think a bright minded person, on reading it the second time, would understand it fully.

Mr. YOUNG: Unfortunately we are not all sufficiently bright minded to do so. In spite of what the minister says, in the last section I read where certain relationships are supposed to exist between the importer and the exporter and I cannot find in the bill anything other than that if such relationship exist, the goods are dumped no matter what

the price is. Surely the minister ought to be willing to clear this up by clarifying his language.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I think it is clear now.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 95, to amend the Special War Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Lennox in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Stamp tax on cheques.

Mr. RHODES: I have an amendment to offer to this section as follows:

That the bill be amended as follows:

That subsection (2) of section 44, as proposed to be enacted by section 2 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(2) The following cheques shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this section, under regulations to be prescribed by the minister, when drawn for an amount of money not exceeding $5:—

(i) cheques issued in payment for milk or cream to producers thereof;

(ii) cheques issued in payment for eggs or poultry by egg and poultry exchanges to producers thereof;

(iii) cheques issued by cooperative associations of wool growers in payment for wool to producers thereof;

(iv) cheques issued by municipal corporations to persons in receipt of unemployment relief.

There is a similar exemption in the case of money orders, post office money orders and postal notes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 3 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

On section 7—Excise tax on money orders, etc., of express companies.

Mr. RHODES: I have the following amendment to offer to this section:

That subsection (2) of section 65, as proposed to be enacted by section 7 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(2) The following money orders shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this section, under regulations to be prescribed by the minister, when drawn for an amount of money not exceeding $5:—

(i) money orders issued in payment for milk or cream to producers thereof;

(ii) money orders issued in payment for eggs or poultry by egg and poultry exchanges to producers thereof;

(iii) money orders issued by cooperative associations of wool growers in payment for wool to producers thereof;

(iv) money orders issued by municipal corporations to persons in receipt of unemployment relief.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—Post office money orders.

Mr. RHODES: I have the following amendment to offer to this section:

That subsection (2) of section 69, as proposed to be enacted by section 8 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The following post office money orders shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this section, under regulations to be prescribed by the minister, when drawn for an amount of money not exceeding $5:—

(i) post office money orders issued in payment for milk or cream to producers thereof;

(ii) post office money orders issued in payment for eggs or poultry by egg and poultry exchanges to producers thereof;

(iii) post office money orders issued by cooperative associations of wool growers in payment for wool to producers thereof;

(iv) post office money orders issued by municipal corporations to persons in receipt of unemployment relief.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 9—Stamp tax on postal notes.

Mr. RHODES: I have the following amendment to offer to this section:

That subsection (2) of section 70, as proposed to be enacted by section 9 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:—

(2) The following postal notes shall be exempt from the tax imposed by this section, under regulations to be prescribed by the minister, when drawn for an amount of money not exceeding $5:—

(i) postal notes issued in payment for milk or cream to producers thereof;

(ii) postal notes issued in payment for eggs or poultry by egg and poultry exchanges to producers thereof;

(iii) postal notes issued by cooperative associations of wool growers in payment for wool to producers thereof;

(iv) postal notes issued by municipal corporations to persons in receipt of unemployment relief.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 10 agreed to.

On section 11—Excise tax on cigarette papers.

Mr. HOWARD: Has the minister any amendment for this section?

Mr. RHODES: That was amended in committee on the resolution, and the bill conforms to the resolution as amended.

Section agreed to.

Sections 12 to 32 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: I wish to amend the bill by adding a new section 1A, reading as follows:

1a. Paragraph (b) of section thirteen of The Special War Revenue Act, chapter one hundred and seventy-nine of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, as enacted by section one of chapter fifty-four of the statutes of 1932, is amended by striking out the words "against fire" in the last line thereof.

The effect of that amendment is this. The act of 1932 exempts from taxation farmers' mutual insurance companies which are engaged in the business of insurance against fire. When that exemption was made it was not in mind that there were also farmers' mutual insurance companies which insured against weather, hail and the like. By striking out the words, "against fire," farmers' mutuals will be exempted from taxation whether they insure against fire or against weather.

Mr. MARCIL: As regards the farmers' mutuals, the other day a farmer told me that he thought the cheques issued on the caisses populaires, the farmers' bank, so called, were exempted from the stamp tax. The bank is not incorporated in the real sense under provincial charter, but it is very useful to the farmers and the cheques issued are numerous. I would like to know for certain if cheques issued on this bank are exempt from taxation.

Mr. RHODES: Since my hon. friend mentioned the matter the other day I have had the opportunity of making inquiry and I find that under the act as hitherto administered those cheques have been regarded as cheques coming within the provisions of the bill with respect to the taxation of cheques.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 96, to amend the Income War Tax Act.

[Mr. Rhodes.]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

On section 9—Five per cent tax on residents of Canada.

Mr. RHODES: I have an amendment to move to amend subsection 5 of section 9B as enacted by section 9 of the bill, by adding the following words at the end of the said subsection:

except those exemptions provided by paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (k) of the said section 4.

Section 4 of chapter 97 of the statutes of 1927 refers (a) to the income of the governor general of Canada; (b) to the income of consuls and consuls-general and of officials or officers of a foreign country whose duties require them to reside in Canada; (c) the income of officials of Great Britain or any of its self-governing colonies whose duties require them to reside in Canada. Those are the ordinary diplomatic considerations which obtain in all countries, and I take it that there will be no exception taken on the part of the committee. Paragraph (k) has to do with the income of incorporated companies whose business and assets are carried on and situate entirely outside of Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RHODES: I have another amendment of a minor character. I move to amend subsection 11 of 9B by substituting the word "income" for the word "revenue" in line 18, so that the proviso will read:

Provided that not more than one-quarter of the gross income of the Canadian company is derived from interest and dividends.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 10 and 11 agreed to.

On section 12—Deductions of 12½ per centum on certain payments made to non-residents.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, you have been proceeding so rapidly that perhaps I have missed the clause concerning which I should have liked to make some observations. If you would permit me I should like to make them now. It was with regard to a debate of about a week ago in connection with the tax on corporations. Am I in order?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Yes.

Mr. EULER: I said at the time that the removal of the $2,000 exemption on corporation incomes has created a discriminatory position so far as small corporations are concerned. May I repeat, lest I be misunderstood, that I am not objecting in any sense to corporations paying income tax. My objection is based entirely on the disproportion between the tax paid by a business which happens to be incorporated as compared with the—

An hon. MEMBER: Carried.

Mr. EULER: If hon. members say it is carried before I am through, it will take all the longer. There is a disproportion between the tax paid by the incorporated company and that paid by a similar business which happened to be owned by one or two persons. I object to the great difference in the taxation. I take as an example the tax which has to be paid by a corporation having a profit of $5,000 as compared with the tax on the $5,000 profit earned by a private individual. As I said at that time the amounts payable were in the one case something like $713 and in the case of the private individual only about $120. My contention was that the difference was entirely too great. The minister attempted to meet my statement by saying that I had not allowed for salaries. I want to say now that I did allow for salaries. When I spoke of the $5,000 income I presumed that salaries had been paid, and I omitted the actual computation as far as salary was concerned. Salary having been omitted in both cases in my computation the result was almost exactly identical in each case. If a profit—and I am speaking of a net profit in either case—is $5,000, and for the purpose of argument we want to say that in each case the manager of the concern receives a salary, the joint stock company at a salary of $3,000 and the manager of the private business on an allowance, if you wish to call it that, of $3,000, the difference, if it is computed by way of a tax on the company and by way of individual taxation, is, if we care to take it that way, $919 to be paid by the corporation or its owner by way of individual taxes, and only $346.50 to be paid by the private owner. I am trying to point out that the difference is entirely too great. I am not objecting to the principle of taxation of the corporation, but it seems unnecessary to state that it is utterly unfair that a business which shows a net profit of, we will say, $5,000 on capital should have to pay $919 while a privately owned business making a net profit of $5,000 pays only $346.50. I have checked these figures carefully, and they represent the difference between the two amounts in the case to which I referred the other day when it was taken for granted that I had not included salaries—$572 in one case and $593.75 in the other, or a difference of only $21.75.

I should like, not for the purpose of delaying the committee but to point out what I regard as an absolute injustice, for a few moments to review the situation. I think when the income tax was first introduced so far as corporations were concerned, in order to avoid double taxation, after the company had paid its taxes and the shareholders had received their dividends, they were allowed to deduct some eight per cent on individual receipts because of the fact that the company had already paid taxes on that income. It was regarded as unjust that taxation should be paid twice on the same sum. I believe that is a sound principle and if I cared to look back I could quote the present Prime Minister as having said what I am now saying, namely that the principle of double taxation is unsound. I could mention a good many members on the opposite side of the house who took that position. Following that I believe it was the late Hon. Mr. Robb who removed the provision for the eight per cent allowance, but included a provision for a family corporation. That has been removed by the minister. In fact, the minister has done these three things within a very short period: He has removed the exemption which joint stock companies enjoyed; he has removed the family corporation provision, and he has increased the rate of taxation.

Just to make the comparison still more glaring may I point out that the owners of a joint stock company have to pay from four to seven income taxes on the same sum of money. The exemption of eight per cent has been abolished. We now have, first, a tax of twelve and a half per cent on the corporation, which is paid by the company itself. The individual is then taxed on the balance which he draws in dividends. There is double taxation. He is then taxed on last year's tax, because that sum cannot legally be deducted. The municipality—and especially is this so in the province of Ontario—then charges him an income tax on the same income, and usually charges about twice as much as it ought to charge, because the tax is based on the mill rate or the assessment rate, and the assessments in most of our towns and villages are usually half or less than half the actual real estate value. The result is that the tax rate or the mill rate is perhaps

forty mills where it ought to be only twenty, if assessments were properly made. So he has a municipal income tax on the same sum of money. Then, in my province along comes the provincial government, placing another tax on joint stock companies of one per cent of their capital. There are at least four income taxes paid by a man who happens to have his money invested in a joint stock company.

But the point I wish to make—and I have no hope that I will be successful in convincing the minister—is that in the case of the small company where there is a proprietor, or two or three proprietors in a family, on so small a profit as $5,000 a tax of over $900 is paid. That figure must compare with the $300 paid by the private individual. Let us take the figures which the minister mentioned the other day when he endeavoured to show I had not allowed for the $3,000 salary. Let me take the $3,000 salary in the case of a joint stock company which I had credited with a profit of $5,000. That reduces the profit to $2,000. Figure it out in that way. Even the small company which has a profit of only $2,000, a company which may be owned by one person or perhaps by one man and members of his family, pays a tax of more than $300, whereas his competitor next door pays only $120. My whole argument is to make this point, that the difference is entirely too great. I am not objecting to the corporation tax, but I do not see any reason why the small man because he happens for convenience to have his business in the form of a stock company—and he gets his charter from the provincial government, not this government, and the provincial government taxes him—should be penalized by having to pay three times the tax on his profits that the man who does business the other way has to pay. I think it is wrong and should be corrected.

Mr. RHODES: Dealing with the first part of the remarks of my hon. friend, in which he refers to an individual doing business as a company as against the individual doing a personal business, and the disparity in the income tax payable in the different situations, I hope he will not think me discourteous if I do not again cover the ground which I covered on Friday during his absence in reply to his colleague the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). He will find the complete reply in Hansard, as far as I am able to give it.

Mr. EULER: I have it right here.

Mr. RHODES: Whether that be regarded by my hon. friend as a satisfactory reply or not, it is the only reply I can give, and it would not be fair to encumber the record by repeating the same argument.

With respect to his second objection, I am very largely in agreement with him. There is no doubt that the feature of double taxation is in itself objectionable. If conditions were fairly normal we might have eliminated it, but I must point out that now is not the time when we can consider such a proposal. When we do approach more prosperous conditions we ought, if possible, to get away from the feature of double taxation, not only in connection with the income tax but other taxes I might cite. Further we should try if at all possible, when conditions improve, to get away from the retroactive feature which has been present in the income tax since its inception, because it is very hard on an individual who has to pay a tax this year at an increased rate on an income which he received and spent last year, and possibly this year he may have no income. There are actual cases of that character. That is a hardship which we ought at the earliest possible moment to attempt to eliminate.

As far as triple taxation is concerned, first by the dominion, second by the province and third by the municipality, in connection with income tax, I am in accord with the views expressed by my hon. friend. I stated to the house, on Friday I think it was, that that subject came up for discussion at the last provincial conference, and as a result there is a committee of the higher officials of the provinces and the dominion at work at the present moment. I hope that as a result of their efforts we may arrive at a working basis which will be fair to the different taxation authorities and also to the individuals concerned.

Mr. MacLEAN: I wish to bring to the minister's attention again the question of reinstating the exemption of $2,000 for small companies. I wish to back up what the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has just said in connection with this matter. Even to-day I received a telegram from the Charlottetown board of trade saying:

> Incorporated companies here and council board trade urge reinstatement exemption of two thousand dollars to incorporated companies in budget.

They seem to think it is working a very great hardship on the small companies. I really think the minister should give serious consideration to this.

Mr. RHODES: It is not a complete answer I will admit, but I may say to my hon. friend that neither in the United States nor Great

Britain do they give any exemption whatever. If the small company feels itself aggrieved, particularly the type of company referred to by my hon. friend from North Waterloo, it is a simple thing to dissolve the company and pay the straight income tax. Admittedly the exemption was dropped for the purpose of enlarging the return to the treasury. I cannot see that there is any injustice, as the exemption follows all along the line with every company.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, the exemption of $2,000 means a great deal to a little company that makes only $3,000 or $4,000 profit, whereas to a company making half a million it means nothing at all. What I am objecting to is the discrimination, and no matter how difficult it may be to raise revenue and how necessary it may be, I think the principle of justice and absence of discrimination should apply.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to move to section 12. It is purely for the purpose of facilitating administration, also to save expense by doing away with the necessity of making numerous small refunds. It will be a benefit from the administrative point of view, and also to the individual in saving him unnecessary annoyance. Taxes are deducted at the source from small payments to individuals who in the final analysis will be found not subject to tax. The amendment reads:

(3) Every person making any payment by any means whatsoever to a non-resident person on account of anything let, leased or used in Canada, or on account of royalties for anything used or sold in Canada, shall deduct from every such payment in excess of such an amount as the minister may prescribe, twelve and one-half per centum thereof.

That is there might be a remittance of $2 or $3, the minister might lay down a declaration saying that the deduction at the source would not be applicable in case of remittances of less than $25, $30 or $50, thus avoiding the necessity of numerous refunds in the case of small payments to individuals who in the final analysis would not be subject to the income tax, and to whom otherwise a refund would have to be made. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

MISCELLANEOUS

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

To provide for salaries and expenses of the tariff board—payments may be made notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act or regulations thereunder, $120,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is understood, Mr. Chairman, that any discussion there may be with respect to any phase of the personnel of the tariff board or of its work may be carried on when the bill which will be based on the resolution now before the house is under consideration.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, in committee.

Item agreed to.

The Canada Grain Act, including management, operation, maintenance and equipment of elevators, administration of, $2,295,172.20.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understood that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was to give some information in connection with this item.

Mr. STEVENS: No, it was in connection with another item.

Mr. YOUNG: The hon. member for Melville asked me to have this item stand for the present; he is busy in committee this afternoon.

Item stands.

Publicity and advertising in Canada and abroad, including the sum of $100,000 for publicity and advertising in the United Kingdom and Europe, to be administered by the High Commissioner for Canada, $173,500.

Mr. STEVENS: I will have the information desired in connection with this item a little later, but perhaps we might let this go through now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will agree if the minister will undertake to stop his advertising.

Mr. STEVENS: That was stopped long ago.

Item agreed to.

Pensions and National Health—care of patients and medical examination respecting pensions, $1,800,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We might take most of these pensions items, but it should be understood that one will be held over on which general discussion may take place.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, any one desired may be held.

Item agreed to.

Sheltered employment, $50,000.

Mr. SPENCER: I should like some information with regard to this item. What does sheltered employment mean?

Mr. BENNETT: As my hon. friend probably knows, this class of work is carried on by returned soldiers who are unable to do ordinary work; they have been assisted by the government, and some of their work has been sold.

Item agreed to.

Pensions—European war—naval, militia and air forces after the war, $45,000,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is understood that if we pass these pensions items any matters having to do with pensions may be discussed during consideration of the bill which will be brought in after the pensions committee completes its work.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Canadian radio broadcasting service, $1,000,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is understood that any matters in connection with radio may be discussed when the radio bill is before the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, when the house is in committee on the radio bill the minister will have his officials here.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

TARIFF BOARD ACT

The house resumed, from Tuesday, May 9, consideration in committee of the following proposed resolution—Mr. Bennett—Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

That it is expedient to amend the Tariff Board Act, chapter 55 of the statutes of 1931, to provide that the salary of the chairman shall be $15,000 per annum; and that any member of the board who has served for a period of ten years, and is, on completion of such period, of the age of sixty years or over, may be granted an annuity equal to one-half of the annual salary of such member.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Several members of the committee have already voiced their opinions in regard to this measure, and I wish to add my protest to the passing of the resolution. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that this resolution should be brought in at this time. It was only a few months ago that parliament decided what was to be paid the different members of the board. We have waited nearly three years to get the tariff board established, and these three years have been years in which a tariff board, if it was to be of service at all, should have been functioning. The real work of a tariff board has been done. Before the government undertook to revise the tariff in the drastic manner it has, it would have been well advised to have had a board of competent persons to give advice not only with regard to our own domestic tariff but also with respect to questions such as those which arose at the recent conference of the governments of the British Empire. The government would have been well advised if they had had a tariff board to which they might have referred, for consideration and information, many matters that came up at that conference, and with regard to which they should have been advised before acting so hastily.

So far as one can see at the moment, the one purpose the tariff board is now intended to serve is in all matters referred to the board to keep the protectionist element in the tariff. The legislation is on trial; the board itself is on trial; the chairman of the board so to speak, is on trial. As yet, none of us knows how successful he may prove to be as the chairman of the tariff board. We do know that he has been on the bench for less than three years, and that in the exercise of his functions as a judge he appears to have given entire satisfaction; but how successful he may be as the chairman of a board concerned with commercial and industrial problems remains to be seen. Had the board been in existence for a few years, had there been opportunity to test its worth and the capacity of the chairman, then it seems to me the government might have been justified if necessary in asking parliament to grant some additional amount to the chairman, having regard to the services he was rendering. Up to the present, however, no services have been rendered; yet we are asked, on the very day on which we have been reducing the salaries of the judiciary, to give one member of the judiciary, who was among the junior members, a position which is incomparably beyond that which any of his former fellow members of the judiciary enjoy.

This morning it was decided that no matter how competent certain members of the bench might be, how considerable their service, they were to have their salaries reduced after they had reached a certain age, whether they were to carry on or not. They were to receive an annuity amounting to a stated sum. Their salaries and annuities, however, were not to be at all comparable to what the chairman of this board will receive. I understand that his salary is to be equivalent to that of the Chief

Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, and that after ten years of service he is then to receive an annuity of $7,500 which is practically equal to the salary he was enjoying as a judge of the superior court.

Mr. BENNETT: He was getting $9,000, and $1,000 from Ontario, which made $10,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank the Prime Minister for the correction. However, it would appear that this gentleman certainly is receiving in salary and annuity, consideration away beyond that which is being given to members of the judiciary generally.

I want to give a further reason for declining to support this resolution, which indeed I strongly oppose. I told the Prime Minister at the time the legislation was being introduced that the Liberal party could not undertake, if it came into office, to continue the policies of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the tariff, and in so far as the tariff board is to be an agency to perpetuate the protective feature of the tariffs which have been put into force by the present government, we on this side must decline to be a party, either directly or indirectly, to anything of the sort. I say that much by way of a further reason for my being opposed to granting this very large salary to the chairman of the board.

May I give another reason. We were assured that the tariff board when appointed would comprise gentlemen whose names would commend themselves to the house as those of non-partisans—gentlemen who would be in every way acceptable. Well, the appointees, so far as one can judge at all, are all gentlemen who have been pretty faithful supporters of the Conservative party, including even one member who sat with the Progressive group in this house.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, yes; he has; I can give his record if my hon. friends want it. I do not think he ever supported, except when a decision of His Honour the Speaker was being challenged, a single motion that originated from this side of the house in opposition to the present government. We are now asked calmly to vote a salary of $15,000 per annum for ten years to the chairman of the board, and large salaries to the other members of the board, and then a pension for the rest of their lives at a sum equal to that of a judge of the superior court, notwithstanding the gentlemen who are on the board have been placed there for ten years by hon. gentlemen opposite and that they are all, from their point of view as expressed heretofore, politically opposed to the policies which we on this side have been supporting. That is asking a little too much of an opposition, or even of human nature, and we on this side cannot think of supporting the proposed resolution or any act based upon it.

It does seem extraordinary that after a great part of the time of the session has been taken up in reducing the salaries of civil servants, reducing the allowances of war veterans, reducing the indemnities paid to members of parliament, giving reasons why staffs must be cut down here and staffs cut down there, we have had within the last few days one man after another, especially persona grata to the Prime Minister and the government, being given salaries far exceeding those of the highest offices in the public service. Just at this time, that kind of thing does more to create unrest than any other single action of the government. Those who have had their salaries cut down, war veterans who are expected to take less in the way of pensions, those who are obliged to make additional payments on income tax account, taxpayers generally, are all to-day comparing their position with that of those few favoured gentlemen who at this time are receiving special treatment at the hands of the government. We ought to oppose very strongly such exceptional cases, especially where there are not grounds sufficient to support them.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to support the leader of the opposition in his protest against what I must regard as discriminatory treatment. I believe in paying good wages and salaries; I believe government employees or those who receive government appointments should be properly taken care of, but during this session and, in fact, for the last few years we have had what has been termed a policy of economy and under that policy there has been a cutting down of salaries affecting especially the lower paid people. There has been no gradation in this matter, but we have had a ten per cent cut all along the line. This has meant a great deal of hardship. In addition, staffs have been cut and many people have been thrown out of work altogether. I think it was only yesterday that some of us were pleading that the rights of railway employees should be protected at this time; that they should not be turned out on the street. The government would not listen to our pleas and put through legislation that we thought was designed in the interest of the bondholders, without paying any regard whatever to the employees of the railways. We have recently had to pass measures which lay a very heavy tax upon

the people of this country. When I think of families that to-day are struggling to maintain the very minimum of a decent living, it seems to me absolutely wrong that such high salaries should be paid to certain individuals in the service.

I am not at all sure that it was necessary to get a judge to act as chairman of the board, nor that legal training is the best for the man who occupies that position. I can understand that legal training may be very necessary for certain positions, but it remains to be seen whether it is a good training for men who are placed in what might be termed executive positions or those involving considerable independent research. I am inclined to think a scientific training would be much more desirable than a legal. There are many men who have had practical experience as well as academic training who, I am sure, would be very glad to accept this position at a lower figure than that which is being offered.

Of course there is the larger question of the wide spread in our salaries. I think we should be tending towards a greater equality instead of a still wider spread. The suggestion has been made that the gentleman who has been appointed to this high position not only has special qualifications, but is also doing this as a matter of duty. I would like to think, if that is the case, he might be prepared to do his duty without receiving such very high emoluments for so doing. There are people who are doing perhaps less responsible work but are none the less doing their duty, who are being paid a wage or salary that is lower than would enable them to maintain anything like a decent standard of living. When I think of those high salaries, I remember that they are possible simply because of the taxation which is levied on the great mass of the people and which falls most heavily on some of the poorer people of this country. As one who for many years has come into contact with the poor people of Canada, I must protest against this further extension of this principle which we are asked to make to-night. I do not think it is at all necessary. I do not think any good explanation has been given why so soon after the original act was passed there should be an increase in salary.

I know it is possible for the Prime Minister to say that only by giving very high salaries can he secure the best men. I do not think that can be very well proven. I know it has been said that only by providing very fully for pensions can men be induced to give up more secure jobs. I do not think that contention has been or can be proven. I repeat: It seems to me at this time, when through our taxation and otherwise people are being called upon to make great sacrifices, the example should be set by some of those who are occupying high positions in the service.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I feel I would be recreant to my duty if I did not protest against this resolution at this time. When the Tariff Board Act was passed, we understood that a salary of $12,000 was to be paid to the chairman of the board, and at that time it seemed to me and to people throughout the country that this was a pretty fair salary. Now we find that the intention is to increase it to $15,000, which is more than judges are paid in any of the courts of this country and equal to what the Prime Minister of Canada receives. I can see no justification for increasing the salary to that extent. It may, however, have been impossible to secure the proper man for the position without paying him a salary in advance of what he was formerly receiving. I believe the chairman of this commission is a man that will fulfil the duties of his office to the satisfaction of everybody. I believe he is worth being paid a fair salary, but it seems to me that when you raise that to $15,000 a year, you are going beyond what is reasonable. We have been going through times of great stress; men as efficient in their respective callings as the chairman of this board has been in his are working for very small salaries or remuneration and can see no particular hope for the future. The poor people of this country are again being penalized by heavy taxation at a time when the number of persons on relief has increased by hundreds of thousands, until to-day, I am told, it stands at 1,300,000. The government in order to try to balance its budget is imposing a tax of two cents a pound on sugar and a sales tax on the necessaries of life, such as oatmeal, rolled oats, cornmeal, pot barley, rice, molasses, corn syrup, shovels, spades, sleighs, and doubling the sales tax on boots and shoes. Thousands of people in Canada are unable to pay the taxes on their homes. In view of these circumstances it does seem to me that at this time salaries should be held down.

My chief objection to this resolution, however, is to the proposal in the last part of it for the payment of annuities after ten years' service. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have come to the time in the history of this country when we should cut out these annuities altogether unless they are granted on the basis of contributions made by the recipients while in office. The civil servants, I understand, have to contribute a certain percentage of their salary in order to be granted an annuity, and I do not see why the same

principle cannot be carried out in the case of these higher officers. Conditions in this country are most serious and it is impossible for us to pay annuities on terms such as this resolution calls for when it must be done at the expense of the ordinary working man through imposing taxes on the things he consumes, such as sugar and boots and shoes, and so forth. I can see no justification for the last part of the resolution at all. The men who are appointed to this board from the chairman down are bettering their position through their appointment, and if they are not able to provide for their future through the greater salary they are receiving, I do not believe it is the duty of the poor people of Canada, the consumers, the farmers, and working classes, to provide for their future in addition to giving them this substantial remuneration during their first ten years of office. On behalf of the constituents I represent I protest as strongly as I can against the whole spirit of the resolution before the committee.

Mr. REID: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is high time that the people of this country took stock of what is being done here and took serious note of the high salaries and remuneration that are being handed out just like a free gift to many of our—yes—public employees. It may interest the house to know that since the present administration came into power under the present Prime Minister numerous increases have been given to certain high officials, increases which have only been obtained by other employees in the civil service after many years of faithful service. I have before me a list of some of the increases that have been put into effect, I am told, under the Prime Minister. Some of them are very striking, and I will say almost alarming.

I find that the salary of Major General A. D. McNaughton, chief of the general staff, has been increased from $8,000 to $10,000. He receives the salary of a deputy minister. The Deputy Minister of National Defence, Colonel LaFleche, appointed recently, gets another $10,000. The man who was superannuated to make room for Colonel LaFleche got $10,000 only after being in the service since 1879. Some of these new appointees are being given the same salary as those who are now being superannuated after years of faithful service to their country. Mr. Breadner, commissioner of customs, got one-third of the previous salary of the deputy minister, two other men being appointed, one as commissioner of excise and another as commissioner of income tax. The deputy got $10,000 after many years' service. Mr. Breadner was given $10,000 as commissioner of customs, and now he has received an increase of $2,000.

I go right down the list and I find the most striking example in the Department of the Interior, where a man sixty-five years of age was superannuated, I am told, at $5,000 or $6,000, and another man who was away down in the civil service list was raised to the post of deputy minister at a salary of $8,000, and this new appointee I am told is seventy-two years of age. That to me requires a lot of explaining. That position is now costing the people of this country $14,000 because the man who was superannuated gets $6,000 or $7,000, and the man who was appointed in his place gets $8,000.

Commissioner Starnes of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police after forty years' service gets $6,450. Major General MacBrien who took his place gets $12,000 right off, and this in a time of stress when every government is preaching economy, and when this government is giving notice to every provincial government to cut down on its expenditures and to economize and to keep within its budget.

I listened very attentively to the Prime Minister's explanation this afternoon of this increase, and candidly I was not at all impressed by his explanation. My own interpretation as to the reason of the increase of salary is this, and I give it for what it is worth: that Judge Sedgewick was pretty well satisfied with his $12,000 until he saw the other two appointees who were getting $10,000, and after seeing them he said to himself: "Well. if these two men are worth $10,000 each per year I certainly am worth at least $15,000." I may be wrong but that is my own plain interpretation of this resolution. I know that there are members on the other side of the house who have gone about this country saying that God has appointed the Prime Minister in this time of crisis, but I also know that in the Scriptures we read of great trials and tribulations that are going to be sent in the latter days, and perhaps the Prime Minister is one of these.

The most serious thing in this whole proposal is the superannuation or annuity that it is proposed to give. By what right should any man after holding a good job at a good salary for a few years burden the people of this country with providing him with a life pension? Take even the ordinary members of that board. After five years' service they may get one-fifth, and after ten years' service one-quarter, of their salary. I say that this thing ought to stop. These life pensions should be cut out. I think also the whole

system of higher salaries for the higher officials in the government service should be carefully reviewed. Personally I am absolutely opposed to handing out a pension for a few years' service to anyone who has the gift of a good position. I feel sure if applications had been called for these positions so many would have been received that it would have been a great task even to read them. Applications would have come readily from men of ability who would have been willing to take the job, not only as chairman but as members of the board at the amount received as indemnity by members of parliament. But the fact that he is given a pension for life, after having been given the gift of a job, is atrocious. It is just about time this sort of thing was stopped. Personally I am absolutely opposed to it. There are instances where the country in recognition of long and faithful service has given a gratuity or life pension. But where a man has been given a good job with a pension provision, under which he will receive one-fifth of his annual salary if he retires after a period of five years, I must express my indignation, especially when the burden falls upon the people of Canada, the majority of whom are not able at the present time to obtain the necessities of life. Personally I am opposed to the increase.

Mr. BROWN: I shall state very briefly my objection to this resolution. The arguments against it have already been well stated by the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the hon. members for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), Swift Current (Mr. Bothwell) and New Westminster (Mr. Reid). I believe it my duty, however, to register a protest on behalf of my constituents. I believe I am not presumptuous when I say that in speaking for my constituents I voice the sentiments of all people of Manitoba, even if hon. members representing Manitoba constituencies do not feel called upon to speak upon this occasion.

So far as I am concerned there is no reason to doubt the ability of the man who has been chosen as chairman of the board. Some of us had the privilege, the honour or whatever you may call it, of meeting the board a few days ago. We came away with the impression that the chairman of the board was a man well qualified to fill the position. It was the first opportunity we had had to estimate his ability. That is not true of some other members of the board with whom we had been associated for a number of years and with whose ability and capacity we were familiar. I say we have no reason to doubt the ability of the man who will discharge the functions of the office of chairman. But he would have occupied a higher position in the opinion of the people of Canada had he not, before entering upon the duties of his office, demanded this additional salary. We take it—and if I am wrong I shall gladly accept correction, so that we may know where the responsibility lies—that he refused to accept the office unless the salary was increased.

Some years ago we used to talk about conscripting men for service. Sometimes we hear the term to-day, and we like to see men willing to serve their country. The chairman of this board would have stood much higher in the estimation of the Canadian people if he had been willing to serve without demanding the extra remuneration. There is no need of repeating the arguments which have been advanced—the difficulties of the times, the hardships which men are enduring, the tremendous loss suffered by the farmers, labouring classes, many of the smaller business men, and even larger business men. All these have suffered during the past few years. There is no necessity of recounting these facts; at such a time as this an increase of salary is simply without any justification whatever. I am amazed at the Prime Minister doing it, if he has any consideration even for the future welfare of his own party. In 1926 it was said that the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen had not given his followers in the prairies a feather to fly with. I assure the Prime Minister and all members of the cabinet that this is just one of the many millstones that he has hung around the necks of his followers in the west.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in protest against the resolution. I am amazed, as is the hon. member for Lisgar, at the Prime Minister in such days as these bringing in the resolution we have before us. I shall be further amazed if his followers support him. If they support him in this measure I cannot understand how they can justify their position in their constituencies when they return home, in view of the position they have taken in regard to other economies which have been made during this and the last sessions.

When we were discussing the ten per cent decrease in civil service salaries I drew to the attention of the Minister of Finance the circumstances of a case in my own city where a man with a wife and child was working two and a half hours a day at forty cents an hour. On that dollar a day, which made him

ineligible for relief, he was suffering a ten per cent salary reduction. I asked if situations of that kind could not be obviated, but received no response. Such reductions still go on. I am not opposed to high salaries, but in these days if we are going to increase salaries or wages we should begin by increasing the wages of those who are at the bottom. We should not increase first the salaries of those at the top.

When in 1931 provision was made for a tariff board the salaries of the chairman and the other two members of the board were stated. I presume at that time the Prime Minister felt that $12,000 a year would be sufficient remuneration to obtain the best talent possible. During the last two years the trend of salaries has not been upwards; it has been the reverse. We have been told how the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway have slashed the salaries of their officials. To come at this time and ask for an increase in salary, presumably because the chairman of the tariff board has asked for it, is not fair. If anything would seem to indicate his unfitness for such a high position, it would be that he should come at this time when according to our government the country is in such distress, and ask for still further remuneration, especially when the salary for which provision had already been made gave him a very fat living, compared with that of the great majority of people in Canada.

A few days ago when the social workers of this dominion were in convention one of the delegates who is in close touch with conditions in the country stated that to-day in Canada 1,600,000 people are on relief. What does that mean? It means that 1,600,000 people, and many more, are on rations, just as if we were under a state of siege. Why should a few people live on the fat of the land while probably fifty per cent of the community are living on rations such as would be handed out in time of famine. Before we begin increasing the salaries of those who are already getting salaries sufficiently high, or too high, I ask that we begin raising the remuneration of those who do not now receive enough to keep body and soul together. Some little time ago I came across an article written by a Canadian woman, the mother of seven children. It appeared in the April issue of Chatelaine, and was so compelling an article that I took pains to find the author, although it had been published anonymously in the magazine. I found the lady in the province of Nova Scotia. I should like to give a few words from her article by way of indicating the conditions under which she and her family have to live at this time. She says:

> I am a Canadian mother.
>
> The most noble calling in the world is mine.
>
> I am a Canadian mother and my country honours me. At banquets I am reverently toasted by Canada's noble sons.
>
> When depression comes, my country rushes to the rescue. But when the S.O.S. goes out, do Canadians cry "Mothers and babies first"?
>
> I am provided with groceries. No milk.

A family of seven children, and provided with no milk!

> We are allowed no butter at all, no meat but fat pork for beans. I copy from our bill: 1½ bags flour, 3 pounds shortening, 1 pound tea, 10 pounds sugar, 1 gallon molasses, 10 pounds beans, 4 pounds pork, 6 pounds broken codfish, 10 pounds rolled oats, 2 boxes yeast cakes. This is the allowance for the family of seven for one month.

I would like to bring this woman and her family face to face with a man who is already getting $12,000 a year and ask him if he is justified in requesting another $3,000 a year while this woman with her family has to live under such conditions. I would ask hon. members opposite, how are they going to face their constituents who are on relief and justify to them this increase?

Then we come to the matter of superannuation and retiring allowance. I am in favour of retiring allowances and superannuation for every one, not only a few people who are already getting high wages and are able to take care of themselves. May I ask hon. members opposite, is not the tendency here to work in the opposite direction to need? This is a certain sort of paternalism, which manifests itself in the providing of pensions and retiring allowances for persons receiving high salaries. It would be different if we were asking it for other members of the civil service. Remember that during the last two years the annual increase in salaries and wages of the civil service staff, something that was justly coming to them, has been discontinued, so that they have not only received the ten per cent reduction but in addition have suffered the loss of their annual increase. I protest against the passing of this resolution at this time.

Mr. HEAPS: Mr. Chairman, I will only say a word or two. I could not but notice the contrast between the proceedings yesterday in this house and those of the present sitting. To-day a great part of our time has been taken up with the question of pensions and superannuation for people who least require it. In the motion we are now discussing it is proposed in respect of persons

receiving $10,000 and $15,000 a year that after they have been in the service of the government for ten years they shall be entitled to half their salary as a retiring allowance. In other words the $10,000 a year members of this commission will receive after ten years, if they are over sixty years of age, a retiring allowance of $5,000 a year, and the chairman of the board after he has served ten years and is over sixty will be entitled to a retiring allowance of $7,500 a year.

First of all I object to the increase at this time in the salaries of these highly paid officials. Again I must contrast to-day's proceedings with what took place yesterday when we were discussing the railway bill. During that discussion mention was made of the salaries paid to officials of the Canadian National Railways, and the Minister of Railways took a certain amount of credit for the large reductions made in the salaries of many of those officials, making reference to the fact that in some cases those reductions were as high as forty per cent.

Mr. MANION: Many of them are still getting higher salaries than this.

Mr. HEAPS: Well, I am speaking of the principle, not of particular cases. In this case the government, instead of proceeding consistently with the actions of which they were so proud yesterday, ask us to provide a salary for the chairman of the board twenty-five per cent in excess of what was proposed just a few months ago. When the government practises economy at the expense of even the lowest paid employees, it is a very poor time to ask parliament to grant a twenty-five per cent increase in the salary of a highly paid official of the government service. I remember very well just a few weeks ago when we were discussing civil service salaries it was said that even the charwomen ought to be proud to make some contribution to the state in its hour of difficulty. But here a highly paid officer, who in addition to his salary is promised a very large retiring allowance, instead of being proud to make a contribution in this hour of financial crisis asks a twenty-five per cent increase in the salary originally proposed. What a contrast! As the hon. member for Acadia just says, he does not happen to be a charwoman so he does not have to make the sacrifice.

In connection with pensions or retiring allowances to railway men who perhaps as a result of the legislation passed yesterday will in the very near future find themselves without employment, we were told yesterday by the Minister of Railways that he objected to providing retiring allowances for them because it would be a form of class legislation. Yet lo and behold! within twenty-four hours of that legislation being passed we are asked to provide retiring allowances for judges. I suppose this will be called not class legislation but an act of statesmanship. At this time when salaries are being slashed, when municipalities find it most difficult to provide even the bare necessities of life to the men and women who are unemployed, it will be impossible to justify before our constituents this action on the part of the government.

Mr. MITCHELL: I wish to make a few observations on this question. Every other hon. member has approached the problem in an attitude of amazement. To-day we have been discussing salaries of judges; we are now discussing the salary of a judge who is to be chairman of this new tariff board. But, Mr. Chairman, I am not amazed. We have seen many leading members of the legal profession doing a good turn for their own fraternity. I am not finding great fault with that. That reflects I suppose a human characteristic in them. But I think the government must agree with this side of the house that when the labour members fought so strenuously to have some provision made for the railway men, there was a great deal of merit in their contention. This government has practised economy with religious zeal. I have always held the opinion that the present state of agriculture and industry, its make-up, its driving force, is absolutely in opposition to the economy practised by the government of this day. Someone suggested that many applications would have been received if this position had been advertised. I believe there would have been a queue reaching from Ottawa to Vancouver on the one side and from Ottawa to Halifax on the other if that had been done. It is passing strange that when the governments of this country are taking $5 from the pensions of the old people who happen to be living together in the sunset of their lives, they would ask for legislation that has for its purpose an increase of 25 per cent in the salary received by the chairman of a board who already receives $12,000 a year. Let us not forget also that one of the members of this tariff board will be a comparatively young man when he will be entitled to retire on a pension of $5,000 a year.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the past and anticipated future policy of the government nothing can be said in favour of this measure. I am not so sure—and I am not casting any reflection upon the chairman

of the board—that it would not have been better if some able economist had been appointed to head this tariff board, but that is beside the point. I just want to register my protest with regard to a policy that I consider absolutely wrong in principle, particularly in view of the practice of the government with regard to many other employees in the civil service, and indirectly with regard to the old age pensioners of this country. This granting of increases to people who could well do without them seems to be a studied policy of the government, but I believe we are passing through a time when these high salaries are neither necessary nor sound in the industrial, commercial and governmental life of this dominion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think there is any need to administer any more of these pin pricks to the Prime Minister; they just seem to put him to sleep. He seems to be saying to himself, "Well, I wish to glory these fellows would quit yapping or do it a little more quietly so I could really sleep." For myself I am really speechless. Ever since the Prime Minister made that outrageous appointment to Washington, which savoured so strongly of the family compact of a hundred years ago, this government has been going from bad to worse in these appointments, and from there to Milton Campbell.

I see the Prime Minister is awake now. If I tried my best to devise a method to turn out communists, bolshevists, reds and all those people whom we do not desire, I could not do better than the government has done. Look at that rearguard bunch of dummies, taking it all; not one of them has approved of it. I will bet that they wish they could rear into it just as I am trying to do. I imagine some of them would give a hundred dollars if they could have ten minutes at their leader. I would not give that much, because I can have it without paying the hundred dollars.

I have no language with which to express my disappointment in the course being pursued by the Prime Minister. We are asked to vote fifteen thousand plunks for a man who has not been on the job long enough to warm the saddle; already he wants an increase of $3,000. I think he should get a hoist from the toe of somebody's boot rather than this sort of hoist in salary. Milton Campbell! Well, I shall not say anything about him; his chief qualification was that he was a political dancing dervish, pretending to be a Progressive when everyone knew he was a hidebound Tory all the time. The people out in the country well know that Milton Campbell has sold himself, and that is the end of the "Progs" out there.

I have been wondering what to say. I obtained a big brown envelope, and into it I slipped a couple of these order papers, and I addressed the envelope to the central Liberal committee in the constituency of Kinistino. I think I will send a few more to the constituency of Mackenzie, just to see what the boys up there think of it. I may have to buy those order papers; to-morrow I may have to put up five cents each for them, but perhaps I will buy a dozen more just so the people in the west may know what has been going on in salary boosting on the hill.

I wonder if the Prime Minister has no shame. To what extent is he going in coughing up these great big salaries to men who are just starting on the job. Milton Campbell! Well, will some person support me? I will need some support soon; I can hardly stand up. That is not all; after these people have been ten years on the job they will get life pensions of $5,000 a year. If for the next ten years the members of this board pursue the policy that has been followed in the past by this government I do not believe they will stay in their positions very long, and there will be no question of pensions involved at all. We hope it will not be too long hence until we get another government, before everything goes to the bow-wows. We heard of some General McNaughton and General MacBrien or O'Brien or some such name, another of these big mugwumps with the big salaries who was given an increase recently. Out on the farm we have to work hard; my own wife has to work from five o'clock fast time until God knows what time at night. She does not get a look in at this sort of thing and thousands and tens of thousands of other farmers' wives have to work long hours to help to pay these mighty big salaries.

Mr. SPENCE: You should be there helping her.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Do you think I am going to sit here in silence and see the taxes of this country—and like other people we have to put up our share of those taxes—being shovelled into the capacious maws of the friends of the Prime Minister? No, I am not going to keep silent. I was trying—and I thought I had succeeded in doing so—to cultivate a better relationship and a better feeling towards the Prime Minister. No one in this house admires his many abilities more than I do, but it is a pity those wonderful abilities cannot be devoted to better purposes. I would suggest that in future he should not be so almighty generous with other people's money, in regard to salaries. Why was it necessary to increase these salaries; were these

gentlemen going on strike? I see even the chairman is hiding his face. No wonder; a cloud should come over the land and hide us all for shame. Now I forget what I was saying when the chairman covered his face, so I will have to start all over again. I had some notes here; I do not know what was on them, but I think this is far more serious than most of us realize at the moment. Fifteen thousand dollars for one year! Why, that looks like a fortune that would last the average farmer a lifetime. I do implore the Prime Minister in justice to himself to stop this kind of extravagance at this time. Wait for two or three years; wait for a few months; even wait until we have turned the corner a bit. We believe we are turning the corner but we shall never get it turned if the Prime Minister and his Minister of Finance are going to be digging into the treasury in this manner. Does this mean that we are going to start all over again, after times have improved a little, and once more enter upon a rampage of borrowing and spending and spreeing? It looks like it and the Prime Minister of Canada is setting the example—he or his Minister of Finance or perhaps the whole lot of them.

I do not find any pleasure in making these observations, but I am so filled with indignation that for my own safety I have to say these things. I would ask the Prime Minister whether these gentlemen were really going on strike, whether they had refused to work for the salaries they were being paid. I understand that this matter was up yesterday; I did not know it. In fact, I have not yet recovered from the shock I received when I first saw it on the order paper two days ago. I think I have a right to get an answer to that question I have just asked the Prime Minister, because we all contribute to the taxes of the country more or less, some of us less and some of us more, and we have a right to know why this salary has been raised at this time so quickly after the appointment of these three gentlemen.

I met the three of them. There is nothing wrong with their looks, but we are not paying them for their appearance. I do not know whether they have held a meeting of the tariff board or not. Have they sent in their resignations, may I ask? Who has charge of them anyhow? The Minister of National Revenue perhaps can answer that. Is the board under my good friend? If I get no answer from that quarter I will address my remarks generally. Have they indicated that they cannot continue in the employ of the government unless they are given a considerable more than $12,000 for the chairman and $10,000 apiece for the other two? Someone is saying something. It may be a very profound observation but I do not catch it. At any rate I am entitled to know why this thing has been done in face of the conditions in the country, on the farm, in the factory and everywhere. How dare this government flout the people with these outrageous salaries at this time?

I have felt pretty hard sometimes towards the people who call themselves communists. What are they? People so inflamed with indignation that they will do anything. I am going to sit down before I begin to feel that way myself.

Mr. BENNETT: I have listened to the criticisms which have been made against this resolution, and it was not unexpected that they would be made; in fact, I should have been disappointed if they had not been made.

An hon. MEMBER: You aren't disappointed?

Mr. BENNETT: Not in the least. Whoever is responsible for government in these days has a twofold responsibility, and the discharge of those responsibilities is not pleasant, nor is it calculated to make one popular.

The right hon. the leader of the opposition a moment ago referred to this act as having been nearly three years on the statute books. That was a slip of the tongue; he meant two.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said we had been waiting three years.

Mr. BENNETT: It has been on the statute books since August 3, 1931, and when it became apparent that there would be an imperial conference I ceased making any efforts towards filling the positions for the reason that I intended, as in fact I did suggest, that the board should be a tribunal to which the British manufacturer and others might go who sought reductions in our tariff structure. That provision was inserted in the trade agreements made with Great Britain, and this court—it is a court—will be discharging in reality international functions. It will be clothed with very great authority in the finding of facts upon which will be predicated the tariff policies of the country.

Those who have followed the trade agreements will recall that provision is made in these agreements for the basis of our tariff imposts. In my judgment it became therefore of the first importance that whoever were appointed as commissioners under that statute should be men of experience representing various schools of thought. The chairman stood in a different position. Those who rep-

resented the United Kingdom at the conference here last year all urged in the strongest possible terms that for the sake of this country and of the agreements themselves the chairman of the board should be as far as possible one possessed of judicial qualities. It has been said that it is doubtful whether a judge was necessary. In my opinion, having regard to the duties to be discharged, and the functions of the position, it was essential that one trained and skilled in weighing evidence and arriving at facts should be appointed. I think that opinion is pretty generally held by business men who have the interests of the country sincerely at heart. That being so, it then became important to ascertain where the chairman could be secured, and I will ask hon. gentlemen in this chamber to put it to themselves, from a study of the personnel of the bench and of the bar, as to where we could turn, if not to the bench itself, to secure such an appointee.

It has been said to-night, in no ill will, I take it, that Mr. Justice Sedgewick was a friend of mine. Unfortunately I was not privileged to know Mr. Justice Sedgewick beyond saying good day to him twice in my life. When he was appointed to the bench the Minister of Justice personally saw him twice before he could impress upon him the necessity, as a matter of public service, of taking a position on the judicial bench of the country. He yielded to that solicitation, although it meant a financial sacrifice and a very considerable one. I need hardly say that his appointment was received with great acclaim by the profession and by litigants alike, and that in the two years in which he discharged judicial duties he did so in a manner that satisfied all who came before him—members of the profession, his brethren on the bench, and litigants, whether in the bankruptcy court or elsewhere—that his was a first rate legal mind.

It is difficult in this country to induce professional men to realize that they should be prepared to make some contribution to the country's service. I suppose that in an old country tradition plays so large a part that the difficulty experienced in this country is there more or less unknown. I recall one leading member of the English bar who was in receipt of an income of £25,000 per annum, and when the Lord Chancellor sent for him and suggested that he should take his place upon the bench, he declined. On the second occasion that the Lord Chancellor sent for him he said: No refusal will be taken this time; we must all make our contribution to the state. This gentleman then took his position upon the bench with a lessening of his income by two-thirds and discharged his judicial duties with very great satisfaction alike to litigants and to the profession.

That tradition has not yet fastened itself upon the life of Canada. But there are, let me say, professional men who make enormous incomes in this young country. It was said that one of the leading members of the English bar at one time within the last fifteen years made an income of £70,000 per annum. It may strike some hon. members as strange when I say that there are in this country members of my profession who during the last ten years have made incomes in excess of $200,000. I need hardly remind the house that, as seen by the auditor general's report, the fees paid by the former administration, to a single individual for a service rendered with respect to a few cases, amounted to much more money by three times than the amount it is suggested should be paid to the chairman of this board I mention that merely because it is well known. I know one medical practitioner who made $80,000 in one year and some who have made larger incomes than that.

Under those circumstances Mr. Justice Sedgewick was asked by me to take this position I had not, as I say, seen him beyond saying good day to him and a casual shake of the hand at a bar association meeting but twice in my life. He asked for time to consider the matter and he took time to consider it. He then made it apparent that if he relinquished his position, which he had accepted reluctantly and as a matter of public service and which he was greatly enjoying, thus necessitating his leaving Toronto and the friends that he had made there during his professional lifetime, although his family, as is well known, are Nova Scotian by birth, this would mean a very great change in his whole habit and custom of living. After consultation with his friends—and I do not say that in a narrow sense, because he numbered among his friends many distinguished members of the Liberal as well as of the Conservative party—he felt that if he were to undertake this service, his salary should be the amount mentioned in this resolution, and I agreed. He has not struck nor asked for larger compensation by reason of his having been in the position for the time he has, but it will be observed that the resolution undertakes that his salary shall be that from the date of his appointment.

To express surprise and indignation may be the function of an opposition; I doubt not that it is, but I ask the house to consider just what is involved. Had we appointed a second or third rate man as chairman, we would never have heard the last of it; by so

doing I could have escaped the necessity of coming to this house and asking that this resolution be adopted, and if anyone suggests that it is a pleasurable occupation for a man in my position in life to sit here and be attacked in the manner in which I have been to-night by hon. gentlemen opposite, notably by the hon. member who last spoke, he must have a strange idea of what constitutes enjoyment. But it is comprehensible that some person may be willing to render a little public service; that is possible, and when we asked Mr. Justice Sedgewick under those circumstances to accept this position, he said: If I am to accept this position with the insecurity that attaches to it in view of what has been said in the House of Commons, I think I am entitled to the compensation which is mentioned in that resolution, and I agreed; I believe he is if he discharges those duties in a manner worthy of the office which he holds. It is a great responsibility. He is in reality sitting as the arbiter between two governments, between the United Kingdom and Canada. He will hear evidence of expert witnesses from Great Britain and from this dominion. He will hear cases presented on behalf of those who seek to obtain access to our markets under more favourable conditions than now prevail, and the reasons given therefor. He must examine, analyze and sift testimony for the purpose of ascertaining to what extent the allegations made support the ends sought. All these things he must do, and if he is to discharge those duties with the judicial quality that characterizes one who is chairman of a board that commands the respect not only of Canadians but of those from other countries who come before this tribunal, then I say that he must be in a position where he is not going to be worried every day whether with to-morrow's sun he will be able to pay his grocer.

Someone has said that the chairman is on trial. Not only is that true, but there is on trial the whole ability of the Dominion of Canada to appoint at the head of a great board one who will command the respect and confidence not only of his own countrymen but of people from the United Kingdom who come here with their cases under the terms of the conference agreements. That must be considered. If we had appointed some partisan as chairman; if we had selected, as we might have done, someone from the ranks of those who support this party; if we had appointed one who might be described as a party hack, what then? What about the indignation of those who go before that tribunal? What would be thought in the United Kingdom and other countries of our ability to meet and discharge a great responsibility? When the railways and canals commission in England has to deal with a problem, you will find a great judge at the head of it. When they had the tariff commission, they had Sir Sydney Chapman, Sir George May and another gentleman whose name does not come to my mind at the moment. We have no such reservoir. When we have to go to the bench for the purpose of securing an appointment, we do not do so because they are judges as such, or because I happen to be a member of the legal profession, but because in the very nature of things we must endeavour to secure for the positions the best talent we can command, with the idea in mind that not only will Canadians be proud of the appointment, but that those from other lands who come before that tribunal will say: Here is a man who discharges his duty in a manner worthy of the great traditions that belong to those who sit in judgment upon matters affecting the interests of the country as a whole.

That was the idea in my mind, and actuated and governed entirely by that thought, I sought out Mr. Justice Sedgewick and asked him to accept this position. The terms upon which he was willing to accept it are those indicated in the resolution and for the reason that may be stated, namely, that he was already discharging a great public service. I may say that the resentment expressed by many members of the legal profession that he should be taken from his position, was widespread. If the committee were interested, I could give the names of members of the profession who said: You must not take this man from us; he is the most brilliant and the best qualified of the judges we have had for years on our bench in the trial division and in connection with bankruptcy. It is not a light or easy thing, may I say to my colleagues in the house, for one to tear up the roots of his home in a community, leave it and come to another city to establish his home. If it is thought the compensation is out of all proportion to the duties that will be performed, I can only say this: Having regard to the rewards that go to members of the legal profession Mr. Justice Sedgewick made a great sacrifice when he went upon the bench, and if my appreciation of the situation is correct, to leave that position and accept this meant sacrifice even although the compensation provided is larger than that which he previously received.

May I make just one or two other observations with respect to the matter? I knew that in time of stress and strain this house might not think this the most desirable thing

to do; yet I say to my colleagues in this House of Commons that canvassing the situation in its entirety and looking over the field in every part of the dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific I know not where I could secure an appointee who would so fully measure up to my conception of the ability required to perform the tasks imposed upon him under the statute as the gentleman who has been selected. I do not believe that the Canadian people in the remote sections of the country will be led astray by the attacks that have been made, the specious appeals to sentiments so easily aroused in days of poverty and hardship, the attempt to raise class against class and man against man. Not since the first day of the record of civilization have all men been of equal capacity or equal ability to discharge obligations and duties and responsibilities, and down through all the ages the remuneration paid to men has sometimes been regarded as entirely out of keeping with the value of the services rendered. I know there are men in this house who think that the late president of the Canadian National Railways, who with all his emoluments of office received ten times this salary, was being paid too much, and yet the Pennsylvania railroad pays a much larger compensation than that to one man for the duties he discharges. And so with respect to other lines of railway in the United States, and so with respect to lines of railway in the United Kingdom. Great executive heads in this country also receive a sum to which $15,000 would in comparison seem a mere pittance.

This position is so much more important than any other that I do not believe you can appeal successfully to the prejudices of people even in the remotest part of this country by pointing out to them that the government should be condemned because it desires to put in this position the foremost man it can find to reflect credit on the Canadian people in the discharge of great obligations before an international tribunal.

Look at the fees you pay to a lawyer before an international commission, running up sometimes to amounts sufficient to pay the whole cost of this office for ten years. These are mere facts. Look at the auditor general's report and see the fees paid by governments, by this government, with respect to litigation which it did not initiate, fees it was bound to pay. I merely mention these things because I did not intend at any length to traverse the matter beyond saying that as the first minister charged with the responsibility of making this choice. I have no apology to make to my fellow countrymen or to any man for agreeing to the terms which Mr. Justice Sedgewick suggested if accepting the office meant tearing up the roots of his life in the community in which he lived. I believe that the sober, intelligent common sense of the Canadian people will commend any position taken by any prime minister who endeavours to see that the public service is worthily served by worthy public servants.

There has been dragged into this debate to-night a discussion with respect to General McNaughton, who is receiving $2,000 more than he was receiving. General McNaughton is receiving less than his predecessor received and less than his predecessors have received, and I should like to say this, that if we had not done that, we would have lost him. As to the capacity and the quality of General McNaughton, whom I did not know intimately at all until I came to this city as Prime Minister, a great English soldier said to me—not a Canadian soldier—"If this empire were involved in war to-morrow I know of no man I would sooner see at the head of affairs than your McNaughton." That is the conception that others have of a man who is now serving the state, and he is serving the state for a smaller sum than he could receive in at least two other quarters, but he loves the service in which he serves, and he is giving to this country in my judgment in the work that he is at present doing a service that is worthy of the amount that is being paid.

When you talk about the Royal Canadian Mounted Police I shall not to-night pay that tribute to General MacBrien which has been paid to him by those who know his work, from his sovereign down, those who know of his capacity, those who know of his training, those who recall the fact that he served in days long since past as a constable in the police near the city, part of which I have the honour to represent in this house; those who know his record as a field officer, his record as a general and as an administrator, his record and his capacity to earn a much larger sum than that which we are now paying him. I believe we have saved more money since he took over the duties of that office than he will ever receive in the entire sum that we shall pay to him during the term he serves. I know that his service does not commend itself to everyone. It is not expected it would. His job is to preserve law and order. His job is to put down anarchy. His job is to stamp out lawlessness, and there are many who do not like that.

A further attack was made upon the commissioner of customs. I wonder if it is known that the commissioner of customs in this coun-

try has really been working for a mere pittance. He has been entitled for years to a superannuation allowance. He serves the state for a few thousand dollars per annum; he was promised an addition to his salary of $2,000, which he had a right to receive, and which makes the sum total for the service he is performing $12,000. He retired from the service; he was brought back by Sir Thomas White again to serve the state; he was promised a larger sum, and that in part has been paid.

But I want to go a step further. When the right hon. gentleman appointed a commission, a very proper thing to do, to inquire into the salaries to be paid to what are called the technical officers of this country, it will be recalled that recommendations were made that the salaries should be increased because they were out of all proportion to what might be received if these same men were working for private enterprise and not serving the state. If my memory serves me aright it was pointed out by the right hon. gentleman then leading the government that it was desirable in every way for this dominion to endeavour to secure the services of men who would be sought by private undertakings, and that we should be able to secure just as faithful service to the state as would be rendered by these same men if they served private enterprise. In many instances that has been the case, and I trust that it will continue to be so. I know a great many men serving the state faithfully in these times who by reason of their very qualities could be receiving larger compensation if they served private enterprise where their great talents and abilities would find larger scope and greater opportunities for expression. I mention that because it seems to me I should fairly state what actuated the government in arriving at the conclusion which it reached to accept the suggestion that was made, and which I agreed to at once, as to Mr. Justice Sedgewick.

One thing more. The attack that has been made against Mr. Milton Campbell I am not going to traverse beyond saying this. In the Parliamentary Companion issued after the last general election, Mr. Milton Campbell describes himself as a Progressive, previously Liberal.

Mr. YOUNG: He has a good opinion of himself.

Mr. BENNETT: That is how he described himself.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is camouflage.

Mr. BENNETT: I have in my hands the journals for 1931 and for 1930. Some hon. members surely will remember that he voted against the government when the motion was made on the first occasion this session for the speaker to leave the chair. And five days before he was appointed he had no idea in the world he was to be approached for that purpose. I think he knows perfectly well he was not the first choice. But because of being unable to secure the gentleman whom we sought to secure, Mr. Campbell, as a western man, was asked to accept the office, and he did. I still believe he is at least not a Conservative, whatever else may be said about him, and that he is not a supporter of this government. His criticisms of this government you will find upon the records of Hansard.

As far as the younger man, the gentleman from Quebec, is concerned, you have there an illustration of what I consider to be the duty of governments with respect to the public service. The government could do one of two things. It could select an old and tried supporter, one who, in the language of the right hon. gentleman, was thoroughly imbued with the doctrine of protection, or it could take a young man on the threshold of life, who has been educated in the universities of this country and of Great Britain, who speaks with equal fluency both the official languages of Canada, and who in his father's organization has had practical business experience. We selected a young man with this training, because it is my firm belief that under those circumstances you will get the best service for the state.

That is about all I have to say to the committee as to the factors that influenced us in the appointments that were made. But may I add that the right hon. gentleman made another mistake when he suggested that these commissioners are to receive pensions equal to those paid to judges. It will be remembered that in the statute the salary of the chairman is placed at $12,000 and those of the remaining commissioners at $10,000. After serving ten years they might receive one-quarter of their salary as pensions, and after serving at least five years twenty per cent; that is all. As the right hon. gentleman has said, the language of the resolution is general. With respect to the chairman I propose to add after the word "sixty" the word "four" so that it can apply only to the chairman, and to no one else. He is now fifty-five years of age; ten years from the sixth of February last he will be sixty-five. Instead of providing that he should be sixty or over, the resolution will provide that he should attain the age of sixty-four, and the

provision will apply to him and to no one else.

I have spoken longer than I had intended. I repeat that I have neither apologies to make nor regrets to express in regard to this matter. The necessities of cases make it incumbent upon me frequently to make decisions which, quite properly, are subject to criticism. But the position taken in this case is I believe the only one which could properly be taken having regard to the interests of the state, having regard to the importance of the issues to be dealt with and the necessity of providing as chairman of this board one who would reflect credit upon Canada both at home and abroad amongst those peoples with whom we have made trade agreements. We must have confidence in his capacity, his integrity, his broad view and his ability to grapple with the problems presented to him.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is satisfying at least to have been able to awaken the right hon. gentleman from his slumber of a few minutes ago. I do not pretend to be a stickler on ethics in parliament or anywhere else, but when various members had each spoken about a half an hour, while the Prime Minister lolled over as if he did not give a continental who we were or what we were or what we were saying, I thought it was just about time someone gave him a good poke in the eye so as at least to get him up. The right hon. gentleman is an expert at explaining; I admire him from the bottom of my heart. I take my hat off to him. If there is anybody on this earth who can make black appear white and white no colour at all, it is the right hon. gentleman. Now we know just about what his estimate of a proper public man for public service would be,—that is Milton Campbell, because he says himself he was a Progressive and formerly a Liberal. Saying things does not make them so. Recording them in that book, whatever it is, does not make them so. Milton Campbell was known to many of us in the west. I think he did vote for a provincial Liberal once, but that does not make a man a Liberal. I do not think the Prime Minister would have referred to Hansard if he had looked it up himself and had seen just what was Mr. Campbell's record since this government came into power. We also have been looking them up, and we find that he has not voted very often for this side of the house, especially when something could be gained by not doing so. The fact that he drew in what he threw his bait, hook and line after, shows where he stood. To say that he is a Liberal in the face of what has happened is pure nonsense. What are the farmers saying about him? That he sold them out. That is what they say. I detected in the Prime Minister's remarks that he resented our—what he called—attacks upon him.

Mr. BENNETT: Not a bit.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does he think we are taking any pleasure out of this performance now?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know where the laugh comes in. Part of the performance was put on by the Prime Minister himself. I do not take any pleasure out of it, but I am not going to sit here and see these outrageous salaries paid when there are people who are out at the elbows and down at the heels throughout Canada, especially in agriculture, lumbering and the other industries. Why could he not have saved us this humiliation? Could he not have waited a little while before doing this thing? The very fact that these three gentlemen are exacting this money at this time shows that they are not fit for their jobs.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, it does. They have not the decency or sensitiveness of a hollow-backed ox or they would not have demanded more money at this time. I say it; I say it again, and I will say it as many times as I like, because it is true. What about the clergymen and school teachers throughout this country, many of them living on miserable, measly salaries paid by people so poverty stricken that they cannot afford to pay more?

An hon. MEMBER: No salaries at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We want someone on the tariff board who will not be worrying about his grocery bill the Prime Minister says. Fifteen thousand plunks, and worrying about the grocery bills! If some people had one-twentieth of that they would be well satisfied and thought well off. I am sorry that we will have to change our views with regard to the Prime Minister's conception of public duty. Just think of the grab there will be throughout the country if a man knows that all he has to do is to put in a claim that with a salary of $12,000 his grocery bill is worrying him, and that he wants another $3,000. They will be rushing in from all points of the compass. Why not? I am amazed at the reasoning of the Prime Minister. My right hon. friend is mistaken if he thinks that this country is not shocked at this shovelling out of money when the treasury is so depleted and it is so hard to get it replenished from the taxes. I might as well not try to express my feelings because

I cannot express myself to-night as I would like. It is the way of the evil doer always; if anyone criticizes or objects, the answer is: "Oh, you are making a commotion; they will hear you; someone will be alarmed!" Who is the author of the commotion but the government which pays out these salaries? The government could easily have let a year go by before taking this action; in all conscience that is what should have been done, and then later on when things were getting better they could have done something for them, poor boys! I do not know Judge Sedgewick; he may be a world beater, but as for Milton Campbell—

An hon. MEMBER: You used to like him.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The best evidence that this whole house is shocked beyond description is the fact that the hon. member for Marquette is not endeavouring to babble his support of the Prime Minister. Even he has not got up. It is the greatest tribute that the supporters of the government have paid to themselves that they sit there in silence. They cannot do otherwise if they are to be honest with themselves.

Mr. McPHEE: As a former political neighbour of Milton Campbell, former member for Mackenzie, I think I should correct an impression which may have been created in the minds of the members of the house this evening by the Prime Minister. He glories in the fact that Mr. Campbell was formerly a Liberal. If my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will look along his front line he will find his Minister of Railways and his deskmate the Minister of Justice who were formerly Liberals, which does not make them any worse or any better Tories. As far as Mr. Campbell is concerned I have lived in the district adjoining his for twenty years. On the 25th of May, 1915, I received the Liberal nomination for the Mackenzie seat which Mr. Campbell represented until recently. Mr. Campbell was then an anti-Liberal; and he never voted for or supported the Liberal party from that day to the present time.

If there is any doubt about it let Mr. Campbell answer for himself. I have here a letter written by Mr. Campbell on November 21, 1928 to a gentleman in Winnipeg—I will not mention the party's name. This is written on House of Commons stationery and is signed by Mr. Campbell:

> Regarding our conversation over the telephone last night, I have submitted the newspaper you gave me to one of my Alberta colleagues; he is looking into the matter and will advise me in due course. If these allegations are correct and we have financial and industrial sabotage in connection with the development of our natural resources, it is high time that the general public knew something about it.
>
> I am prepared to start something along this line just as soon as I am in possession of sufficient facts. There is an angle to the situation I would like to point out, however, I understand that Mr. Bennett is heavily interested in the oil business, presumably through the ..... company. The men associated with you are prominent Conservatives and although I am not a member of that party myself, I must confess that as between the two old political parties my sympathies are with the Conservatives. If our suspicions regarding the holding up of Alberta and Saskatchewan oil development by the ..... company are correct and if Mr. Bennett is a heavy shareholder in the latter company, any exposure of this nature would seriously affect the fortunes of the Conservative party.
>
> I would, therefore, suggest that the matter be discussed with Mr. Bennett before the question is given publicity. I expect to see you in the course of the next ten days.
>
> Yours respectfully,
> M. N. Campbell.

Mr. BENNETT: To whom is that directed?

Mr. McPHEE: A man by the name of Daugherty in Winnipeg.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Give him another thousand dollars for that.

Mr. McPHEE: This is the man that is held up as a Progressive-Liberal. Mr. Campbell was never a supporter of the Liberal party to my knowledge, and we disclaim any association or connection with him.

Mr. COTNAM: You used him!

Mr. McPHEE: As far as the resolution is concerned, on behalf of the constituency that I represent I must protest against it. In the first place the act by which the tariff board was created specified the salaries to be paid. These men knew when they accepted the positions what salaries they would receive. Now we have this government banking on an impossibility becoming a possibility—that they will be in power ten years from now—and granting to these men a bonus equal to fifty per cent of their salary. I protest against this on behalf of my constituents. I am satisfied that the people of western Canada at least, when they get the opportunity, will place upon it the indelible stamp of public disapproval.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister had been seeking to defend giving to the chairman of the tariff board a salary comparable to that which is given to a judge of a superior court or to a minister of the crown I would have had a good deal of sympathy with what he might

have said as to such an amount being appropriate, and also as to the difficulty there sometimes is in obtaining suitable persons for these positions. But all that the Prime Minister has said to-night would be equally applicable with regard to what might be necessary to secure members of the legal profession to take an appointment on the bench, and particularly an appointment on the supreme court bench. The Prime Minister has spoken of the privation involved in having to tear up one's roots as grounded in one community when one comes to live in another. Gentlemen who come to Ottawa to take positions in the Supreme Court of Canada have for the most part done that in the past and will have to do it in the future, and those gentlemen, with the exception of the chief justice, receive a salary $3,000 less than is now proposed to be given to the chairman of this board. I venture to say that the qualities and qualifications of members of the Supreme Court of Canada are equal in every particular to what is required of one who is to be chairman of the tariff board.

The Prime Minister said to whom should we look; in what direction should we look other than to the bench or the bar for one to fill a position of this kind? As a matter of fact, I think the Prime Minister himself looked in other directions, before he made from the bench or the bar the appointment he has made. I think his efforts were directed first to getting someone who had large experience in public life and who might commend himself particularly to those who come from the west as one familiar with the western point of view. Later on, I think he sought from among economists of at least one of the universities for someone to fill this position, and it was only after these gentlemen refused to accept the post—not because they did not care for the work, but I imagine because they were none too well pleased with the government policy on tariff matters and had not much confidence in the government itself—that the Prime Minister then began to look to the bench and bar. I do not believe, either, that he found the only individual on the bench or practising at the bar who was capable of filling that position, or who would not have filled it quite as well, and been glad to fill it, at a salary comparable to that which he would have received had he been appointed to the bench itself, or, if on the bench, received some slight additional honorarium. That is the exception we are taking at the present time. It is an exception not to paying even a large salary to one in a very responsible position, but to paying the chairman of the tariff board a salary $3,000 in excess of what is being paid to judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, $6,000 in excess of what is being paid to judges of the superior courts in the different provinces, and $5,000 in excess of what is being paid to ministers of the crown and those holding diplomatic posts as ministers. All these gentlemen are making sacrifices to some extent. I think the public service sacrifice argument is a little overstressed when it comes to receiving a salary of $10,000 and over and the emoluments that go with it. Perhaps the less that is said about sacrifices the better, under those circumstances, particularly when people in all walks of life are making very considerable sacrifices to the state to-day by way of the taxation that is being imposed upon them, among other reasons to help support positions such as these.

There is one point, however, in what the Prime Minister has said, to which I should like to take very strong exception. It indicates that so far as this position is concerned the Prime Minister himself takes a different view to-day from the view he took some time ago, when he was describing the functions of the tariff board. Certainly his present view as expressed to-night is one which will not be accepted for one moment by those of us who are on this side of the house. The Prime Minister says it is all important that this gentleman should be given this large salary because he has a high judicial office and because upon the exercise of that high judicial office and the manner in which it is discharged will be predicated the tariff policies of the country. Those were the words used "on which will be predicated the tariff policies of the country." I say, Mr. Chairman, that if it is to be the function and duty of the board to make reports on which will be predicated the tariff policies of this country, we should abolish the board altogether and not vote a dollar for any member of it. The tariff policies of this country will be predicated upon the will of the people as expressed at the polls and as given effect to by the party returned to power; they will not be predicated upon the report of any tariff board which may be appointed at this or any other time.

The Prime Minister said in addition this position was so important because the chairman of the board must decide on cases which may be brought before him by firms in the old country. I shall not go over the controversy we had with respect to the tariff board, but at present that is about what the functions of this board have become restricted to—to listen to those in the old country who have grievances rather than to listen to the

grievances of consumers and those suffering from excessive tariffs in Canada. The board must make perfectly sure that those in the old country who have been promised something under the United Kingdom-Canada agreement will have some court to which they may appeal if they think the terms of that agreement are not being fully carried out. I do not think this parliament should be called upon to vote excessive salaries for purposes of that kind. I do say that what the Prime Minister has said to-night only tends to strengthen in my mind the conviction that we should make no change as between the present salary of the chairman of that board and what he is to receive hereafter.

There was another point to which I should refer. This United Kingdom-Canada agreement is to be in force for five years, assuming that it is carried through to the end of the period for which the agreement has been made. One year of the five has pretty well gone by, and already many changes have been made by the government. How much of the agreement will be left at the end of four years is problematical, I think. Why should we give a huge salary for ten years to a gentleman whose main function will be adjudicating on measures relating to an agreement that will last only four years? Then we are being asked to give him for the remainder of his life an annuity amounting to half his salary, or to $7,500 if this measure goes through. In the light of what has been said to-night I do not see why this should be done. Certainly at this time this house ought to show that it is determined to see that the salaries paid for these positions are kept somewhat in line with the salaries paid generally to the judiciary and to others in the public service, and when salaries are being reduced on all sides, that salaries already very high should not be increased.

Mr. MALCOLM: Mr. Chairman, some time ago I had a definite feeling with respect to appointments to the tariff board, but any feeling I had in favour of the board was absolutely dispelled by the remarks made this evening by the Prime Minister. The tariff board must exist for one of two purposes; it must be a fact finding body to give to the government the information which the government should have in order to decide on the tariff policies of the dominion, or it must be a body sufficiently well equipped to take that duty away from the government and decide on the tariff policies of the country itself. It must be for one of those two purposes. If, as the Prime Minister said, it is to decide great questions of policy I submit that a worse board could not possibly have been chosen.

Mr. BENNETT: The Prime Minister did not say that; I hope the hon. gentleman will take it back.

Mr. MALCOLM: If the Prime Minister did not make that statement I do not need to make any remarks relative thereto, but if the Prime Minister meant that this board was to decide on Canadian tariff policies I say again that a worse board could not have been chosen. To be of any value in deciding the policies of Canada the board should be composed of men having broad political experience, with some knowledge of the needs of the producer and of the consumer. I submit also that a worse board could not have been chosen as a fact finding body. If it is to be a fact finding body the man at the top, the chairman, need not be a judge; there is nothing to decide. Of course hearings must be held, but the man at the head of the board should be the most eminent economist in the Dominion, a man who can use our national statistics; compile figures from the evidence which will be heard, and submit to the government conclusive calculations showing exactly what will be the economic effect upon the general industrial fabric of this dominion of any specific tariff action. Judge Sedgewick is a gentleman for whom I have a very high regard. I do not object at all to the salaries of the members of the tariff board being substantial amounts; I am not now dealing with that point. However, certainly Judge Sedgewick's training has not been along the line of economics; his training has been in interpreting the statutes which are passed or amended by parliament from year to year. The duty of a judge is to determine whether or not a man is guilty of an offence under the laws of the country. The training of a judge is far different from that of a man who is required to compile statistics to submit conclusions to the government by whom the final judgment must be made.

Then, Mr. Chairman, if it is to be a fact finding body it does seem to me that industry in Canada has a perfect right to have someone on the board who knows the industrial condition of the country and who will be in a position intelligently to question British manufacturers when they come here to make their submissions as to why their products should be admitted to Canada at lower rates of duty. I think also that on the board there should be someone representing the purchasing public of Canada, whether it be from the standpoint of the importers or of the consumers.

So far as salaries are concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that at this time neither Campbell nor Hebert could get $5,000 a year from any private concern in Canada. I know nothing of young Hebert's qualifications; he may be the brightest young man in Canada. I know Milton Campbell only slightly; if he is a Conservative that does not hurt him, nor does it hurt him if he is a Liberal. It should be for their qualifications that this dominion is paying these men $10,000 a year each. I submit that from the standpoint of being economists, and ability in compiling information to assist the government to determine what its tariffs are to be, these are not the best men who could have been selected. I greatly resent at this time seeing $35,000 of the money of the taxpayers being paid annually to these men.

Motion agreed to on division and resolution read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Bennett thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 100, to amend the Tariff Board Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Maloney in the chair.

Post Office—Outside Service—Salaries and allowances, $15,381,845.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $14,161,500.

Miscellaneous, including $5,000 to provide for payment of compassionate allowance to employees injured while in the performance of their duties or to other persons injured while performing duties in any way connected with the postal service or in protecting His Majesty's mails, or to the dependents of such employees or other persons who may be killed while so engaged, payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, and payment of $205 to S. R. Kirk, $1,076,030.

Mr. POULIOT: I presume the Postmaster General has something to say.

Hon. ARTHUR SAUVE (Postmaster General) (Translation): Previous to discussing the estimates which I have the privilege of submitting to the house, I wish, as it was agreed at yesterday's sitting, to reply to certain questions and statements of the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot).

The committee will agree that considering the hon. member's manner of presenting his case, it was preferable to wait, allow him to put his questions and establish the facts before furnishing the details requested.

I also intended, sir, to make a statement on the work accomplished by my department when the hon. member for Témiscouata rose to speak. This is not a reproach, it is simply a fact that I note. As I stated, last evening, the Postmaster General did not balance his budget by withdrawing revenues from the Excise branch, neither by reducing the salaries of employees. Seventy-five per cent of the Post Office revenue comes from city post offices and twenty-five per cent from rural post offices.

In cities, banks make use of excise stamps, while rural post offices sell excise stamps to accommodate the public.

Taking as a point of comparison, sir, the budget of 1932-33, I request the committee to authorize me to cut down the expenditure of my department, by $1,122,725, as follows: salaries and allowances, $438,155; post offices, a decrease of $1,000,420; superintendent offices, service of inspectors, $173,180; 10 per cent cut in salaries, $788,505; decrease in the transportation of mail, $528,500; divers, departmental expenditures, another decrease of $14,970. For the year ending March 31, 1933, compared with the year 1931-1932, we decreased the expenditure of the Post Office department by $4,281,100, as follows:

Reduction in salaries and allowances:		
(a) General reduction of 10 per cent in the salaries of civil servants.		$1,799,507
(b) Decrease in the work performed owing to the postal traffic reduction..		658,250
		$2,457,757
Reduction in operation cost:		
(a) Railways..	464,513	
(b) Service by water..	8,693	
(c) Service by air..	797,875	
(d) Service by land..	272,502	
		$1,543,583
Reductions of expenditure for material, bags, etc..		279,760
Total decrease..		$4,281,100

It is the third reduction we have made since I am at the head of this department.

The grand total of all reductions amounts to more than $7,000,000, and is as follows:

Reductions in the expenditure for a little over two years (since 1930)

Mail services—	
By railway..	$1,784,118 63
By water..	240,952 37
By air..	1,220,652 04
By land..	927,365 56
Salaries:	
Postmasters and staff..	2,049,743 45
Inspectors and staff..	79,520 45
Travelling clerks..	324,649 88
Travelling clerks (mileage). ..	141,294 51

Divers:	
Postal stamps..	72,243 59
Travelling expenses..	20,737 14
Printing and stationery..	489,357 47
Scales, uniforms, telegrams, etc..	34,604 12

I think, sir, that this budget will be approved unanimously by the committee and particularly by my friends opposite who, again recently, advocated economy.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Do accounts balance?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): In reply to the hon. member for Témiscouata, in connection with dismissals; I may state that I never dismissed 1,500, or 1,400 or 1,300 or even 1,200 postmasters as he contends and this can be verified at page 5124 of unrevised Hansard.

To summarize my statement, perhaps, it might be well that I place before the committee certain figures which will prove that I am not the axe-man proclaimed by a member of this house.

The facts are as follows: From 1896 to 1911, the Liberals dismissed 1,788 postmasters.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): For lack of education?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): These are facts. The hon. member for St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) may put questions to me, if he wishes, but they must be to the point.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Was the reason a lack of education?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): A lack of education?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Why were these postmasters dismissed?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): For political partisanship. It was the reason given then. I wish to be fair: for bad administration and also, I think, to change the location of the post office, as at present.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That was in the course of 15 years.

Mr. ST-PERE (Translation): 17 years.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): 17 years.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): There were 1,788 dismissals between 1896 and 1911. From 1922 to 1930...

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): To establish continuity, give us the number from 1911 to 1921.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am coming to it.

[Mr. Sauvé]

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Louis-Philippe Pelletier, who even dismissed the dead!

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): From 1896 to 1911, there were 1,788 postmasters dismissed of whom 555 resided in Quebec and 383 in Ontario. From 1922 to 1930, the Liberals dismissed 1,147 postmasters, and the Conservatives, from 1930 up to this day, 770.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): There is a discrepancy in the number of years. The hon. Postmaster General would not successfully have passed a test in figures had the Chief Inspector Fortier been in charge of the test.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member for Témiscouata intends to speak later on; let him allow me to make my statement. He will find that my replies are to the point.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is what we wish.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Under the Liberal regime, from 1922 to 1930, 396 postmasters were dismissed in Quebec; since 1930 to date there were 376 postmasters dismissed in Quebec.

My hon. friend from Témiscouata looked upon the Shelburne case as a crime. He may permit me to state to the committee that this incident took place over a year ago and that the Toronto Globe, of which he quoted an excerpt last night, congratulated the Postmaster General for having confirmed the appointment of Mr. James Hill Kennedy. Enough for this case.

The committee will admit that I am not the great evil-doer that the hon. member for Témiscouata seems to imagine or conceive.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I never made that statement. I said something else, but never that.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): As to the French Canadian martyrs conceived in the mind of the hon. member, they will be found among those which he usually fabricates.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): This is too entangled to follow.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am not only alluding to the hon. member for Témiscouata, this applies also to other members.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Nobody was able to follow the hon. minister's argument.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Must I repeat it, these dismissals are made on complaints not from me but from fellow-citizens of the

postmaster, or members—exactly as in the past—and when these complaints are verified by a commissioner, after an inquiry is held, or when reports are made against the administration or location of the post office.

They are carried out according to the regulations established long before my time under the régimes of both parties. The hon. member was wrong when he asserted, yesterday, that I had acted differently and had proved myself an enemy of the province of Quebec, because a larger number of postmasters in Quebec were dismissed. The hon. member for Témiscouata is well aware that it is, perhaps, an after election practice. I repeat it—I stated so last year—and, moreover that has been the practice in the past, under the régime which my hon. friend supported, and under the preceding régime.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): What figures of mine are wrong?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon member may quote them, I shall reply to him.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri), (Translation): I put a question to the minister, a moment ago, namely, how many were dismissed from 1911 to 1921? I wish to have a general idea of the dismissals from 1896 to this date. You did not fill in that gap.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): Also, the gap before the deluge.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I have not the figures with me.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri), (Translation): Why did you quote the figures from 1896 to 1911, under the Laurier régime?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): It was because I wished to establish a point of comparison. So as not to take up too much time, I did not wish to refer back to confederation.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri), (Translation): Are you aware that after 1911, the famous Bergeron inquiries were held which were responsible for the dismissal of postmasters from the Atlantic to the Pacific?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I closely followed the remarks of the hon. Postmaster General. I must congratulate him, his standard is certainly higher than that of the candidates examined by the Chief Inspector Fortier, because he figures in the millions. He is certainly better qualified to fill the position of postmaster than one who can only figure to one or two millions.

I regret that the hon. postmaster has not replied to the question I put to him yesterday, with reference to the Sully affair, We shall now travel to the beautiful Sully village, in Témiscouata. No doubt, sir, you will all be interested. I put an important question, yesterday, to the hon. Postmaster General and he did not think proper to reply to it. I requested him to dispel the dark clouds, illuminate our intelligence and furnish us with all indispensable information to help us understand the routine of his department. An inquiry was held against the ex-postmaster Mr. Plourde, on October 24, 1931, at Sully. A memo from the Postmaster General to the council, states that this postmaster was found guilty of political partisanship, and he therefore recommended his dismissal, on November 4, 1931. However, the order in council P.C. 1178, was only passed on May 18, 1932, many months later. Why was this postmaster suspended instead of being dismissed? We find the explanation in a letter written by the deputy minister, Mr. Gaboury to Mr. Foran, secretary of the Civil Service Commission, dated March 30, 1932.

> Referring to your communication of the 22nd of March regarding the postmastership at Sully, your file PO-34981, permit me to inform you that the dismissal of the postmaster at Sully has not yet been authorized by order in council and therefore, no action has yet been taken towards the permanent appointment.

(Translation): The reason, sir, the hon. Postmaster General suspended Mr. Plourde instead of dismissing him, was to avoid making a report to the Civil Service Commission, as the deputy minister's letter clearly shows. The Postmaster General cannot deny the fact, to-day. I am giving him proofs that I am better acquainted with his department than he is, because I put that question to him and he was unable to reply.

Let us refer to something else: the hon. Postmaster General wrote on July 4, 1932, to Mr. C. E. Dubé, who has charge of the conservative patronage in Rivière-du-Loup. This letter was quoted in Hansard, at page 4781. It contains the following:

> The act provides that the department is under the strict obligation to give preference to veterans of the great war.

This obligation existed previous to May 28, 1932, as it exists to-day. The Postmaster General disregarded the Act; he set it aside in the case of the Sully post office; he paid no more attention to this obligation than he did to the Act governing the Civil Service Commission.

I quoted yesterday, the letter from Mr Merriam, private secretary to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett), to Mr. Jean, dated October 5, 1932. It may be found in Hansard, p. 5128. I have not the time to quote it again this evening.

Mr. Parker, secretary to the Minister of Pensions wrote to Mr. Jean on October 28, 1931:

This question comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department.

Telegram of Mr. Jean to the hon. Murray MacLaren, Minister of Pensions, on November 17, 1931—long before the appointment of Tardif as temporary postmaster:

The person in charge of patronage for the county of Témiscouata informs me that the post office at Sully will be transferred within three days. Will you be kind enough to see that my rights as a veteran are recognized and that I be appointed temporary postmaster while awaiting my permanent appointment.

The Minister of Pensions' reply to Mr. Jean, on the same day:

I desire to acknowledge receipt of your telegram of November 17, and shall bring your name to the attention of the Post Office Department.

Telegram of Mr. Jean to the Minister of Pensions, January 25, 1932:

Will you kindly see that my rights as a returned soldier are recognized in the appointment of a postmaster at Sully; Andrée Tardif was notified that there was a vacancy in the post office and to prepare himself for the position. I cannot understand why my rights are disregarded after all my entreaties with you and the Postmaster General.

Reply from the Minister of Pensions to Mr. Jean, on the same day:

I am passing your telegram on to the Post master General for his information.

(Translation) Then, even before Tardif was temporarily appointed, the Postmaster General had received the request of Jean, and furthermore, the Minister of Pensions as well as the deputy minister and himself had maintained that the question came under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. Moreover:

Ottawa, January 29, 1932.

Mr. Isidore Jean,
Sully, P.Q.
Dear Sir,—

Pursuant to my letter of January 25, in connection with the position of postmaster at Sully, the hon. Mr. Sauvé, Postmaster General, informs me that the vacancy will be advertised on the premises, shortly.

The hon. Postmaster General had promised the secretary of his colleague, the hon. Minister of Pensions, to advertise the position of postmaster at Sully, in the near future. Is that a fact or is it not?... I might just as well address myself to the calendar in front of me.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

I would therefore advise you to submit your application to the Civil Service Commission, since the appointment of the postmaster will be made by the commission.

The calendar has an advantage over the hon. Postmaster General: the minister does not change, the calendar will change to-morrow.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Then the calendar is like the member for Témiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Yesterday, I was very patient with the hon. Postmaster General, I took pity on him, to-day, I note that he does not deserve my pity, and the crown of the calendar would seem very queer on his head.

. . . . since the appointment of postmaster at Sully will be made by the commission.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) H. D. Parker,
Private Secretary.

Since September 28, 1931, Mr. L. J. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General; Mr. E. J. Underwood, General Superintendent of Postal Services; Mr. Maurice Grondin, private secretary to the Postmaster General, have always replied, and this on more than one occasion, that the appointment would be made by the Civil Service Commission.

Yesterday, the hon. Postmaster General stated that the reason he had set aside the recommendation received from the right hon. Prime Minister to appoint Mr. Jean, postmaster at Sully, was that instructions had come from a person named Dubé, of Rivière-du-Loup. I shall quote in full two letters written by Mr. Dubé to the hon. Postmaster General, on November 10, 1931, and November 13, 1931; however, before quoting them I shall put a question to the hon. Postmaster General, and request him to follow me closely for a few moments. Are the returns tabled in the house true copies of the letters, including the mistakes in spelling?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I do not copy the returns.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I think the minister should know, for instance, how they are copied and if they are verified. Can he state whether they were verified.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): They have been closely compared.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is what I wanted to know. Letter from Mr. C. E. Dubé to the hon. Postmaster General, on November 10, 1931:

So far as Mr. Isidore Jean is concerned, when the position is advertised, he will have the right to apply. . . .

It is more or less acceptable French, however, it does not matter.

. . . and to lay stress on his services. I must, however, add that this gentleman has only been a resident of Sully for the last few months. . . .

There is but one mistake, he should have written "ne réside".

. . . and, moreover, I am informed that he has no education nevertheless when . . .

There is no accent on the "u", it does not matter.

. . . the appointment is made permanent, if Mr. Jean is chosen . . .

"Choisie" with an "e", "s-i-e".

. . . by the commission, I shall willingly conform myself.

"Volontier", "t-i-e-r".

Here is a gentleman who complains that Jean has no education and he himself writes a letter full of mistakes in spelling. (Returns 92, S.P. 142A, April 1, 1932.)

The following is another letter from Mr. Dubé to the hon. Postmaster general, on November 13, 1931:

Mr. Isidore Jean who has been residing in this parish about a year, and who wrote . . .

"Qui a écris", "r-i-s", he should have written "r-i-t".

. . . that I had recommended a well-to-do merchant, was wrong. . . .

"Erreure" is written with a mute "e".

. . . and as a proof to substantiate. . .

A "l'appuie", "p-u-i-e".

I am enclosing the certificate which is a recommendation for Mr. Tardif, and explains well . . .

He did not write "explique" but "e-s-p-l-i q-u-e".

. . . his standing.
(Returns 92, S.P. 142A, April 1, 1932.)

Here is a gentleman who does not write French correctly and complains that another has no education and, on his advice, the Postmaster general refuses—notwithstanding that he is bound to conform himself to the act—to give the position to a returned soldier.

At page 4785, of Hansard, there is a letter written by the parish priest of Sully, in which appears the following excerpt:

Mr. Isidore Jean has the necessary qualifications to take charge of the post office.

Had Jean not been qualified, would the right hon. Prime Minister have taken the trouble to recommend him to the hon. Postmaster general?

Furthermore, at page 307 of Hansard, October 18, 1932, the following answers to inquiries I made, are to be found:

Andrea Tardif, what education has he had? Answer: Primary school. Question: Did he receive a business or university course? Answer: No. Question: What education did Mr. Jean receive? Answer: Primary school.

We note, therefore, that they have received the same education.

Yesterday, in the house, I depicted a very pathetic scene which took place on the battlefields. We shall now describe the incident, at Sully, by another picture, a very interesting one: the scene of Buridan's ass. All know the story of Buridan's ass. It is an ass placed equidistant from a feed of oats and a bucket of water. It was thirsty and hungry; however, it was undecided whether it was more thirsty than hungry or more hungry than thirsty. It neither ate nor drank. It died! That is the story of the Postmaster general's hesitation to whom the following words apply: Piger vult et non vult. To-day he decides to act one way, the next day he changes his mind.

It is January 12, 1933. The deputy postmaster general acknowledges receipt of the letter and account of Mr. Jean and adds that his claim has been noted. Previous to the adjournment of the house, yesterday, I produced a letter from Mr. Jean to the hon. Postmaster general, enclosing a bill amounting to $194.50 for expenses incurred after being notified that he was appointed postmaster and had remained under that impression for over a month. Finally, three weeks or a month later, the department decided not to appoint him but to give the position to another person. A claim covering his expenses was forwarded and examined by the department. On January 12, 1933, the deputy psotmaster general acknowledges receipt and adds that his claim will be noted.

On January 12, 1933, Mr. Underwood writes to Mr. Green. Mr. Underwood is one of the head officials of the department and Mr. Green is the Quebec district postal superintendent:

(Text) I enclose herewith copy of an account submitted by Mr. Isidore Jean who was appointed to the postmastership at Sully on the thirtieth of June last, the transfer being suspended and later cancelled.

It is observed that Mr. Jean refers to the purchase of a house, but it is understood that he had made arrangements with the retiring postmaster with regard to post office quarters. As regards his reference to salary paid to a girl he intended to employ as assistant, there does not seem to be any justification for a claim as action towards the transfer to Mr. Jean's charge was suspended just a few days after his appointment, and he had no reason to continue paying the girl in question.

Regarding the detailed account concerning alterations made to the building in which Mr.

Jean proposed to house the office, no doubt most of the material is still of some use and the department wonders whether Mr. Jean would accept the total amount of $75 as total compensation.

There is, sir something very diplomatic about this transaction, $75 is offered when Jean requests $194. The hon. Postmaster stated he had been able to economize!

(Text) Would you kindly, in a diplomatic manner, endeavour to adjust this case along the above lines. I would be pleased to hear from you as soon as possible.

On January 16, Mr. Jean writes again to the Governor general to claim his expenses for the outlay he made. The Deputy minister writes to Mr. Jean as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General has transmitted to the hon. Mr. Sauvé your letter of January 16.

In connection with the position of postmaster at Sully, I wish to state that in my letter of November 17, I informed you why the Postmaster General could not appoint you to that position. I may add, however, that the department is at present considering the settlement of your claim.

On January 12, the minister was considering the claim of Mr. Jean. On January 25, he was still considering the matter. It was a question whether $75 or $194 would be paid. On January 27, 1933, Mr. Jean writes to the Deputy Postmaster General:

I believe I have given you sufficient time to think over the matter, and it would be only fair for you to apprise me of what has been decided as regards my claim in connection with preparing the Sully post office premises.

You have received my account and have had ample time to check it up. I therefore wish to know what has been decided in this matter.

On January 31, 1933, the Deputy Minister writes to Mr. Jean:

I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst. addressed to His Majesty the King, with reference to the position of postmaster at Sully, and which was referred to this department.

Now, we find that the Deputy Postmaster General has become private secretary to his Majesty George V. That is a promotion; he will be known as Lord Staffordham!

I wish to draw your attention to the letters that were recently addressed to you and to which the department has nothing further to add. I also wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 27, in connection with your claim, which the department at present has under consideration.

On January 31! The Postmaster General had passed the whole month of January thinking over Jean's bill, it had kept him busy. He draws a salary of $14,000, plus $2,000 in lieu of an automobile; he was busy the whole month, that is, he received about $1,250 to settle an important bill of $25. However, the matter is still pending. This matter has kept him busy for more than a month. On February 20, 1933, a report from Mr. Green was forwarded to Mr. Sauvé. It is amusing!

(Text) Office of District Superintendent of Postal Service

Quebec, February 20, 1933.

The Postmaster General,
For Post Office Service,
Ottawa, Ont.

Re: Sully, P.Q.

In reply to departmental letter of the twelfth ultimo, in reference to an account submitted by Isidore Jean, whose appointment as postmaster was subsequently withheld, the district superintendent has to say that Inspector Beauchamp visited Sully on the tenth instant to try and adjust the matter.

Mr. Jean when first interviewed was seemingly determined not to compromise or accept anything less than the full payment of his claim; inasmuch as he had already, through his lawyer, filed for a petition of right to sue the government. He was given to understand that his attitude would not likely bring relief but might occasion more outlay on his own part than he might obtain from a judgment in his favour even if such evolved—and he could not depend on such favourable outcome.

It is only later in the day that the inspector convinced him that, to his own advantage, he should accept compensation if the department decides to give any. He would not entertain any amount less than $100 which would seem rather fair for the following reasons:—

Upon receipt of his appointment, Mr. Jean bought a property for $650 payable in yearly instalments of $100. He had an annex twelve feet by fourteen feet built for the post office at a cost of $194.50 as per detailed account submitted. He further hired the services of Miss Irene d'Auteuil a clerk in a local store, who for that reason lost her former position and could not secure employment since and is living with the Jean family.

Mr. Jean is a labourer without employment and cannot pay for the house he bought which will likely have to be taken back by the former proprietor, but Jean cannot expect any compensation for the extension he built thereto. It means to him, a total loss,—hence his account for $194.50.

Even if he should undertake to dismantle it, he would have to pay for labour and would realize but a small portion of the amount paid for wood, door, windows, office fixtures and table, whereas all the other material would be a complete loss.

The inspector admits that the loss to Jean would be at least $194.50. The letter continues:

For all these reasons the amount of $100 would seem only reasonable and just and it is believed that the claimant would be satisfied with that amount. It is possible that $75 might alternatively be accepted, but only as a palliative with probable dissatisfaction and "come-backs."

You see, he was terrified of "come backs" for the difference of $25. "Come backs"

would not be for the $25, but for the fact that the minister is unwilling to repair his wrong by paying a fair indemnity to the man whom he had appointed but to whom he did not give the position,—a man who was a returned soldier.

On February 27, 1933, Mr. Jean writes to Mr. Sauvé that he hopes that his claim has been taken under consideration and that a cheque covering the amount will reach him by the next mail.

On March 3, 1933, reply of Mr. Gaboury, Deputy Postmaster General:

The report of the inspector who interviewed you in this respect is at present being considered by the minister. . . .

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me. The case of Mr. Jean has been settled to his satisfaction. He accepted $100.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): When did this settlement take place?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Recently.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): On what exact date?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Last week. The order in council was signed and we have settled the claim.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): On what day of last week, please?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I cannot say the exact day. What does it matter to the hon. member, whether it was Thursday or Friday?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is of great interest to me. The hon. postmaster cannot give me the exact date?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I shall tell him: it is after receiving the letter in which I informed him that I would discuss the Sully case in the house. He felt ashamed, and settled the case. However, I wish to congratulate him.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member should cease drawing on his imagination in making such statements which are incorrect and untrue.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I had intended to congratulate the minister, but I shall not do so now, because of the language he made use of. I have been, for months, fighting on behalf of a poor fellow, to have the Post Office department settle his claim for $100, because of the loss he sustained. That is the kind of government—or rather, I shall not place the blame on the whole government, because the Prime Minister acted honourably in the whole of this affair, but the Postmaster General deceived Jean.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member has no right to make such a statement; I did not deceive Jean and the latter never made such a statement. The hon. member for Témiscouata is again drawing on his imagination.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If I told the minister that I was going to give him candy—

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I would refuse it.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): and I withdrew the hand, I wonder whether I would be deceiving him. He told Jean: I am giving you a position; and he withdrew that position. He deceived Jean. My language is parliamentary, I am not drawing on my imagination. What I am reproaching the Postmaster General, his own conscience reproaches it to him—if he has any. I am delighted to hear that he has settled this claim and I regret that we had to fight over it so long to compel the minister to do an act of justice and equity by reimbursing this poor fellow for the loss he sustained and for which the minister was responsible. This goes to prove that we should have compassion for humble, poor and distressed people, and that, if one suffers injustice, he may appeal to any member of the opposition and rest assured that we shall champion his cause until he obtains justice.

Now, sir, as the hon. minister mentioned the saving he realized, we shall refer to his small expenditure. I regret very much that he did not produce, here, the postal box of Amédié Lesieur, however, I have here a good photograph.

Mr. STEVENS: Carried.

Mr. POULIOT: No, no. I treat the hon. minister well enough; he should give me a little chance now. I expected to have a field day to-day but unfortunately I have had not even an hour to-night. However, I will try to make the best of it. After the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has heard the questions I will put to the hon. Postmaster General and his answers thereto I am sure he will share my views, so that it will be beneficial to him to listen to me.

I thank the hon. Postmaster General for having tabled yesterday these photographs of that rural mail box to which I referred yesterday. It is a stovepipe; it would be

rather comical in other times than these times of stress. Many questions have appeared on the order paper about it, but first I should give Amédée Lesieur high praise for this marvellous invention—greater than radio, something wonderful! A great invention by a wine merchant who made some money while the Scott Act was in force in Quebec and developed into a manufacturers' agent as soon as his friend the Postmaster General took office! A very great man, a famous inventor, greater than Edison! Now what is that box? First of all I may say he is not a manufacturer's agent at all; he has acted as a go-between in securing and placing the mail box shown in this photograph. These boxes have been described, and the description is most interesting. The metal in the box does not cost more than 30 or 35 cents, and the total cost of labour in making a thousand is about 30 cents each. The box is 24 inches long and 10 inches in diameter, made of 26 guage galvanized iron, double seam, with one end closed by a cap seamed over a plain drop door on the front. In other words it is nothing but a piece of stovepipe closed at one end with a drop door at the other. Mark the glory and the greatness of the Postmaster General! The box is exceedingly flimsy and cheap. I rather suggest that the minister should bring a sample, or give one to each of us as compensation for the days we have been sitting here—a little souvenir. The total labour and material cost of that box is about 75 cents; but let us see what has been done. A great genius should not be left in the lurch. I could compare him with such men as Judge Sedgewick. The Prime Minister spoke very highly about Judge Sedgewick, but he is a child compared with Amédée Lesieur. Lesieur is a great man. In fact he got $5,000 more than Judge Sedgewick; Judge Sedgewick will earn $15,000 in one year, but Amédée Lesieur was clever enough to earn $20,000 with this mail box. A smart man! A great man!

As the hon. Postmaster General answers other questions than my own, questions that he sees in his imagination, I have here written answers to written questions. I will put them before the house and I will ask him some other questions, and I hope that if he is in his genial mood he will answer them. On January 1, 1931, there were 23,002 rural mail boxes in storage, according to information placed on Hansard on March 9. On July 1, 1931, there were 20,088; on January 1, 1932, 18,294; July 1, 1932, 25,760; on January 1, 1933, 25,638; and on March 1, 1933, 25,412. When the hon. Postmaster General took office there were 23,000 rural mail boxes in storage. How many of them did he place since he has been in charge of the department? 5,546. The smallest number on hand on any of the dates mentioned was 18,294. It was wise for the then Postmaster General, the predecessor of the hon. gentleman, to have a certain stock of rural mail boxes because it was the policy of the department then to establish rural mail routes and post offices, and at that time there was a surplus of $40,000,000, so it was right to have some boxes ahead for the poor years. But when the stock dropped to 18,000 boxes the minister says the stock of boxes on hand was so low that an additional purchase was necessary. He had placed 5,000 since he has been in office. He did not ask for any tenders, but he paid without tender $2.75 each for these boxes. How many did he order? Ten thousand! And the cost of manufacturing them was about 75 cents, so there was a clear profit of $2 a box for Amédée Lesieur.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): A Christmas box.

Mr. POULIOT: It should have been brought before the public accounts committee. In these times of stress why should Amédée Lesieur have a gift of $20,000 from the Postmaster General? It is a shame when the post office is cutting salaries and closing offices, and the Postmaster General is unable to justify a single figure that he gave yesterday, to pass over as a gift to Amédée Lesieur, money out of the public treasury to the amount of $20,000. Why were they bought? They were bought because "the patented box submitted was found satisfactory," and ordered according to the needs of the department. The department did not need at the time a single rural mail box; they had plenty of them, but in spite of that they bought 10,000.

I have one question to ask the hon. gentleman, and it is this; in what number of the patent record is this box described?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I listened with the same interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Témiscouata with reference to the postal boxes, and I find it strange, knowing his parliamentary and political experience, that he displayed so much astonishment because these boxes were paid $2.75 when, under the regime he supported, they were paid as much as $2.80, $3.00 and $4.00; we pay them cheaper to-day. We purchased a certain number from Mr. Lesieur because the report of Mr. Murphy, our expert in these matters, stated that they were an improvement on some already used, that they better answered our

requirements, especially for postal parcels, and that they are of a better quality. When the hon. member contends that our method of economizing was at fault, he is wrong. He forgets one thing—perhaps, he is unaware of it—that the stock, the quantity of boxes was limited and that these boxes were stored, for the requirements of the west, in Toronto and certain western centres and that those for the eastern section were practically exhausted. That is why we purchased that number of boxes, so that the Eastern part of Canada would not run short.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): As a matter of course, the Postmaster General can contend that under the liberal regime some boxes were purchased at fancy prices—

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to complete my answer? It was also a question of economy. By transferring the boxes stored in the west to eastern points, the cost would have been increased and it was, therefore, to economize that we effected that transaction. The hon. member contends that no tenders were asked. First, pursuant to the act, the department is not obliged to call for tenders.

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): Under $5,000.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): This does not apply to the Post Office department. Secondly, this box was patented; I could not call for tenders on a box recently patented. It was recommended by the department's experts, both as regards economy and meeting modern requirement, especially in connection with postal parcels. The hon. member will admit that, for a number of years, this system of distributing goods has been in vogue and seems to be considerably developing. The distribution of parcel post throughout the country has greatly increased—I am not alluding to these times of depression—and will further develop.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Since the hon. Postmaster General refers to economy, why did he not call for tenders? That is the first question I am putting to him. The second question to which he did not answer just now, is the following: I wish to inquire in what number of the "Patent Record" is to be found the description of this patent.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): As explained, I did not call for tenders because it was a new box, recently patented, which answered the requirements of the department because it was of better quality; and, secondly, because it was cheaper than those we had purchased previously. Some of these postal boxes were paid $2.80, $3.00 and even $4.00; this one only cost us $2.75.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): How many postal boxes were paid $4.00 by the Liberals, were they made from stove pipes? Other boxes were purchased from Lesieur—50 boxes at $46.25. That was costly!

I wish to inquire from the Postmaster General in what number of the Patent Record is this invention described?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The number of the patent is 319,598, February 1932.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I thank the hon. Postmaster General for his information. Would the hon. minister take a copy of the order in council sanctioning the purchase of 10,000 rural mail boxes from Amédée Lesieur? Has the minister any objection?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, not at all. However, not this evening.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): No, to-morrow. If the committee is not going to rise, I shall broach another subject. I do not wish to take up too much of the committee's time; however, there are certain cases on which I desire the hon. Postmaster General to throw some light. I wish to show him all the courtesy possible. However, I shall have to slip certain matters thoroughly, so as to obtain all the information to which we are entitled.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Certainly .

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Thank you. Does the hon. Postmaster General wish me to submit to him another case or is the committee going to rise?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am ready to meet the wishes of the hon. member or the committee.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General is in charge.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, the committee and its chairman are.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I shall refer to the case of Notre-Dame-du-Lac.

I regret very much that the right hon. Prime Minister was not present in the house the other evening or at the beginning of this evening sitting, because I said many pleasant things about him. When I am so disposed, I do so heartily.

The Notre-Dame-du-Lac case is almost as interesting as that of Sully.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 11, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS—SENATE BILL

Bill No. 101, for the relief of Angelo Stavrow. Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Fifth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.—Mr. Stinson.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

IMPORTATION OF OMNIBUS CHASSIS

Mr. MALCOLM:

Has the government entered into, or concluded any arrangements for the free importation into Canada, from Great Britain, of omnibus chassis or complete omnibuses?

Mr. RHODES: There have been no arrangements other than those disclosed in the amendments to the tariff which have already passed the house this session.

OYSTER CULTURE—LOBSTER PATROL

Mr. MacLEAN:

1. How much of the $13,000 grant for oyster culture was spent in the Bideford, Malpeque and Grand River areas?
2. What are the particulars in connection with the balance spent in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick?
3. What is the total number of lobster patrol boats engaged in lobster protection in the straits of Northumberland and around Prince Edward Island for the season of 1932?
4. If boats are rented, chartered, or owned by the department, what is the cost in each case?
5. What is the number of men engaged on each boat, their names, and amount paid in each case?
6. What is the total cost of the lobster patrol service in the county of Prince, Prince Edward Island, for the season of 1932?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Return now tabled.

STEAMSHIP BRIGHT FAN

Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Has the government any official information as to whether or not the certificate of the master and first officer of the steamship Bright Fan has been suspended or cancelled in consequence of the findings of the investigation presided over by Judge Mellish?
2. How much did the last owner of the Bright Fan pay for it?
3. How much net insurance did the owner of said boat receive, and was the full claim paid?
4. Had the master or first officer of the Bright Fan any monetary or proprietary interest in this boat?
5. If the government is not in possession of any part of this information, will they endeavour to secure it with reasonable dispatch?

Mr. DURANLEAU:

1. The certificates of the master and first officer of the Bright Fan were not cancelled by Judge Mellish. The Department of Marine has been informed by the High Commissioner in London that no further action has been taken by the board of trade.
2. No official information—Press report stated £8,625.
3. No information other than that contained in letter from owners laid on the table of the house on the 4th instant.
4. In his evidence given before Judge Mellish the master of the Bright Fan testified that he had no interest in the ship.
5. Answered by 1, 2 3 and 4.

MARINE DEPARTMENT AGENT—PICTOU, N.S.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has any appointment been made by the Marine department to fill the vacancy as agent of the department at Pictou, Nova Scotia, since the death of Mr. J. R. Davies, the late agent?
2. If not, is it the intention of the department to make an appointment to fill said vacancy? If so, when?

Mr. DURANLEAU:

1 and 2. No.

ILLUSTRATION STATIONS

Mr. FERLAND:

1. How many illustration stations organized and subsidized under the authority of the federal Department of Agriculture are there in each of the nine provinces of Canada?
2. What are the annual grants in connection with such stations?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort):

1. Prince Edward Island	13
Nova Scotia	17
New Brunswick	19
Quebec	54
Ontario	16
Manitoba	15
Saskatchewan	30
Alberta	22
British Columbia	19

2. No annual grants are made. These stations are operated under contract, the department paying an acreage rental and furnishing special supplies when necessary for special experiments or demonstrations.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

RADIO STATION CHRC

Mr. LAVERGNE:

1. Who are the owners of radio station CHRC in Quebec?
2. If the owners are a corporate body, who are the directors or associates of said body?
3. When does the licence of said station expire?
4. If the licence was renewed, when was it renewed, for how long, and on whose recommendation?

NEW WESTMINSTER HARBOUR COMMISSION

Mr. REID:

1. What lawyer or lawyers have been engaged by, or on behalf of, the harbour commissioners of New Westminster, British Columbia, since October 1, 1932, and up to April 20, 1933?
2. For what specific legal work were they engaged?
3. What respective amounts have been paid for all legal purposes during the above mentioned months?
4. What respective amounts are still outstanding for any legal work done during the above mentioned months?

PICTOU, N.S., RAILWAY PIER

Mr. DUFF:

1. How much was collected by the Department of Marine during the the financial year ending March 1, 1933, for wharfage at what is known as the railway pier, at Pictou, Nova Scotia?
2. How much was due and owing for wharfage at said pier during said period?
3. From whom has said wharfage not been collected though due?
4. Who is the agent representing the department for the collection of wharfage at said pier and what is his yearly compensation?
5. Is any wharfage collected from the old barge allowed to remain at said pier? If so, what is due therefrom?

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (East Hamilton): In a press dispatch in the Hamilton newspapers the story is carried that an agreement has been arrived at between the federal authorities and the provincial authorities in British Columbia to reduce the federal contribution of 33⅓ per cent which is at present being paid to that province in connection with relief to 20 per cent in June, 10 per cent in July, and contributions to cease entirely in August. This report has naturally caused consternation in the larger centres of Ontario. I would ask the Minister of Labour if any similar policy is contemplated with reference to relief in the other provinces of the dominion, particularly in Ontario.

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the question of dominion contributions in connection with relief to the provinces is essentially a matter for the provinces to determine. It is gratifying to me, although it may be disappointing to others, to know that conditions are improving throughout Canada. After long conferences with the British Columbia government it was made apparent that the need of that province for contributions towards relief was truly set out and reflected in the agreement between the dominion and the province which was tabled in this house some days ago. The province of Ontario has not indicated the extent to which the dominion may be called upon to contribute with respect to relief in that province. Unquestionably within a short time they will consult with this government regarding the position of affairs generally. I am hopeful that the contribution will be less than last year. If so it will be very well received by the taxpayers as something about which the province, the individual and all concerned should be extremely happy.

Mr. MITCHELL: The minister said he hoped the contribution would be less. Would that be on a percentage basis, such as a reduction of 33⅓ per cent or in bulk?

Mr. GORDON: That would be a matter to be determined after conference with the province.

Mr. W. G. WEIR (Macdonald): May I ask a question of the Minister of Labour concerning unemployment relief measures? Provision is made, as I understand it, for the Dominion government to pay one hundred per cent of the relief for single homeless men going into camps. This provision is for men who may congregate in the larger towns and cities. The question I have in mind concerns men of the same class who may be found in rural towns and villages. As they in the same position to have that assistance afforded them? I have in mind also the $5 a month paid to men going on farms. Is there any chance of those men partaking of the same provision as applies to men in cities and larger towns who are going into camps?

Mr. GORDON: Mr. Speaker, the provision that was made for that class of people falling within the definition "single homeless men" was provided on account of the situation which developed in the western provinces, and particularly the province of British Columbia. In that province by reason of a number of factors, the burden became very great. To put it shortly, the factors were these: Many thousands of single homeless men, a large percentage of whom arrived in Canada from continental Europe between the years 1927 and 1930 and for whose settlement no adequate provision had been made, drifted into the industrial centres, challenging the Canadian market for Canadian labour. When they found no work in industrial centres they gravitated to the province of British Columbia, and it was said by one person who knows that province very well that having regard to the situation British Columbia was rather cursed than blessed by its climate,—at least for the moment. After the matter had been investigated it was felt that there was a great deal in what had been urged by the province of British Columbia, and by reason of its action in the past some of the responsibility fell directly upon the Dominion government. It was therefore thought desirable and necessary that some added contribution—I say "added contribution" meaning something more —should be made with respect to that class of person who was concentrated in British Columbia and that more should be done than had been done in other parts of Canada. This by reason of the fact that the principle upon which relief has been extended is based upon the need, in any locality. Therefore with respect to single, homeless men in that province and in the other western provinces special provision was made. Representations along the same line have not been made from the other provinces. I doubt, in fact I am sure, they could not make out any such case based upon the same facts, because they do not apply. Therefore no provision in the same sense has been made generally throughout Canada. I cannot, of course, forecast the future but I do believe, from the information I personally receive from different sources, that many of these men will shortly be absorbed in various activities. There is no question that business to-day is better and is steadily improving. A glance at the reports even in the press will disclose that in various parts of Canada, as I am sure every member of the house will be pleased to note, workmen are being re-engaged and employed in useful avocations. The question of the disposition of single men in other parts of Canada will have to depend upon the future, and the representations the provinces may make with respect to the same.

[Mr. W. G. Weir.]

BANKING COMMISSION

INQUIRY IN REGARD TO APPOINTMENTS TO ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the government if there is any truth in the rumour which appeared in the press this week to the effect that Lord Macmillan of the judicial committee of the privy council is about to be appointed to the chairmanship of the proposed royal commission on banking?

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): No conclusions have been arrived at as to the appointments to that commission.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the government to proceed with amendments to the Shipping Act at this session, and if so when we may expect them?

Mr. BENNETT: It is. We expect the measure down to-day.

BANK INTEREST RATE REDUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question submitted yesterday by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) I desire to say that the Dominion government is not charged under the Bank Act with the duty of determining the rates of interest allowed by chartered banks on deposits nor with the rate of interest charged their customers for banking accommodation. However, believing that it was of the utmost importance to business and trade generally that interest rates should be lowered, the government has reduced the interest rate paid on post office savings bank deposits by one-half of one per cent effective May 1, thereby cooperating in the general program to lower interest rates paid on savings deposits by the chartered banks and other depositories in Canada. The government participated in this matter in order to lay the ground for an effective reduction in the cost of money to all classes of borrowers and to promote the stimulus to business recovery which should result therefrom.

My understanding is that while the Canadian Bankers' Association has made no official statement as to a general policy with respect

to a reduction in interest rates to borrowers, substantial reductions have already been effected.

I may add further that I propose to bring to the attention of the Canadian Bankers' Association the question submitted by the hon. member for Battle River.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY

INVESTIGATION INTO ALLEGED COMBINE AMONGST BUYERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GOTT (South Essex): Mr. Speaker, some time ago proceedings were instituted to investigate an alleged combine in the tobacco growing industry. I should not say "alleged," I should just say "combine." I should like to ask the Minister of Labour, in view of the fact that conditions in my riding are nothing short of criminal, as to what progress has been made and what steps the government proposes to take to assist the tobacco growers.

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the report of the registrar making inquiry has not yet been reviewed by me. The hon. member suggests there is a combine. If there is one, the steps which should be taken as contemplated by the statute will be taken, and those responsible for it will have to defend themselves as best they can.

Mr. GOTT: I should like to say another word so that I shall not have to make a speech under an item.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GOTT: Burley tobacco in the United States and American tobacco sold out at fifteen cents a pound and—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GOTT: I shall make a speech some time to-day, then.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not the time to make it.

WORLD ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there has been intimation in the press of the names of certain gentlemen likely to accompany the Prime Minister to the World Economic and Monetary conference. Might I ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position to state who will accompany him, and will he so inform the house, if not at the moment, before we adjourn?

I notice also that the Prime Minister of Great Britain has intimated to the British house the attitude he intends to take with respect to some questions coming up at the conference. Does the Prime Minister of Canada intend to make a similar, or any, intimation of his position?

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, the matter of who shall attend the economic conference has not been considered.

As to the second question, it was not the intention of the Prime Minister to make any statement.

GOVERNMENT LOAN, $750,000,000

REDEMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS AND PURCHASE OF UNMATURED SECURITIES

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That the governor in council be authorized to raise by way of loan under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, an amount not to exceed in the whole the sum of seven hundred and fifty million dollars, for paying or redeeming the whole or any portion of loans or obligations of Canada, and for purchasing and withdrawing from circulation unmatured securities of Canada.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Finance any intimation to give to the house as to the reason for desiring the amount which is named in the resolution; also as to what he has in mind with respect to conversion?

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Speaker, this sum is similar to the sum which was sought in 1931 prior to the refunding which followed. Perhaps in this connection I cannot do better than quote one paragraph from my remarks on the budget:

When the opportune moment arrives, we propose to offer a conversion loan to the public of this country. But it will be on a basis that will keep faith with investors and will not in any sense involve repudiation of existing contracts. Under such conditions, the issue can be made, it is believed, at a rate which will involve a substantial saving to the public treasury.

We will in any event this year have to refund 4½ per cent treasury bills maturing on August 1 in Canada, amounting to $50,000,000, and on October 1, we have a 4 per cent one year issue of $60,000,000 due in New York. There is also to be refunded on November 1 a residual of the 1933 issue amounting to $169,971,850.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Are those tax-free?

Mr. RHODES: Those are tax-free. The total of those three which in any event will have to be refunded this year is $279,971,850.

There will also have to be money provided to meet the deficit on the Canadian National Railways and for the amount expended under the Unemployment and Farm Relief Act. So that in round figures we may say that in any event we will have to fund and refund a minimum of $375,000,000 for this year.

The balance we require for the purpose of being able to put through a refunding operation. No date has been set when that will be effected, but it will be our purpose to bring it about at such time as will enable us to secure as large a sum as we can at the lowest possible rate, with a view, through this refunding process, of saving a substantial sum in interest.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Might I ask the Minister of Finance if the odd $100,000,000 mentioned is all of the loan he will require to cover deficits on account of current debts?

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps if it is agreeable we might go into committee before I answer.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River). The finance minister has informed the house that the refund will be made at the lowest possible rate. I hope he means therefore that the rate will be a good deal less than 4 per cent. At no time in the history of Canada has it been more necessary that the rate of interest should be brought down to a point below that prevailing to-day. I would like to remind the minister that under the Finance Act the government of Canada have advanced large amounts to the banks of Canada at very low rates, some at 4 per cent, some at 3 per cent, some as low as 2½ per cent. I hope therefore that for the refunding of the large amount he mentioned a very low rate will be set, and if it is not all subscribed I trust he will have no hesitation in making up the difference by a direct issue of money from the treasury. We have an example set by our neighbours to the south where the president has been given power to put out no less than three billion dollars of direct issue for the purpose of meeting obligations. I therefore hope the finance minister, if the amount is not fully subscribed, will make up the balance by a direct issue from the national treasury of Canada.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Hackett in the chair.

Mr. RHODES: Will my hon. friend from Edmonton submit his question?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I was asking if with the $280,000,000 in round figures needed for outstanding treasury bills plus the other 1933 needs, he estimates that he will have in the neighbourhood of $375,000,000 of the $750,000,000 asked for, to use for refunding? My question was whether that odd $100,000,000 will cover your floating outstanding capital obligations for the year 1933.

Mr. RHODES: We will still have ample legislative provision, which is customarily contained in the appropriation bill, to enable us to take care of all obligations of that character. This sum to which I had reference, apart from the refunding and funding of which I have spoken, has to do entirely with a conversion loan.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): What I was trying to get at was the direct obligations of the government for which they must borrow money this year, in addition to their floating treasury bills. My hon. friend has just stated that those obligations amount to approximately $375,000,000, and I am asking if that is all that will be required and if the remainder will be directly applicable to refunding.

Mr. RHODES: I think I have already told the committee the total amount we will have to meet by way of maturities and funding this year. If there should be an additional sum required it will be cared for by the borrowing power contained in the appropriation bill, but there is no other funding that we must do this year.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I should like to direct two questions to the minister. First, what is the total internal debt of the dominion, as such; second, in addition to the $169,000,000 of tax free bonds maturing this year, what amount is still outstanding?

Mr. RHODES: We have payable in Canada outstanding bonds to the amount of $2,013,201,570.85. It is not possible, of course, to say whether that is all domiciled in Canada, but that is the best answer I can give my hon. friend. As I understand it, the second question is how much remains outstanding of the tax free issue?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Yes, after the $169,000,000 mature this year.

Mr. RHODES: In round figures the total is $774,000,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Including the $169,000,000 coming due this year?

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I should like to say just a word in regard to the general resolution. I am not at all opposed to it, but I should like to state my views. I very much regret that the administration has not seen fit to take steps to inaugurate a refunding program for the general outstanding debt of the dominion. I believe the initiative should have come from the administration with regard to a general reduction of interest rates and a conversion or refunding program such as was successfully undertaken in Australia. Some hon. members might suggest that it would not be easy to obtain the money at a very low rate of interest, say 3 per cent or 3½ per cent, but I suggest that this is the time to appeal to national sentiment in Canada with regard to a general conversion scheme including all our outstanding obligations.

Mr. RHODES: I can assure my hon. friend and the committee that it is the desire of the government to refund as large a sum as may be possible, at as low a rate as can be possibly obtained. When my hon. friend refers to a refunding of all our issues, and when he compares the situation in Canada with that in Great Britain, for example, he must remember that their bonds were callable. Ours are not, and that feature must be borne in mind in connection with the volume we can attain in the matter of refunding. I can assure my hon. friend that so far as we can judge the trend of money and interest rates we are wise, I think, in deferring until the most favourable opportunity any general refunding scheme that may be undertaken. Exercising the best judgment we can, and guided by the best advice we may secure, it will be our endeavour to carry on the refunding at the most favourable moment.

I think I might very properly add at this stage that it will be our endeavour to secure our funds not upon the basis of the strict value of money in the terms of the market at the moment, but that we will appeal just as far as possible to the patriotism of the Canadian people.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the minister if the bonds when refunded will be payable in notes or in gold, and whether they will be payable in Canada or in other countries as well?

Mr. RHODES: It is anticipated that they will be payable in lawful money of Canada.

Mr. YOUNG: May I ask if this is to be a purely domestic loan or if it will be floated abroad, at least in part?

Mr. RHODES: It is anticipated that it will be a purely domestic loan.

Mr. YOUNG: I have here the public accounts for 1931, and at page XI I find the following:

> $45,000,000 three year 4 per cent treasury notes, issued on December 1, 1927, matured December 1, 1930, and were replaced by the issue of two year treasury notes for $40,000,000 at 4 per cent maturing December 1, 1932, the balance of $5,000,000 being paid from cash. These were sold at par to Canadian chartered banks.

How were those notes taken care of when they matured last September?

Mr. RHODES: They were met by the proceeds of the four per cent loan of last October.

Mr. YOUNG: They were paid?

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. YOUNG: I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, but I have been told that those notes were payable in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver or New York. Is that correct?

Mr. RHODES: I am sorry to say I have not the facts before me, but my recollection is that they were payable entirely in Canada.

Mr. YOUNG: Is it the intention that this new loan shall be payable at the option of the holder either in Canada or elsewhere?

Mr. RHODES: No, Mr. Chairman; it is anticipated that they will be payable in lawful money of Canada, in Canada.

Mr. SPENCER: I take it that lawful money of Canada is either gold or dominion notes?

Mr. RHODES: It is whatever the law says money is in Canada at the time.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Rhodes thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 103, to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. RHODES: With the unanimous consent of the house, I move the second reading of the bill.

Mr. POULIOT: May I point out to the Minister of Finance that I could have made a long speech at every stage of the debate; I did not do so in order not to delay the Post Office supply.

Mr. SPENCER: Unless the minister is particularly anxious to proceed with the bill just now, I suggest that it might be well to

postpone it for the time being. The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) could not be in the house this morning and I know he would like to speak to the bill. However, I will not press the request.

Mr. SPENCE: He has talked enough now.

Mr. RHODES: If it suits the purposes of the hon. member we can let the bill go through committee and I will hold the third reading.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Mr. RHODES: At a later hour this day, if that suits hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this sitting.

RADIO BROADCASTING ACT

PURCHASE OF STATIONS—APPOINTMENTS TO STAFF

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 99, to amend the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I was under the impression that the Prime Minister would have something to say on the second reading of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought we might have the discussion in committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It seems to me it is rather important to have some pronouncement on the second reading, because this bill will come as a great surprise to the house and to the country, especially as it is being introduced at this stage of the session. When the Radio Broadcasting Act was passed at the last session of parliament we were told that its provisions were based on the report of a royal commission endorsed by a committee of this house and, as such, should commend themselves to hon. members. My recollection is that, for that reason, the bill went through without much discussion. We assumed that we were passing legislation in accordance with what the committee, after listening to all the representations that had been made, deemed to be wise and prudent provisions in the circumstances.

In particular, it was stressed that appointments under the radio commission would be made just as are appointments to departments of the government generally, by the Civil Service Commission. We were also advised that, with regard to capital expenditures, whether in the acquisition by lease or purchase of new stations or of stations already in existence, parliament would have a voice in the matter and that the acquisition would not rest solely with the commission on approval of the governor in council. Above all, we were told that the expenses of the commission would be met out of its receipts, and that while parliament would have to make appropriations, thus bringing before the house a review of the whole situation, such appropriations would not exceed what was likely to be raised in the way of receipts from the commission's own operations.

Mr. BENNETT: That has continued.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: After parliament had listened to these representations the bill was passed in the belief that the act would be carried out as set forth, and last year provision was made, in the nature of an appropriation, of $400,000. This year that appropriation has been raised by $600,000 and parliament has been asked to grant $1,000,000 for the commission, as compared with the sum I have already mentioned as having been voted last year, $400,000, which we were led to believe would be sufficient.

Yesterday we passed an appropriation of $1,000,000, assuming that that amount would be equal to what would be raised by the receipts of the commission itself. As I read the present measure, the commission is to have the right to expend not only the $1,000,000 appropriated by parliament but in addition all that it may raise by way of receipts. That seems to me to be going very much further than this house was led to believe was intended at the time it made the appropriation; for that appropriation of $1,000,000 would not have passed the commons, certainly not without considerable debate, unless it had been deemed that it would be the total expenditure which the commission would be in a position to make.

I wish to take strong exception to the provision in this bill that the officials, the clerks and employees generally of the commission, are not to be appointed by the Civil Service Commission as are the clerks and employees of departments of government, but that the commission is to be given a free hand in the making of such appointments. I do not believe there is an argument that can be brought forward in support of giving to the commission any such powers. The employees of the radio commission are no different from the employees of the department of government which has heretofore had

charge of radio broadcasting, and those employees were all under the Civil Service Commission. I see no reason why they should now be taken out. Also as respects this commission which as yet is untried, why should we remove the matter of its expenditures, operations and so on, from such control as parliament may continue to exercise over capital expenditure? On the score of the measure taking away from the Civil Service Commission its authority in the matter of appointments, taking away from parliament its control over capital expenditures and of vastly increasing the total expenditure of the commission, giving to the commission all the funds that it will raise itself through receipts in addition to what may be appropriated by parliament, the bill is objectionable. Every one of these three grounds is subversive in its character of principles to which we should adhere, and contradicts absolutely the provisions of the original act which we were told was based on the report of a royal commission and of a committee of this house. On these grounds we on this side will certainly oppose this measure as strongly as it possibly can be opposed.

May I say to the Prime Minister that seeing that it has been brought in at this stage of the session I think he ought to withdraw the measure. It is not treating the House of Commons fairly to bring in at this stage of the session a measure subversive of all that we have understood to be governing in the matter of the radio broadcasting commission and particularly after this house has permitted the appropriation of $1,000,000, an increase of $600,000 over the appropriation of last year, to be passed with the distinct belief and understanding that it would cover the total expenditures of the commission and that that was supposed to be the amount which the commission itself would be able to raise from its own receipts. All through this session we have been led to believe that the commission's total expenditures would be limited in that way and that the original provisions of the act would be complied with. If it is necessary to change this or for any reason to alter original provisions then I submit the bill should be held over until another session when all these matters can be fully discussed.

Mr. C. E. BOTHWELL (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any organization in this country that is as unpopular as this radio commission. Apparently there is no place that one can go in this country without hearing complaints. I have received considerable correspondence from radio users in the west and yesterday I forwarded to the minister a memorandum made up by a group of radio users in the city of Moose Jaw. A portion of the letter enclosing the memorandum reads as follows:

The change in wave lengths has resulted in spoiling the reception of practically every one of the good American stations which we were able to get here in Saskatchewan, and in place thereof we have to content ourselves with purely local programs, which, as you know, are not to be classed with either the Columbia or National programs.

We have had to stand for a lot from the new radio commission here in the west, but when Mr. Charlesworth took it upon himself to boast of what he had done for the west, it was about the last straw. So far as radio programs in the west are concerned, we were much better off before they had any commission, than we are to-day.

I do not know that I can put the complaints that we hear in better words than those contained in this memorandum and for the information of the house I propose to quote what this group of radio users have said. The memorandum reads:

1. Judging the commission by what it has produced so far, it would appear that the members of the commission have no personal grasp of the actual history or requirements of radio broadcasting entertainment in Canada.

2. During the past season in the main the programs provided over Canadian stations have been very much inferior to the programs provided in previous years.

3. This is most particularly true of programs sponsored by the Canadian radio commission.

4. The finest programs we get in Saskatchewan are furnished by western agencies without any assistance or even recognition by the Canadian radio commission.

5. The chain programs furnished by the Canadian radio commission consist practically entirely of broadcasts by some orchestra or band with the exception perhaps of the corn husker program on Saturday night which consists of old time dance music with appropriate calling off.

6. The commission through its chairman has publicly announced that it intends to borrow programs from the NBC and put them over the Canadian chain.

7. It also announced through its chairman on one occasion that there were no good comedians in Canada (which may or may not be true, but there is no evidence of any effort on the part of the radio commission to find out).

8. The demand for Canadian broadcasting commission was due to the desire on the part of Canadians to have programs of a Canadian flavour and to induce Canadian listeners to listen to Canadian stations with programs of a Canadian flavour rather than programs of an American flavour.

This is particularly necessary in western Canada where so large a proportion of our people are of foreign origin.

The demand for such programs featuring Canadian ideals, disseminating in a palatable way information as to Canada's history, Canada's status in the world, and Canada's future.

9. A program of symphony music is just that, namely, a program of symphony music. It is much more palatable well played by a foreign orchestra than it is not so well played by a Canadian orchestra, and the mere fact that a program of symphony music is coming over a Canadian station has no particular significance, particularly to the foreign born, and those of foreign extraction in our country.

10. The Canadian Pacific Railway broadcasts and the Canadian National Railways broadcasts of previous years were splendid broadcasts. The radio commission has apparently made no attempt to continue these programs. The Canadian National Railways programs particularly were fine from a national and educational viewpoint because they gave Canadian historical skits and playlets, such as we hear from an American viewpoint over the American stations.

11. The announcement by the radio commission that they were going to procure and broadcast over the Canadian chain American programs was most unpalatable because the commission was appointed to wean our listeners away from the American programs, and it was entirely unnecessary because the American programs were already accessible from the American stations.

12. Following some criticism on the floor of the house, the radio commission through its chairman made a statement in Toronto that Montreal and Toronto should realize that they were not the whole of Canada and that the commission had done some wonderful things for the west. The fact of the matter is the commission has done absolutely nothing for the west.

13. The First Battalion, King's Own Rifles of Canada at Moose Jaw, have one of the finest military bands in the country. The bandmaster wrote the commission offering the services of the band for broadcasts and received from an employee of the commission a curt if not insulting reply. Many people claim to have written the commission with helpful suggestions and to have received not even the courtesy of an acknowledgment of their letters.

14. If any further evidence were wanting of the absolute total ignorance of the commission of the condition of broadcasting in western Canada the commission itself furnished this evidence by the change in wave lengths of the Saskatchewan stations. Prior to this change in wave lengths it was possible to get the following American stations regularly with splendid tone and plenty of volume:

KFYR, Bismark.
WCCO, Minneapolis.
WHO and WOC, Des Moines.
KSL, Salt Lake City.
WENR, Chicago.

This will do for an illustration.

The commission announced that the reason for the new k.c. ratings of the Saskatchewan stations is to conform to the international agreement. Whoever made this international agreement knew nothing of the situation in western Canada.

The stations above referred to can none of them with the exception of KFYR be heard in Saskatchewan when the Saskatchewan stations are broadcasting. In addition the Saskatchewan stations cannot be heard outside of their own centre when these stations are broadcasting.

To illustrate: One of the finest programs put over on a regular schedule by the Western Telephone Systems was the fireside hour from Regina Sunday night 9:00 to 10:00. Listeners in Moose Jaw trying to listen to this program through CKCK, Regina last Sunday night found it impossible to do so due to the fact that WOC, WHO came through at the same time and it was impossible to detune them and hear Regina, so that throughout this very fine program there was the other program coming through, speaking voices and singing voices and orchestra mixing in with the fireside hour.

All over Saskatchewan radio listeners find themselves in this wretched position, that their favourite Canadian station is ruined by their favourite American station, and they cannot listen to either when the other is on. In fact the situation is such that in the city of Moose Jaw for illustration, and in the city of Regina for another illustration the only stations which can now be heard satisfactorily are the purely local stations. Even in the immediate rural vicinity of the cities in which Saskatchewan stations are located the local station cannot be heard with any quality of tone because of the heterodyne caused by the carrier signal of some other station.

Had the commission deliberately planned to make it impossible for Saskatchewan listeners to hear any but their local station it could not have been achieved more satisfactorily than it has been done.

One is forced to one of three conclusions, either:

1. That the commission does not know what it is doing, or
2. That it does not care, or
3. That it has deliberately made these wave length adjustments to produce this state of affairs in Saskatchewan to compel Saskatchewan listeners to listen to such programs and only such programs as are available over their local station whether of chain or local origin.

Mr. BENNETT: Who signed that?

Mr. BOTHWELL: It is not signed. The letter is from Schull & Marquis, a firm of reputable solicitors in the city of Moose Jaw.

Mr. BENNETT: Then there is no evidence whose opinion that is.

Mr. BOTHWELL: Except what it says in the letter—from a number of radio listeners of the city of Moose Jaw.

Mr. BENNETT: But who are they?

Mr. BOTHWELL: I am only judging from the letter written by the firm of Schull & Marquis. It is in the nature of a personal letter making a protest on their own behalf as well as on behalf of the others who joined in making up the memorandum. I wanted to put that on record because of this fact. Since

coming to Ottawa to attend this session one hears complaints on every hand of this radio commission and the way they have manipulated things so that radio users are not able to get the benefit of the radio they bought and paid for, and when I see that the chairman of the radio commission states, "There is difficulty here but we have done wonderful things for the west," I want to show what the situation in the west is.

I believe that before any further money is voted for this commission before we give them any greater power than they now have and before they are allowed to employ their own officers, clerks and employees without the intervention of the Civil Service Commission we should have some evidence that the radio commission know what they are doing.

Mr. JOHN VALLANCE (South Battleford): When the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Bothwell) was reading the memorandum complaining of the radio commission the Prime Minister asked who had signed it, and the hon. member for Swift Current replied that he had received it with a general letter written by a reputable firm of lawyers in Moose Jaw. For the edification of the Prime Minister may I just read a few extracts of opinions which have been expressed by individual radio listeners in the province of Saskatchewan complaining of the action of the radio commission. I do not know whether I should read them all, but I have quite a few of them condensed and I will give the names and places.

Here is one from W. S. Pierce, Archiwill, Saskatchewan, He has this to say:

> We would like to express our dissatisfaction with the change in your wave length. Your station CJRM was about the only station we could get clearly on a good night. Now you are placed so close to WENR and WLS that we cannot get you or them in the evening.

Then Miss G. E. Grant of Sceptre, Saskatchewan, writes:

> As we take the wheat prices for the elevators here at Sceptre, we are very disappointed with the change in your wave length. It is not half as good as it was before.

Mrs. G. Hill, Blaine Lake, Saskatchewan, writes:

> Since they changed the wave length we cannot get Fleming at all and have to put on all the volume we have to get CJRM—

That is the Moose Jaw station:

> —and if Saskatoon is on, we cannot get it at all. Saskatoon interferes with all the stations terrible.

Then there is a complaint of the same nature from Mrs. A. Brown of Birch Hills, another from M. McMillan—I do not suppose that is the member, but the name is McMillan. He writes:

> Since you have changed the wave length we cannot get Moose Jaw with Saskatoon on as they both come in about the same place on our radio.

Then there are other complaints from Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Abbey, Ridpath, Herbert, Melfort, Glenellen, Swift Current, Masefield, Saskatoon again, Richlea, Grandin, Leroy, Wadena, Milden and Regina, all making the same objections which are set out in the memorandum which was read by the hon. member for Swift Current. I feel just as he does, that instead of the chairman of the radio commission telling us what wonderful things they have done for the west, in view of the protests that are now being made against the radio commission I think we should get from the minister through his radio commission some illustration of the wonderful things that they have done for the west before we vote any more money for the commission.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): I wish to add my protest to those which have already been expressed by my hon. friends on this side of the house against this bill. I do not see what justification there is for giving the radio commission power to employ all its officers, clerks and employees in any different way from that prevailing with the other departments and public agencies of this government. The reason which is given in the explanatory note is that the Civil Service Commission has not in the past been accustomed to employing personnel of the type required by the radio commission, and it is not considered that the Civil Service Act is a suitable vehicle through which the commission should obtain its employees either technical or clerical. Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot for the life of me see any good reason in that explanatory note. What they say there applies to every other department of the government when it is first placed under the Civil Service Commission. For example, the Civil Service Commission had not in the past been accustomed to appoint, and did not possess the qualifications for appointing, legal officers in the Department of Justice or financial experts in the Department of Finance. The practice that they follow is to appoint a board of men who are competent to select the men required from among the applicants for these positions, and the Civil Service Commission acts upon the report it receives from these various boards. Surely this radio commission, and especially at this time, should not be a state within the state, should not be

exempt from all the restrictions and control which are exercised over the other departments of the government. I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken that there is no public body in Canada, no government body, so unpopular as the present radio commission. As far as I am concerned I must say, although I do not suppose it matters much, that the radio commission lost my entire confidence immediately after they took office, when, as it was shown in the house last session, the commission had been appointed on October 3, and sworn in on October 30 or 31, and that two days before they were sworn in a licence was given to a political newspaper in Montreal. The commission did not act after its appointment. The licence was granted by the Minister of Marine just two days before the commission was sworn in. They say they have no responsibility, because they were not sworn in when the licence was granted. But the law gave them power to prevent the opening of that station. In that instance we had an example of the worst kind of political patronage. When the radio legislation was passed I was the first on this side of the house, on the second reading of the bill, to voice my approval and give my support. Had I known that the commission now in office was to be appointed I would not have given to that bill the support I then gave. I have not confidence enough in the commission to relieve it from the control and necessary restrictions other departments of government are under. I am also opposed to section 3 which gives them the right to expend the moneys they receive from any business carried on under the act, apart from those moneys appropriated by parliament. This body is under the control of parliament. We cannot free parliament from responsibility for these moneys. As I said a few moments ago I am opposed to building a state within the state, especially in view of the personnel of this commission.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, on account of the very illuminating speeches which have been delivered since this bill was introduced I am very happy that it has not been carried. Since I mentioned in the house that I would pull Mr. Charlesworth's whiskers I have received two anonymous letters, one in capitals and the other in semi-commercial characters. I do not pay any particular attention to them, but I do say that the Prime Minister will never say about the chairman of the radio commission the nice things he has said about the chairman of the tariff commission. Here we have a gentleman who has been writing articles in a Toronto publication—writing about music. What does he know about music? He gave lectures about this, that and the other thing; now he is non compos mentis all the time, and is supposed to rule the air. He is full of hot air, that is all he is.

Mr. DAVIES: You are.

Mr. POULIOT: Who says that?

Mr. DAVIES: I do.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member has exploded.

Mr. DAVIES: I suggest you have.

Mr. POULIOT: First of all, the hon. member is a newcomer in this house. He has to learn the law before teaching others, and he will learn the law by listening to others.

Mr. DAVIES: Make it interesting and I will listen.

Mr. POULIOT: He will gain great advantage by listening to others before making such an exhibition of himself.

Mr. GOTT: The hon. member said if it were made interesting he would listen.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not accepting the judgment of the hon. member, the baby of the house. I am not surprised when he shouts, because we always hear babies scream.

Mr. DAVIES: What about yourself?

Mr. POULIOT: Oh, I am speaking in a most delicate way. I say this, that the Prime Minister is master of the land; the chairman of the radio commission is master of the air. I wonder why the aeroplanes of the Department of National Defence are not put under his control. I wonder why the flags are not put under his control, and everything in the air. The birds—why are they not put under his control? Everything that has wings and is lighter than air, or up in the air, should be under his control—as should my hon. friend the baby of the house. He should be under his control, also, so that we would have peace in this House of Commons.

Mr. GOTT: Hot air is not under control.

Mr. POULIOT: Then you are full of hot air.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You cannot make another speech before the orders of the day are called.

Mr. GOTT: The hon. member spoke, but he did not say anything.

Mr. POULIOT: Speaking seriously I am asking the government to keep control of the

radio commission. I was very sorry when I heard my good friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) say he would not interfere with the work of the radio commission. When he said that I was scandalized. I say to him now, while he sits next the Prime Minister, that he should run the radio commission as well as his own department, with an iron hand and a velvet glove. He should be the master of the radio commission. Then when we come to this House of Commons we would find one man who would be responsible for what has been done by the commission. This is true parliamentary doctrine which no hon. member on the treasury benches will deny.

We have a Civil Service Commission. It is either good or bad. If it is good, leave to it the powers it should have; if it is bad, abolish it. There was a hole made in the law favouring the Postmaster General by which he was allowed to dismiss postmasters of post offices having revenues of $3,000. Under the change the Postmaster General was allowed to dismiss postmasters who previously could be dismissed only by order in council. That power was granted to him. He was granted the power to appoint postmasters to post offices earning a net revenue of $3,000. That change was an encroachment upon the Civil Service Act. Now, in connection with the radio commission, we have another encroachment of the same kind.

I have nothing to say particularly against any member of the board. The Quebec member seems to be a very pleasant gentleman, although I have not had many dealings with him. I am very discreet in these matters. I do not know the expert, and I know Mr. Charlesworth only from reading what he has written in Saturday Night. In addition to that there has been some personal correspondence. Are these men superior to the members of the Civil Service Commission? Why should exception be made in favour of the radio commission when there is no exception made in favour of the Minister of Marine? Are these men of the radio commission such superior men? I see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gordon) in his seat, also the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré)—they cannot make permanent appointments in their own departments, except by a vote of the House of Commons or through the Civil Service Commission. Why should there be any exception in favour of Mr. Charlesworth and his two companions? I ask the government to decide now whether or not it will stand behind the Civil Service Commission? I ask them whether or not the Civil Service Commission is a body worth having. That is the main point. We have to know how things are being done. If they are done properly one way they should always be done that way. That is the statement that I make with full responsibility as a member for a constituency in which there are many radio listeners, and in which there will be a permanent broadcasting station if the minister grants the licence that has been asked for for months and months. In the name of my own people as well as of all Canadians I protest strongly against such discrimination. Can a thing be good and bad at the same time? It is impossible. Sir, I entertain great fears that the Canadian people will not be treated fairly by the chairman of the radio commission. That is my personal feeling; I express it here in the House of Commons. I do not trust that man. I wonder why I should be bound to accept the decision of a radio czar in this country. It is absurd. Is there a milk bottle in the House of Commons?

Mr. GOTT: If there is the hon. gentleman should sip at it.

Mr. POULIOT: Is there a nursemaid in the House of Commons?

Mr. CHEVRIER: Onions.

Mr. GOTT: I did send the hon. gentleman a bag prepaid.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, Mr. Speaker, with due respect I stand here for the liberties of the Canadian people, for the freedom of the electors, the men and women and children of this country and of the constituencies of hon. gentlemen opposite as well as my own. We will not stand for discrimination, we want fair play for all, and as members of the parliament of this country we want to retain control of the men who are paid with the taxes that come from the Canadian people. We wish to be able to say our word about what is done; to praise if it is right, and if it is not right, to condemn. We want to keep the right to present to the government the grievances of the people, of the electors of my hon. friends opposite, both of them, Essex and the newborn child.

Mr. O. HANSON (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on this bill on behalf of the people of central and northern British Columbia. I have had a lot of communications asking me as to what the radio commission are doing. Up in our country the people are paying licence fees to listen to American radio programs. They have re-

quested the commission and the Minister of Marine that a radio station be established in northern or central British Columbia to serve that territory, but up to the present nothing has been done. The other day I received five letters in one mail asking what they were paying licences for to the Canadian government, when they only have American broadcasting programs to listen to. I therefore urge the government and the minister, if this money is voted, that consideration be given to those people. They are isolated, many of them use the radio as their only means of keeping in touch with what is going on outside; they have not the facilities of those living in the populous centres. I urge the minister to see that something is done for those people to warrant them paying the licence. They are complaining, and rightly so, about paying it, and I submit they should be given some consideration. I trust the minister and the radio commissioners will see what can be done on their behalf.

Mr. E. R. E. CHEVRIER (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to what the previous speakers have said. At this late stage of the discussion I do not desire to take up time. My views as to appointments to the government service are well known to hon. members of this house. May I add that I fully concur in the remarks made by the former Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe).

Mr. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, in view of the criticisms this morning I wish to express the opinion of this group, which is absolutely in favour of the principle of public ownership. After all, this child is only just born, and the 245 members of this house were the midwives.

Mr. YOUNG: No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL: It was carried unanimously.

Mr. YOUNG: No, it was not.

Mr. MITCHELL: Well I understand it was; at any rate we will not argue about that. I am not unmindful of the fact that in bringing order out of chaos there is bound to be some disagreement.

Mr. YOUNG: How about bringing chaos out of order?

Mr. MITCHELL: Someone says "How about bringing chaos out of order." That hon. member must have a very short memory. Chaos has been the general condition in the broadcasting field on the North American continent, largely through the lack of control by this government and the government to the south.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am not complaining about the right of any hon. member to criticize the commission. I believe that in view of the length of public experience of the chairman of the commission someone might whisper in his ear just to keep quiet for a time, which should be quite easy in view of his experience in the newspaper business. In my judgment the radio commision should act in the national life of this country more or less as a judicial body. I do not believe that the chairman should go about the country making such speeches as he has made. I believe that is absolutely inconsistent with the dignity of the position. It is only natural that when he utters what in my judgment were direct insults to members of this house they should be answered on the floor of this house.

But what I chiefly rose to object to is the provision in this bill further reducing the power of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL: The last two sessions of this parliament have seen a fall in the prestige and influence of that commission. Last session we saw 4,000 members of the postal service given back to the old system of party patronage with all its evils. This year we have a measure passed by this house which takes from the jurisdiction of the commission certain employees of the penitentiaries. Now we have, before the ink on that bill is quite dry, this commission being given power to engage its own personnel. In my judgment, taking the long view of it, we are thereby opening the way for the entrance of all the evils of party patronage into the operations of this commission. I am not unmindful of the difficulties confronting the commission in the absorption of broadcasting stations, and dealing with the question whether it is a practical thing to absorb the staff that exists at the time the commission takes over a particular station. But I do not think it is beyond the power of the government and the commission to fit such matters into the frame work of the civil service legislation. It is only human nature that the party which created this commission will bring pressure to bear to see that its own friends are appointed to the positions coming under this commission, if this amendment is adopted. I believe this is a retrograde step; I believe it is absolutely against the building up of what I believe to be necessary in this country, an

efficient civil service. I am not unmindful of the fact that party patronage will die slowly; I have not forgotten to take into account the mental background of those members of this house who carried on during that period when party patronage was at its height. I believe I have expressed the opinion before that it will take at least a generation to build up an efficient civil service, on the principle of trial and error. I believe the government is absolutely wrong in taking this step; I think it is absolutely unnecessary and against the general opinion held throughout this country in connection with the building up of an efficient civil service in this dominion.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take very long to reply to the objections which have been raised in this house since this bill was introduced. It seems to me that each time my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) speaks about radio matters he has an obsession with regard to the licence granted to La Patrie for the erection of station CHLP. I have answered my hon. friend once or twice in this regard and for the last time, I hope, I will answer again.

Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot understand why a newspaper which is supposed to be Conservative should have a station. They have been accustomed to having their following in Quebec in control of all the newspapers and radio stations in that province, and they cannot get over the fact that a Conservative paper should have a small, one hundred watt station in order to give a chance to every party and every man who wants to broadcast his opinions with regard to public and even political matters. They cannot understand why we should have even one small station. I have already said to the house that the acting Minister of Marine did well when he granted that licence. The commission was not functioning at the time; the acting minister had the power and he took that action. I believe the people of the province of Quebec are satisfied to have that station; I think we should have more in Quebec, and I hope the radio commission will give justice to every party in that province and see that the electors are given proper treatment and that they have a chance to hear and read both sides of all questions. Since the radio estimates were brought down we have heard a great deal of criticism. We expected it, because we know there are enemies in this country who are heard through the members of this house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. YOUNG: What kind of enemies?

Mr. DURANLEAU: When I say enemies I mean those opposed to state control or state ownership of radio in this country. We expected opposition, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think this criticism is fair when it is remembered that the commission has been in charge of radio in Canada for only three or four months. Why not give these men a fair chance? I know they have been on the job from nine o'clock in the morning very often until twelve o'clock at night in order to give the best possible service to Canada. Of course they had to comply with the international agreements that are in existence, and on April 1 they had to make some changes in wave lengths. That has resulted in some criticism, but conditions will be remedied; give them time. Next June there is to be a conference in Mexico of all the countries of America, at which we will discuss the whole question of wave lengths. All these matters will be readjusted, and I think the commission should have at least a few months in which to satisfy the public. I do know that their aim is to give Canada the best service possible. We hear many local complaints, but if hon. members could go to the offices of the radio commission they could find volumes of letters of congratulation which are being received every day with regard to the programs the commission have put on during the last two months. Hon. members would be amazed to read the congratulations they have received.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We certainly would be.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I say to the minister—

Mr. DURANLEAU: I am sure hon gentlemen have not had the opportunity of hearing all the programs that the commission have put on during the last two months, because they have been attending the sessions of this house every evening.

Mr. CHEVRIER: We cannot get them in Ottawa.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I know there has been some trouble in Ottawa, but in a short time it will be remedied. We will have an agreement with the United States in a short time which will enable us to adjust matters satisfactorily. I do not want to take up very much of the time of the house at this late stage of the session—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Explain the bill.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I should like to mention a few of the things that have been done

by the commission since its appointment. They started with the Christmas broadcast, with which I am sure everyone was pleased. We tried previously to have an imperial broadcast on Christmas day, but we could not get it. This year, however, due to the organization of the commission, that broadcast was successful and everyone was pleased. The commission has transmitted many programs by means of transcontinental chains to all radio stations in Canada that were in a position to take them. On the average this has amounted to about forty stations for each broadcast. We had thirteen one-hour concerts by symphony orchestras; surely that is something. We had eleven forty-five minute concerts by army, navy and municipal bands, and we had ten popular dance programs. In addition we had twelve one-hour French programs from Montreal and Quebec. I am proud to say that with respect to these programs the largest number of letters of congratulations have been received from various parts of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The memorandum continues, giving the following details of broadcast:

Choral societies and choirs—two one-hour programs.

Special events, such as finals and semi-finals in the Canadian hockey series, speeches by the Right Hon. Ramsay MacDonald, Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DURANLEAU: —and Sir Arthur Salter—seven programs varying from fifteen minutes to an hour and a half. I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen opposite applauding, because I am sure that every Canadian who listened to the remarks of the Prime Minister of Canada when he was in Washington on a recent occasion will admit that it was a great achievement for the radio commission to have brought over so clearly and distinctly the speeches made on that occasion.

In the western provinces radio listeners have been hearing for the first time in the history of the radio regular symphonic programs. A survey made by the university of Alberta some weeks ago showed that they were the most popular programs of any kind with radio listeners. Dr. Stapleford, head of the United Church's college at Regina, recently said that the commission's work for the west had been magnificent. A similar tribute with reference to the commission's work for the maritime provinces was recently expressed by Hon. F. D. Richards, Prime Minister of New Brunswick.

[Mr. Duranleau.]

One of the most remarkable of the commission's trans-continental broadcasts occurred on April 21st when the Western Canada High Schools' Orchestra, composed of 265 juvenile musicians from the prairie provinces, was assembled at Winnipeg and heard in a beautiful program. Commenting on this program, Mr. P. G. Padwick, the organizer of the concert, wrote: "The Radio Commission was able to do more for the extension of the orchestral movement in forty-five minutes than has been accomplished in ten years of hard missionary work."

The Empire Christmas broadcast brought upwards of 3,000 congratulatory messages from various parts of Canada. It could not have been carried out had the commission not been appointed. An attempt in the previous year failed because the necessary co-ordinating forces did not exist in Canada. The magnificent Anglican broadcast on Sunday, April 23rd, was arranged through the cooperation of the commission; otherwise it could not have been organized. One of the other recent acts of the commission was the broadcasting to every part of Canada of Right Hon. Ramsay MacDonald's address at Washington on April 22nd. Without the commission's assistance this broadcast would have been heard only in the Toronto and Montreal areas.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to interrupt the minister in the reading of the memorandum he has been quoting from, but I would ask him this question. If the commission is doing so splendidly under the statute as it stands, why is it necessary to amend that statute in the way proposed?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I shall come to that in a minute. Since the commission has been functioning we have observed that its activities are handicapped by the provisions of the act as it is now in force.

Mr. LAPOINTE: With such a glorious record?

Mr. DURANLEAU: We are to-day acting on the advice of a man of very considerable experience. As I say, I shall come to that point in a moment or two, but at present I am merely stating to the house what the commission has done, is doing and intends to do. Surely my hon. friends cannot expect the commission to have done everything conceivable during the short time that they have been in office. They did not own these stations in Canada; they have to hire wireless stations, and their operations cannot be expected to have been so far perfect. But they are doing their best and I hope that in a few

months my hon. friends will admit with others that no other organization could do better than the commission has been doing.

It is the intention of the commission to organize a complete wire chain across Canada, tying in all the principal stations in each area throughout the country. This chain will be operated by the commission for a certain number of hours each day, and Canadian programs of the very higest calibre will be transmitted throughout Canada over these lines. It is the intention of the commission to secure the very best talent in all the cities throughout the country, and to have these artists broadcast from as many Canadian stations as possible. These programs will comprise all types of entertainment, including dramatic productions, talks and music, in such a way as to interest all classes of listeners in Canada.

Due to the wide variation in time between Halifax and Vancouver, it will be necessary for the country to be organized into a number of regional chains in addition to the main trans-Canada hook-up. This work is already well under way. It is the intention of the commission to have available at least four hours of Canadian programs each day. These programs will be clear of all advertising matter and will be transmitted at suitable periods for the various parts of the country.

Upon taking office in January, 1933, the commission found that an agreement had been signed between Canada and the United States, laying down very definitely the distribution of channels and power throughout Canada. This treaty had been arranged by the Canadian Legation with the State Department at Washington in May, 1932. This agreement made it possible for Canada to use an increased number of clear channels and permitted a very large increase in the power of Canadian stations. To effect this agreement it was necessary for a few small stations to be reduced in power and for a number of changes in channels to be made throughout the country. Since the commission could only make these changes at the time of the renewal of the station licences, it was impossible for effect to be given to the agreement until April 1, 1933.

These changes have had the effect of clearing a great deal of interference from Canadian channels and, while it is possible that in some parts of the country certain American stations are not now well received, it will be found that other American stations carrying exactly the same chain programs can now be heard in those particular areas, whereas before these latter stations were blanketed by the Canadian stations. This is the situation which exists in Ottawa at the present time. American stations carrying all of the high class chain programs are now heard here that could not previously be picked up on any set in the Ottawa district.

With respect to western Canada, it is the intention of the commission to build two powerful stations which will give entire satisfaction to the west.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Where?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Is it true that the complaint just now is that the radio commission is working only one way—that it works in the west but not in the east? Is that true?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Why should that be?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I do not know; I am merely putting the question to the minister, because I am not an expert.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I am told that it is working both ways. The commission is trying to give satisfaction to the whole country.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): As they are linked up just now, I am told that the west cannot hear the east.

Mr. DURANLEAU: If my hon. friend has followed the programs of the last two months, he will realize that some were heard from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I heard one last Sunday evening and I will admit that it was wonderful.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I am making a statement in connection with the west because of the complaints which have been voiced in this house. After a careful survey of radio conditions in Canada, the broadcasting commission consider that it is essential that two new stations should be erected in western Canada in order to serve this large area. It is proposed to begin construction of two high powered stations in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan. The coverage in British Columbia is at present very poor on account of the fact that only low power stations are available, and these are all in the vicinity of Vancouver. One large station, suitably located, would give excellent Canadian service to the entire province. The province of Saskatchewan is now served by a number of low power stations scattered over the southern half of the province. It is proposed to erect one large station near the centre of the area where satisfactory power supply can be obtained.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Can the minister tell us where the station in British Columbia will be located?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I cannot give definite information at the present time. The commission is trying to find a location for a station which will cover the whole province.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): To reach the outlying districts?

Mr. DURANLEAU: To reach even the outlying districts, yes. The hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) quoted me as having said that I would not interfere with the operations of the commission. What I stated to this house and what I repeat is that I intend to follow the provisions of the statute which last year was adopted unanimously, with the exception of the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young). Apparently these amendments will not be accepted unanimously. I intend to follow the provision of the statute. I shall intervene where it is my duty to do so, within the provisions of the statute. I shall conform strictly to the law; that is the position I intend to take.

Mr. POULIOT: Will the minister be responsible to the House of Commons for everything done by this commission?

Mr. DURANLEAU: The minister will be responsible for his own acts.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He has got enough of that.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The radio commission is under the Minister of Marine but his responsibility will not go the length of covering all the acts of the commission.

Mr. POULIOT: Then the commission is an irresponsible body.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The commission has the authority and the powers which have been granted to it by this house; that is all I can say.

Now, with regard to the proposed amendments submitted to the house. Since this commission has been in operation it has been noticed that there was something lacking in the law. As the house knows, the Prime Minister of England was kind enough to lend us a gentleman of great ability and of much experience in these matters. This gentleman, for the last ten years has been one of the leading officials of the British Broadcasting Corporation and we were fortunate in having the services of Major W. E. Gladstone Murray. This gentleman has covered the whole situation, he has travelled all over Canada and has heard representations from many different bodies. He has come to the conclusion that the act should be amended in the way in which it is proposed it shall be amended by this legislation. I think it is my duty to read to the house the interim report of Mr. Murray. When he has completed his survey, Mr. Murray will make a complete report but he thought it wise in the meantime to make an interim report which suggests and urges the amendments now before the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would it not have been better to have waited until the final report was made?

Mr. BENNETT: That is the reason he made the interim report.

Mr. DURANLEAU: That would mean that we would have to wait until next session. The commission has been so handicapped with the law as it is at present, that it was thought desirable to proceed at this session. The following is a letter dated May 5, 1933, from Mr. Murray to myself:

In accordance with the arrangement of this morning, I have the honour to make certain submissions. Having had the opportunity of considering, not only the present state of organization of the commission, but also the public attitude across the dominion, I am convinced that it is of the greatest importance in the public interest that reforms should be effected during the present session of parliament. If, unfortunately, immediate action is not taken and the problem is left over until a later date, there is real danger that either the work of the commission will be paralyzed or will evolve in the wrong direction.

The situation is that public opinion is ready to have implemented the wish of parliament as expressed with almost unprecedented unanimity last summer, when the radio broadcasting bill became law. There is, however, a growing suspicion that the law is in certain respects defective, and that, unless it is amended, the unanimous wish of parliament will be thwarted. Guided by experience in connection with the parliamentary side of the B.B.C. during the past ten years, I would seriously commend to your attention the following reforms:—

(1) That the appointments under the broadcasting commission should not be made to conform to the Civil Service Act.

Conditions of broadcasting are essentially different from those which apply to the civil service, and this fortunately was recognized in the early days of the B.B.C. Broadcasting, while too important to be left to private enterprise, is nevertheless too sensitive to be brought fully into the machinery of state. If broadcasting is to flourish in Canada, the authority created by parliament should be empowered to choose, on its own responsibility, those who are to carry out the work.

(2) That detailed expenditure on the work of broadcasting, whether it be in the creation of programs, in the leasing or purchase of stations, or in the erection of new stations, should not be allowed to become the subject of debate on the floor of the House of Commons. The essence of public service broadcasting is to keep it clear of party political warfare. It

seems to me that procedure by order in council would surmount the objection of inadequate public control.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Send that gentleman home.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The letter continues:

Moreover, as in the case of the British House of Commons, it is highly important to confine discussion on broadcasting to broad matters of policy, avoiding detail in all directions.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is very kind of this gentleman.

Mr. DURANLEAU: It continues:

(3) That the revenue accruing from the licence fee paid by listeners should not be regarded as part of the consolidated fund, as apparently is the case at present.

As long as the moneys accruing from licence fees are included in the consolidated fund vote, so long will it be possible to suggest that licence revenue is part of general taxation. In point of fact, as the Prime Minister made clear in the House of Commons on April 21, 1933, the federal government is in the position of a trustee. When the owner of a radio receiver pays his licence fee, he is actually subscribing to a contract for service. If and when the licence revenue, as in Great Britain, becomes greater than is necessary for the purpose for which it was provided, then the state is obviously entitled to take the surplus. But, for the moment, with a national system in embryo, it is obvious that the contract between the listener and the state should be fully honoured. It is submitted that the only way to achieve this result and to prevent misrepresentation is to have the licence revenue paid over direct to the commission, there being, as in the case of the B.B.C., an annual independent audit and a report to parliament.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Are we doing anything to this gentleman for lecturing parliament?

Mr. BENNETT: Because he does not agree with you there is no reason to talk that way.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is terrible to have the parliament of Canada spoken of in that way by that gentleman.

Mr. DURANLEAU: To continue:

(4) That there should be no impediment to a moderate scheme of development.

The commission is anxious, and, in my opinion, rightly so, to create new stations as opportunity permits, in order to extend effective coverage beyond the limits of what is possible under existing private ownership. Moreover, there is confident expectation on the part of the public that the commission will go forward in this way. It would appear, therefore, to be inadvisable to impose any reduction either in the main or supplementary votes which would imperil a moderate plan of development in the form of new stations.

In conclusion, sir, I would reemphasize my feeling of the urgency of these reforms, upon the early enactment of which may well depend the success or failure of a potentially great asset for the Canadian people.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) W. E. Gladstone Murray.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is one o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Speaker, may I ask that the house by unanimous consent revert to the order for motions so that I may have the privilege of introducing a motion which is more or less of a routine nature?

The house having reverted to the order for motions.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I beg to move:

That pursuant to a special order made on the 27th of March last, Bill No. 102, respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company be now read a first time and a second time and referred to the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first and second times.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BENNETT: May we refer back to the orders for motions in order to enable the report of the select standing committee on pensions to be submitted.

Mr. SPEAKER: The house will revert back to the order for motions.

PENSIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): I beg to present the second and final report of the special committee to which was referred Bill No. 78, to amend the Pensions Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is the hon. member moving concurrence?

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved:

That the bill be placed upon the order paper this day.

He said: I understand that the conclusions were unanimously arrived at with no divisions, and it is for that reason I make this motion.

Mr. ARTHURS: The reprinted bill has not yet come to my hand, but I expect it will be ready for distribution among the members within a very short time. It is expected this afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

NEW ZEALAND BUTTER

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): At this point would I be in order to ask the Prime Minister if the statement regarding importations of New Zealand butter has been made out?

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): It is being prepared in the Department of Trade and Commerce, and it will be submitted.

Mr. STEVENS: I shall have it in hand very shortly.

Mr. BENNETT: It cannot be done in a minute.

RADIO BROADCASTING ACT

PURCHASE OF STATIONS—APPOINTMENTS TO STAFF

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Bennett for the second reading of Bill No. 99, to amend the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to add much to what I stated to the house this forenoon. I cannot add much to the interim report of Major Gladstone Murray, except to say that I hope hon. members opposite who are criticizing the radio commission at the present time will not deny that the commission is attempting to give the best service possible to the country. Their experience of three or four months has shown them that they need these amendments, and that is also the opinion of that great expert, Major Gladstone Murray.

It seems to me the opposition is not consistent when it criticizes the commission and at the same time denies the commission the tools which they think they need in order to make a success of their administration.

Hon. IAN MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, without unduly detaining the house I desire to make one or two observations arising particularly from the observations of the Minister of Marine this morning. In the first place I desire to recall to the minds of hon. members the very wonderful spirit of unanimity manifested a year ago in this house when the principle of the control of radio broadcasting was before the house for decision. At that time, Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that hon. members to your left, with the exception of one, were all in favour of the principle embodied in the legislation. Therefore I do not at all give way to the hon. member for East Hamilton

[Mr. Arthurs.]

(Mr. Mitchell) when he suggested that hon. members to your immediate left were not altogether in favour of the principle of public ownership. I wish to assure the hon. member—

Mr. MITCHELL: I wish to correct that statement; I never said that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I rather gathered that inference from the hon. member's remarks. I wish to assure the house that members of His Majesty's opposition sitting to the left of the Speaker have the finest record possible in regard to our public activities, and are as strongly behind the principle of public ownership as are any hon. members in this House of Commons.

I was greatly amazed to hear the Minister of Marine, when referring to criticisms from this side of the house, suggest that the attacks made upon this measure were inspired by a dislike for state control. May I remind the hon. member that we have been the unfailing champions of public ownership. The other day he and the administration of which he forms a part, in connection with another measure which I cannot mention at this time because it is contrary to the rules to refer to a previous debate of this session, most signally departed from the principle of state control, in connection with our railway systems of the Dominion of Canada.

In the first place the minister's defence consisted of reading a long and elaborate memorandum which was obviously and transparently prepared by one of the officials of the radio commission, or by the director of public relations. After hearing the complaints from Saskatchewan, the far west and Quebec in regard to the operation of the commission the minister submitted a memorandum obviously prepared by one of the officials I have named, and giving us a wonderful description of their various activities. He told us about the wonderful Christmas broadcast, about the symphony concerts, about military band concerts and, as a climax to the wonderful description, he told us that only the other day the people of Canada had the high privilege of listening over the radio to the broadcast of the inspired words of our Prime Minister, while in a foreign country.

Despite the obvious attempt of the minister to defend the operation of the radio commission since its inception, it is a fact they are to-day a very distinctly unpopular body throughout Canada. It is a fact that complaints received have been more than justified. The minister did not give us one reason which would justify the presentation of the bill we

now have before us. What were the reasons he gave. He read us an interim report of Mr. Gladstone Murray. The report of Mr. Murray referred, in the first place, to section 1 of the bill, namely taking away from the Civil Service Commission the power of employing staffs, and vesting that power in the radio commission itself. Speaking for myself, may I say that I have not sufficient confidence in the present personnel of the radio commission to entrust them with control over their employees, and my distrust is shared by a great majority of the Canadian people.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I agree.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Here is an obvious and to my mind unwarrantable intrusion upon the fundamental activities of the Civil Service Commission. There has been a continual effort to lessen the powers of the Civil Service Commission. If this government is allowed to function for a longer time in the Dominion of Canada, the Civil Service Commission will be nothing but a pale anaemic ghost, without any power of its own. Those who believe in the Civil Service Commission, as such, cannot possibly support the principle of this bill.

Let us turn to clause 2. We are taking away from parliament the power to purchase, and placing it under the supervision of the governor in council. The only possible justification I can see, after reading the section, would be that occasions might arise where expedition would be proper. But when I heard read the memorandum which the minister submitted to parliament, I found it was inferred, if my recollection is correct, that it was considered improper for this Canadian parliament to discuss details of radio administration. That appears to have been the opinion of Mr. Gladstone Murray. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the sooner specialists brought from other lands cease to criticize the affairs of Canada or the parliamentarians of Canada, our duties and our functions and our responsibilities, the better it will be for the Dominion of Canada as a whole.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are too many of them.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It seems that we cannot any longer settle our own problems with Canadian brains. We have to import specialists from other countries to settle our affairs,—and this from the party of "Canada first." Although Mr. Murray was Canadian born and undoubtedly an eminent gentleman I resent the repeated suggestion he made that members of this parliament should not be given the opportunity of discussing the details of radio administration. Here again we are setting up another independent body in Canada and giving them power over their own employees. According to the interim report read this morning by the Minister of Marine we are going to be deprived of the opportunity of discussing session after session the details of radio broadcasting and radio administration in our various communities. The complaints which are raised in Ontario, Quebec or the maritimes we cannot properly ventilate unless we discuss the details of that administration. Unless that gentleman is prepared to submit a more constructive final report than his interim report he should be immediately dismissed from further investigations of our Canadian radio system. We have never in this house passed legislation that more directly touched the lives of Canadian people than this Radio Broadcasting Act. That act, according to the minister himself—I am not agreeing with him—has been functioning well during the last year. The minister read an elaborately prepared memorandum to defend the actions of the commission. If it functioned so well why the necessity for this new legislation, brought into this house in the dying hours of the session without any knowledge by any member of this house as to the contents? As far as I am concerned I think it unfair on the part of the government to introduce this legislation at this late hour. I think the four paragraphs of the bill are absolutely indefensible, they infringe upon the Civil Service Act, take away the powers of parliament and recast the financial structure which was so ably defended by the Prime Minister himself a year ago.

In view therefore of these considerations, although I am in favour of the principle of public ownership of radio, I am obliged to oppose this bill.

Mr. ONESIME GAGNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the house very long, but having been a member of the special committee on radio broadcasting which studied this problem very diligently last year I think it will not be out of order if I attempt to demonstrate that the powers which are now asked are not at all inconsistent with the unanimous report which was made by that committee last year. I have the report here and would like to quote a few propositions which were unanimously adopted by all members of the committee before being submitted to the house. In passing may I say that no committee worked more harmoniously and more earnestly at problems concerning Canadian life than that which

last year studied the radio problem in Canada. Here are some of the main principles which were unanimously adopted:

Your committee further recommends that the commission be vested with the necessary powers to carry on the business of broadcasting in the Dominion of Canada, such powers to extend to the following matters:—

I will pass over a few items which are unnecessary for the purpose of my argument.

(j) subject to the approval of the parliament of Canada, to take over all broadcasting in Canada.
(k) to be vested with all other powers necessary or incidental for the fulfilment of the objects of the commission.

Last year when we were studying these problems we considered whether we would recommend the appointment of all officers and employees or artists by the radio commission, and we were unanimous in deleting from our report anything relating to the Civil Service Commission. In no part of our report do you find any reference to that commission, nor anything which could be taken as recommending parliament to take steps to see that radio artists or employees of the commission be appointed by the Civil Service Commission. I may go further and say that the first draft of the bill submitted to the house did not make any mention of the Civil Service Commission. It was only on the morning on which the bill was presented to the house, during the last days of the session, that we found a new draft which obliged the radio commission to have recourse to the Civil Service Commission for the appointment of its employees. Therefore I say that those who contend that the bill now before the house is in conflict with the report of the radio broadcasting commission last year are certainly mistaken.

Before going further may I interject a few remarks with respect to the criticism directed against the commission by the distinguished member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) with respect to the erection of a radio station in Montreal. First I must say in all sincerity that this criticism is wholly unfounded, because it has not been proven yet that these small stations of 100 watt power will come in conflict with the national hookup. If hon. members of this house would read the report of the committee they will find that section (c) provides:

That all stations, 100 watt and under, not required for the national system, remain under private ownership, but be regulated as to programs and advertising by the rules of the commission.

[Mr. Gagnon.]

Therefore it was absolutely in order for the minister acting for the Minister of Marine during last fall to grant a 100 watt power radio station licence to La Patrie of Montreal. I think I can offer a very serious argument in support of that contention. Montreal is the biggest city in Canada. Its population exceeds one million people. While hon. members from the other party have found no fault with the fact that there are four or five high-power stations in Toronto, the population of which is certainly less than that of Montreal, in Montreal there was only one station providing French radio broadcasting, that is the station of La Presse. Why is there not room in Montreal for another radio station, especially when it is contemplated that probably the high-power station of La Presse may be acquired in the future by the national radio system? Now this criticism is absolutely unfounded and only made in an attempt to mislead the people of Canada. Some say that La Patrie is a Conservative organ. It is true that in recent months it has approved the policy of the federal government, but my hon. friend from Quebec East will recognize that some of the large shareholders and directors of that concern are Liberals who are supporting the Taschereau government in Quebec. Therefore if La Patrie supports this government in federal affairs and on the other hand the Taschereau government in Quebec, the least we can say is that La Patrie is rather an independent newspaper.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Strike one!

Mr. GAGNON: Of course, this is only a matter of detail on which we must not dwell at great length. Last year, Mr. Graham Spry, who is not a Conservative but I understand is one of the directors of the Farmers' Sun of Ontario, a newspaper which is far from approving all the policies of the present government, came before the committee on radio broadcasting, as chairman and president of the Canadian Radio League, and presented a very carefully prepared report to which the members of the committee gave great attention. Mr. Spry himself explained before the committee how the Canadian Radio League met with the approval of many associations in Canada. He said:

National associations, labour and farm organizations with a membership of 279,308 have passed resolutions and have supported the Canadian Radio League. Sixteen university presidents, eight provincial superintendents of education, and other educational leaders are members of our council and have supported us.

The heads and other leaders of Roman Catholic, Anglican, United, Baptist and Presbyterian churches. Some of those religious organizations as bodies, have contributed in a small measure to the financing of the league. Leaders of women's organizations and women's organizations with a total membership of 683,800 are supporting us, and we have the suport of 70 publications with a combined circulation of over 2,000,000.

I could analyse the support in any way you wish. Geographically take for example the west. The legislature of the province of Alberta passed unanimously a resolution endorsing the public ownership of broadcasting in Canada.

Now, sir, what did this distinguished gentleman propose to the commission? He proposed the organization of a national system of radio broadcasting which would be put in operation in the course of three or five years. If hon. gentlemen opposite are interested to read the memorandum which was submitted to the committee by Mr. Spry they will find that for the first year, for instance, he recommended that the sum of $1,400,000 be devoted to the establishment of a system of radio broadcasting. What has been done? Last year the government asked this house to vote $400,000, and this year the house is being asked to vote another $1,000,000, so these demands by the government have been wholly consistent with the recommendation made to the committee last year.

When we hear hon. gentlemen opposite criticize the present broadcasting commission we are amazed to think that they would expect the commission to establish a broadcasting network in two months, when the president of the Canadian Radio League told us last year that it would be better to proceed very slowly, that the best way to deal with the problem would be to take three to five years to carry out that project. In providing, under the present bill, that the commission shall be entrusted with all the money paid by radio set owners the government is entirely consistent with the unanimous report of the committee of last year, which recommended to this house that all revenues obtained from licence fees and the sale of advertising, and other revenues accessory to the business of broadcasting, should be used by the commission in the interests of radio.

Major Gladstone Murray, a man of great experience, who also appeared before the committee last year recommends that all moneys paid by the owners of radio sets should be left in the hands of the commission. Why should hon. members opposite now try to throw discredit on such a distinguished gentleman as Major Gladstone Murray? It has been incorrectly stated that he is a stranger. Major Murray is a distinguished Canadian; he was born in British Columbia, educated in Montreal at McGill university, and went to England at the age of twenty. When Major Murray was sufficiently competent to leave Canada at that age and become general chairman and director of publications of such a wonderful organization as the British Broadcasting Commission by the time he was thirty years of age it does seem to me that hon. members of this house ought to applaud his success and congratulate him instead of trying to discredit his ability. When he appeared before the committee last year he was not acting on his own impulse; he came because his presence was desired by all political parties. I remember that the nicest compliment paid to Major Gladstone Murray last year came from the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), who sits in the extreme left corner of this chamber. That committee was not composed only of Conservatives; I am happy to say that among its members were two very distinguished Liberals, namely the hon. members for Richelieu, the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin) and the hon. member for North Waterloo, the former Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler). I am sure these two hon. gentlemen will agree that Major Murray is a very efficient and experienced gentleman with regard to radio broadcasting. When he came again this year to help the commission it was not at his own suggestion, or in order to impose his views on the Canadian government; he came here because the government and the radio commission asked for the benefit of his experience and wisdom. I think we should be glad to have had his valuable suggestions and the benefit of his ability in this matter.

I should like to conclude my humble remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that it is absolutely incorrect and unjust to attempt to mislead the people by stating both in and out of this house that the Canadian government is imposing an additional burden on the taxpayers of Canada by voting $1,000,000 for radio broadcasting. This money is paid by the owners of radio sets. I think when the government raised the licence fee from $1 to $2 it entered into a contract with the owners of radio sets by which it bound itself to make available the best possible programs and to improve the whole system of radio broadcasting.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Richelieu): Mr. Speaker, I rise in order to express my dissatisfaction with the suggestion made this

morning by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) in his reference to the new station operated by La Patrie in Montreal. In answer to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) the Minister of Marine said, "Well, you were satisfied when you controlled everything in Montreal, newspapers, radio stations and so on," leaving the impression that the Conservative party was not properly treated when radio broadcasting came under the Department of Marine, which I had the honour to administer for some years. Let me declare here—and I do not fear any successful contradiction—that when I administered that department radio broadcasting was administered fairly, and all parties received their fair share of the time allotted to all stations. There was no discrimination with regard to the Conservative party in Montreal; if any complaints are to be made I think we are entitled to make them. During the election of 1926 in particular we were not given the same advantages that were afforded the other party, in our judgment. We may have been wrong, but some of our people were under the impression that we were not properly treated by the stations then existing. When I was Minister of Marine and had charge of radio broadcasting I did all I could to satisfy the requests which came to the department, and I do not think the Conservative party can complain with regard to the broadcasting of speeches in the city of Montreal.

My good friend from Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) justifies the issuance of the licence to La Patrie by saying that small stations of one hundred watts and less do not come under the control of the radio commission. That may be true, but in making his argument I thought he sought to justify a stronger station in Montreal because in Ontario there are several powerful broadcasting stations. I do not object so much to the issuing of a licence to the newspaper La Patrie, but I do object to the procedure that was followed. I am not sure whether in the report of the radio committee of last year it was recommended that new licences should not be issued pending the formation of the commission, or for a certain period after it was formed, in order not to complicate the work of the commission; at all events it was the understanding between all members of the committee that nothing should be done by the department, in the way of issuing new licences, which would have that effect. Certainly the issuing of further licences is an obstacle to the work of the commission, and later on it will encounter difficulties when it comes to acquire stations already established. I think it is only from that point of view that it is more or less undesirable that new stations should be established now, since we have the commission in charge of radio broadcasting in Canada. It is only from the point of view of the embarrassment which these stations will cause the commission that I advance my objection. By the terms of this bill, I fear that the radio commission will be permitted to organize a new technical and clerical body, and I do not see any need for the setting up of an expensive technical staff to surround the commission or to be engaged in its service. We have at the present time in the Department of Marine experts whose reputation cannot be disputed by anyone. In the radio branch of that department there are experts who are regarded everywhere as men of the greatest ability and the widest knowledge. Indeed, if you go outside Canada and talk to people who are interested in radio broadcasting, and who know something about the administration of that important appliance of science, you will hear that there is no man better qualified in Canada, indeed in the world, than Commander Edwards of the Marine department. We have Commander Edwards and other employees of the department and I say that they are competent and quite capable of giving to the radio commission whatever technical advice may be required. I repeat, we do not need to create a new body of technical men because it will mean purely and simply a duplication of systems, and we know that at the present time we have too much duplication of services in the administration of public affairs. Let us use the services of those competent men whom we already have in the radio branch of the Department of Marine. If we do so we shall need very few extra men to take care of the operations of the radio commission in Canada.

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General): I did not intend to take part in this debate but this morning I heard again some criticism from the other side especially on two points—first, the issuing of a licence for a one hundred watt station to La Patrie in Montreal, and secondly criticism with respect to the appointees on the radio commission, one such criticism coming especially from the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe).

So far as the licence to La Patrie is concerned, I am the one responsible for it and I have no apologies to offer the house. I did it when I was Acting Minister of Marine because I thought it was the proper thing to do. At that time there were five stations

in Toronto and only two in Montreal. There were in Toronto three stations of five hundred watts each, plus one station of nine thousand watts, and another of five thousand watts, as against one station of five thousand watts in Montreal, La Presse, and another station of four hundred watts, Marconi. All I did was to add one station in Montreal, a station of one hundred watts, and this resulted in these comparative figures: fifteen thousand watts in Toronto and five thousand five hundred in Montreal. I took it upon myself to do that because it came in the ordinary routine of business and because I considered it in the public interest. The criticism that has been offered in this matter is not that it was a wrong thing to do, not that these people were not entitled to any station, not that they would manage it badly. The sole criticism is founded on the fact that La Patrie is a Conservative paper. I do not think that criticism can be defended, but rightly or wrongly I did as I have indicated, and if I had to do it again I would do the same thing.

The second point is this. My hon. friend from Quebec East again attacked the personnel of the commission. The three principals of the commission are the president, Mr. Charlesworth, the vice-president, Mr. Thomas Maher and Colonel Steel, and respecting these gentlemen all I can say is that we entirely disagree with my hon. friend from Quebec East. We are proud of these appointees, who have done very good work up to now. They are only beginning and it will take a certain time before they can finish their work. They have to please everybody all over Canada and everyone knows it is extremely difficult to please everybody, especially when you are dealing with a population of ten millions scattered over nine provinces with different tastes, different ideals, different traditions and so on. But there is one point particularly I wish to bring forward and it is this. I resent very much the criticism made by my hon. friend from Quebec East against the appointment of the vice-president of the radio commission.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I did not say a word about him to-day.

Mr. DUPRE: For the last three or four months my hon. friend has delighted—

Mr. LAPOINTE: All right.

Mr. DUPRE: —in criticizing Mr. Maher, trying to minimize his work and his efforts. I am to a certain extent responsible for that appointment and all I can say is that up to now that gentleman has proved highly efficient, broadminded and very active. We placed great hopes in him and I may say that they have been more than fulfilled. The only people Mr. Maher has not been able to please are in Liberal quarters.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARCIL: That is, half the population of Canada.

Mr. MANION: Not after the last election.

Mr. DUFF: Wait until the next election.

Mr. DUPRE: From every part of Canada, with the exception perhaps of Quebec East or Liberal constituencies around Quebec, we have received nothing but praise for the work done by Mr. Maher and we are very proud of his appointment as vice-president of the commission. He has done well up to now and will in the future justify what I have just said regarding him.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): When the appointment of a radio commission first came before parliament for discussion, the consensus of opinion was that the commission would be kept out of politics, and my hon. friends opposite were unanimous in their expression of that view. I remember hearing the Prime Minister say that these commissioners would not be politicians and that the commission would be a non-political body. Now it has been made a political body, for if you can find a more thorough politician than the organizer for the province of Quebec, Mr. Maher, then I am at a loss to know where he is. The commission has been made a political commission, and now an effort is being made to turn its staff into a political staff. We have a bill here to create a new Civil Service Commission; it will be a brand new commission appointed by this government. Should we entrust the commission with the appointment of friends of the government, leaving that power wholly in their hands?

I wish my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) and the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) had been in this house in 1917 and had heard Sir Robert Borden and the stalwarts of the Conservative party at that time defending the soundness of appointments by merit and the creation of a Civil Service Commission. The Conservative party of to-day is simply trying to undo what was done by the Conservative party of the past. First it was penitentiaries, now it is radio and the year before it was post office. The government is simply making a political organization of this service and I am sure the people of Canada will look upon it in that light. It is

all right for the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) to say that he has no apologies to make, that he is proud of his appointees, but why did he grant a licence to La Patrie twenty-four hours before the appointment of the commission? Why such precipitation? Did he not trust the new commission to give La Patrie what it was entitled to?

Mr. DUPRE: That application was before the department for many weeks and it came up in the course of the daily routine. There is no doubt it could have been signed before and I do not know why it was not. I have nothing to say except that it came before me and I signed it in the ordinary routine. My hon. friend can be assured that this matter had been in the department at least two or three weeks.

Mr. POULIOT: Why did not the minister give it the six months' hoist?

Mr. MARCIL: I think the Solicitor General has made the case still worse. The minister went to Spain and enjoyed a very nice vacation in that country. We cannot afford these things with the budget of Canada in its present position. We cannot afford to create a new commission when we already have a competent body in the Department of Marine. This department is made up of Canadians and it seems to me to be a mistake to employ a stranger to come to tell us what to do. The government is trying to get away from governmental and parliamentary responsibility. This commission is to receive the money of Canadians and is to spend it as it likes subject to the approval of the governor in council. Parliament will have nothing to say. We are running away from our responsibility. When we go back to our constituencies and hear complaints of the radio commission we must tell our people that even though we have their mandate to represent them in this house, we have nothing to do with the matter, it rests in the hands of three appointees. That will not work at all. Canadians are accustomed to responsible government but I am sorry to say that we are drifting away from it. There will finally be a revulsion in public opinion throughout the whole of Canada and a desire to go back to parliamentary representation and parliamentary government. We have received the mandate of the people to act for them and we will have to account for all these commissions. Thirty-three years ago when I was a young member of parliament the people could say to me: you are young and active and you can do things; we trust you. But to-day they say: you are powerless, everything is in the hands of a radio commission, a soldiers' commission, a pension commission and a civil service commission. We are departing from that most sacred of principles, parliamentary control and parliamentary responsibility.

The Solicitor General is a man of learning and a man of letters and he remembers the fight which took place in Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces to obtain parliamentary government and parliamentary responsibility. We are drifting back to the old days when the government with a self-appointed council could dispose of the moneys of the people and the representatives of the people had nothing to say. We can remember when the representatives in the legislature at Quebec were debarred from voting a dollar of public money. Is it the ambition of hon. friends opposite to return to such a form of government? I hope not. They are Canadians like ourselves, they are proud of the position which Canada occupies as the foremost sister nation of the empire and we should not override, overrule and overthrow the sacred principles of responsible government in order to make a few political appointments which will mostly be wiped out by the incoming administration. Hon. friends opposite are reasonable men. Do they think that Canada will stand for long for the position in which this government is at the present time? The salaries of the members of the tariff board are being increased while the members of the old tariff board were dismissed twenty-four hours after this party came into power. This new board is to be merely a fact finding body, it will have no responsibility or power except to report to the government. The government can do what it likes with its recommendations. The salaries of these men are being increased when the men and women of Canada, the charwomen, the members of parliament and the civil servants have had their salaries decreased. All statutory increases have been withheld for the last two years.

I am sorry that the Prime Minister of Canada, talented as he is, patriotic as I think he is, has come forward and set such an example to the people of Canada. He has stated that there are two measures which shall apply; if a man occupies an exalted position, he is entitled to an increase in salary but if he does not occupy such a position, he will have to take a cut. This session we are voting $70,000,000 in new taxes. I wish hon. members would come down to the part of the country I represent to see the conditions which prevail. There has not been a sawmill in operation for the last two years; taxes have not

been paid and the people are forced to live from hand to mouth on herrings, potatoes and whatever else they can get. Yet we come here and increase the salary of this, that and the other gentleman. We create new commissions and we abdicate our powers.

We have even reached the bench, the most sacred institution we have in this country. Outstanding men are to be forced to retire from their judicial offices in order that new judges may be appointed by this government. The Prime Minister is a distinguished lawyer and I can remember his saying when in opposition that no appointee of his would be raised to the bench except for his judicial qualifications. Let him look over the list of appointments which have been made since he became Prime Minister and then repeat that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: I shall be glad to.

Mr. MARCIL: That is not the impression of the country. Some of these appointments have been considered as purely political. There is a wrangle now going on in the province of Quebec over the new appointments to be made to the superior court. I admit that the plums of office belong to the friends of the party in power, but there should be a limit.

We should consider the financial position of the country at the present time. If we go on abdicating all our powers, we might as well close up this house and the Senate. There will be no need of placing this additional burden upon the overburdened taxpayers. It is unfortunate for the Prime Minister that he should be presiding over the destinies of Canada at the most unfavourable time in its whole history, and apparently he is trying to undo much of what he did in 1930. During the short session of 1930 he came here and raised the tariff probably thinking it would bring about what he had in view. But what has been the result? Since that time he has been trying to undo what was done in 1930, first with the mother country, to-morrow probably with the United States and the day after perhaps with France. He is trying to get back to the policy of the Liberal party which is the policy of all the men who have led Canada. Canada cannot be self-contained. Canada cannot live by itself. What do we need at the present time? Markets, and nothing but markets.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought it was radio.

Mr. MARCIL: That is an illustration. There are thousands and thousands of people in this country who have no radio and have no means of getting one. What we are trying to get now is markets for our products. Yesterday we passed legislation for the creation of a new board in connection with the joint operation of the railways in Canada. If Canada had continued as it was in 1911, when that great Canadian presided over the destinies of this country, or if we had continued the policy we followed in this country when I occupied your chair, Mr. Speaker, and when I heard every man from western Canada ask, not for one but for half a dozen transcontinental railways the country would not now be in the difficult position in which it finds itself. I was old enough to hear from the lips of Sir Charles Tupper when he came to Queen's Hall in Montreal to explain the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, and when the country was afraid that it had sold out a second time to the Canadian Pacific, that western Canada would become the granary of the world and that Halifax, from where he came, would be the new Liverpool of America. But in those days we had a moderate tariff compared with our tariff to-day. Sir John A. Macdonald had a moderate tariff. The Conservative party had always had a moderate tariff. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had a moderate tariff, and it is suicide for Canada to-day to raise its tariffs against the other nations of the world.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but I would remind him that the discussion is not on the tariff but on the second reading of the radio bill.

Mr. MARCIL: I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for being carried away by my faith in these old-time notions of parliamentary government. The only thing I have to say about radio is this. It is unfortunate that the radio commission has been made a purely political combination, that its personnel should be political appointees, and that now the radio commission should be trying to evade the Civil Service Act by making all its appointments independent of the Civil Service Commission. It is unfortunate because such a policy will be condemned by at least half the population of Canada, and by its present policy this government is condemning the traditional policy of the Conservative party as it was laid down in 1918 by Sir Robert Borden, then leader of that party, when he brought the outside service under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Cimmission.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my criticism of this bill is in the main confined to the first section. Had it not been for that I think I could have seen my way clear to have supported the other two clauses. Like the majority of the members of this

house I gave hearty support to the principle of national control of our broadcasting system. There is no occasion at this time to go into the reasons why we thought that that was the best system for the Canadian people. I still believe, in spite of some of the difficulties that have arisen, that our hopes lie in that direction. It is true that difficulties have arisen. Perhaps that is inevitable in view of the fact that we have to trust the carrying out of our ideals to weak and imperfect human instruments, and it may always be that way.

Criticism has been made of conditions prevailing in broadcasting in the west, and particularly in Saskatchewan. I do not know what the conditions may be in Manitoba since I have not had any representations from any of the people there. For my part I am prepared to concede this, that it is only natural that in a transition period there should be some inconvenience and some disarrangement of the former conditions. We cannot overhaul and rebuild a house and live in it at the same time without being subjected to some inconvenience.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN: For my part I am prepared to recognize that fact so far as the technical end of the work is concerned. My thought is that if we fail to give the commission the finances for which they are asking at the present time, possibly we may only prolong this period of inconvenience and dissatisfaction. So on that point I am not going to offer any criticism.

I think we have some reason, however, to suppose that from another standpoint the commission is deserving of criticism. Certain public statements which the chairman of the commission has made would indicate that in some respects he is not temperamentally fitted to be at the head of the commission, for he seems inclined to resent, and to rush into print to repudiate, any statements that are made in criticism of his actions. Being a public servant he will have to learn to take criticism without being too ready to rush into print. The very fact that he was reported the other day to have said that anybody who criticized the radio commission on the ground that it was not functioning properly was either a liar or a fool indicates that the chairman needs a little advice as to that courtesy which is due to the public from a man occupying the position he does. However, as I said, I have an objection to raise to the first section of the bill, and it is to the proposal that the employees of the commission shall be chosen purely at the will of the radio commission, that appointments shall be taken out entirely from under the control of the Civil Service Commission. This radio commission is to be given the power to set up an entirely new organization of its own in spite of the fact that we already have in the employ of the government men who are well qualified from their experience to deal with these matters. What does that mean? It means the possibility of the setting up of a very expensive organization, and if that organization is set up without any control by parliament we have reason to suppose that at least it might become so expensive that the people of Canada would not be able to bear the expenditure, and we might be faced later on with the proposal to raise the licence fee, which has already been raised from one to two dollars. Who knows, if we put into the hands of the radio commission the power to create such an organization as I have suggested, that it might not become so expensive that the people of Canada would rise in revolt against the whole system and would recede from the position we have taken, which I think is endorsed by the great majority of the people of this country, that radio should be under the control of a national system. So there lies in this the danger of completely destroying our national system of broadcasting. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, and for that only, I feel I cannot give my support to this bill. For the reasons I have indicated other sections of the bill may commend themselves to me, especially in view of the fact that as soon as possible the disabilities arising from unsatisfactory methods of broadcasting must be removed.

Sir EUGENE FISET (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he has taken cognizance of section 3 subparagraph 14 of the bill. I believe in this paragraph he is creating a precedent that is bound to have an ill effect on every department of government. He will recall that during the present session of parliament the Minister of Justice introduced a bill to modify the mounted police legislation and to authorize the department to spend, over and above the estimates voted by parliament, whatever revenues would accrue. I objected to that part of the bill, and it was withdrawn.

To-day we are doing exactly the same thing. We are authorizing the radio commission to expend money voted by parliament, and they are being given the right by statute to expend sums of money over and above estimates voted by parliament, and without the control of parliament. I believe the Prime Minister will readily realize that such a precedent

would be detrimental to other departments. No other department has been granted the right to expend moneys which have accrued through revenues. As a rule all these receipts are credited to the receiver general.

Such a provision obtained last year with regard to the radio commission. The Prime Minister himself told us that the appropriations voted for the radio commission represented the income received from the sale of licences, and that in no way shape or form would the moneys received from radio licences be exceeded. Here however we are authorizing the commission to spend money voted by parliament, and beyond that we are creating two sets of estimates for the department, one voted by parliament yearly, and the other consisting of money which will accrue from rendering services mentioned in the bill. It is quite true that in the next section further provisions are made concerning appropriations. We must remember however that these moneys divide themselves into two classes, one being the estimates voted yearly by parliament representing the income received from the sale of radio licences, and the remainder money the commission will have the right to spend without the authority of parliament. I am calling the attention of the Prime Minister to this fact because in the house we have always fought shy of authorizing any department of the crown to spend money, from whatever source, except that voted by parliament.

Hon. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee on radio which sat last year I should like to offer one or two observations on the bill. Those of us who were members of the committee and did not belong to the party in power were, I believe, entirely fair in our attitude when we supported the idea of the nationalization of radio as a great public benefit and public utility. There was no difference of opinion, and we supported the report unanimously. Again in the house we supported the bill unanimously, when it was introduced by the Prime Minister. I am still one hundred per cent in favour of the nationalization of radio. I say without any intention of giving offence that I am not quite satisfied with matters as they have been conducted by the commission. I am willing to make due allowance, and to admit that possibly the commission has not had sufficient time to make good on the work which they have undertaken. As I say, I am quite willing to make some allowance in that regard. I should like to say, further, without intending to give offence to the Prime Minister that I believe he made an error in making appointments, and that the public, and perhaps parties opposed to him, lost just a bit of confidence in the genuineness of the statements made by the government to the effect that politics would not enter into the work of the radio broadcasting commission.

As I said before, we accepted in good faith all assurances, and embodied in the report a clause to the effect that there should be no political influence of any kind either in appointments to the board or in the conduct of the work of the commission, after it had been established. I criticized, as did some other members, the appointment of one of the members of the commission—not on any score of policy, but because it did not seem to me to be in accord with the report of the committee, or with the promises made by the Prime Minister, when the bill was in the house, to the effect that there would be no political influence in connection with appointments.

I cannot agree with the Prime Minister in his definition of what constitutes a political appointment. I will say that I have had a short meeting with one of the commissioners, to whom reference has often been made, the gentleman from the province of Quebec, and I had the pleasure of receiving his assurance in the presence of other hon. members in the committee to the effect that so far as he was concerned no political influence would be wielded in carrying on the work of the commission. In the meantime, at least, I am willing to take him at his word. I think at the outset one mistake was made.

Mr. JACOBS: What does the hon. member propose to do with politicians who are out of a job?

Mr. EULER: I would elect them to parliament. The chief point of contention in regard to this bill seems to be that there has been a political bias exercised in appointments and in the work of the commission. Very naturally, denials have been made by the government. I do not believe—and I do not blame the commission for this, but mention it at this time so that it may serve as a warning in the future—that the granting of the licence to or what took place subsequently in connection with the Windsor radio station was entirely free of party politics. I make that statement, trusting that in future, whatever the commission may do, it will see to it that there will be no further interference, so far as political influence is concerned. I am willing to say that as only three or four months have elapsed since the commission was appointed, it is not reasonable to expect that within such a short time they can properly

rearrange the whole system of radio distribution so that everybody will be satisfied, or so that we will have a perfect system of radio broadcasting. That is not to be expected and for my part I am inclined to be liberal and to make allowance for the difficulties of the work which has to be done.

I find that the bill deals with three things. First it proposes to take from the purview of the Civil Service Commission the appointment of all employees connected with the work of the radio commission. Secondly, it proposes to vest in the governor in council the approval of all capital expenditures in connection with broadcasting stations. And lastly, although I am not quite clear as to the meaning of the third clause, it proposes to give to the commission the right to expend all moneys they receive—I presume by way of licence fees, or revenues received from advertising, and so on. I have not a great deal of fault to find with the last clause, because when the committee drew up its report I favoured the principle that the commission should collect the licence fees. I feel that if it were a responsible commission, a good commission, a commission that wanted to do its duty, it should be entrusted with the work of collecting the licence fees and expending the money for the purpose for which the commission was created. I do not entirely agree with some of my hon. friends on this side that all those moneys must necessarily be voted by parliament. The commission would be limited absolutely to the amount of licence fees which it collects and can spend no more. I can see no very good reason why we should depart from the principle that is observed in the conduct of the Canadian National Railways. Ever since we took over the national railways the revenues collected by those railways in the ordinary conduct of business, charges for freight, passengers and so on, were expended by the board of the railway without reference to the House of Commons. I have not a great deal of fault to find with that, because I believe that if you have a commission worth its salt, one that should have encouragement to go on and do a good job, you have to give it a certain freedom of action. If it is not deserving of such freedom then, of course, it should be replaced.

With regard to the sections of the bill—I am taking them in reverse order—I know they are the result of the recommendations of Major Gladstone Murray, an expert adviser who comes from the British Broadcasting Corporation and has made an investigation into the Canadian situation. I receive these recommendations with a great deal of respect, but I am constrained to say that merely because Major Murray made them it does not necessarily follow that we must approve of them in every particular. In conversation with him the other day and with some of my colleagues on that committee this matter came up; I cannot see why all the employees of the radio broadcasting commission should be removed from the control of the Civil Service Commission. I quite grant this, that as far as the technical advisers and technical officers and artists are concerned there is good reason why the commission itself should make those appointments. I should say the commission should make them. But when you come to the clerical staff, stenographers and so on—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Secretaries.

Mr. EULER: Secretaries if you like, and clerks engaged in the office of the commission, I see no reason why they should not be subject to appointment by the Civil Service Commission just the same as similar employees in any other department of the government. While it may not mean a very great deal at this time, while the number of employees is not very great, this matter of radio broadcasting is a very big thing and may expand in such a way that in time there will be a great many employees. I think there is real cause for criticism by those on this side who believe that, whether or not it will be exercised, there is at least room under this provision for the exercise of political patronage. For my part, as I have said from the beginning, I would like to see as many opportunities as possible for the exercise of such patronage removed. The radio broadcasting commission cannot be as successful as it ought to be if any government exercises political patronage in the conduct of such a national undertaking.

As far as the substitution of the governor in council for the parliament of Canada is concerned in the matter of expenditures on capital account, I have not a very great deal to say except again I do not see why we should depart from the principle that we observe in connection with the Canadian National Railways. When the Canadian National Railways require appropriations for capital expenditures they go not to the governor in council, but to the parliament of Canada, and properly so. I see no reason for varying that practice. The only apparent reason that was given I think was that since parliament meets only once a year and there is an interval of perhaps seven or eight months when parliament is not in session, and

the commission might find it necessary to acquire a station here or there or perhaps build a station, it would be prejudicial to the work of the commission if they had to wait until parliament met to get an appropriation for capital expenditure. There may be a little weight in that argument, but I do not think there is enough to justify us in violating the principle.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, while in some respects I am in favour of the provisions of the bill, I feel that the government might very well make a distinction as far as appointments are concerned, they could segregate the technical officers and have those appointed by the radio commission itself but as far as other clerical employees are concerned they could leave them for appointment by the Civil Service Commission. And they should make no change as far as capital expenditures are concerned but should have those authorized by parliament in the same manner as capital expenditures are authorized for the Canadian National Railways.

Hon. RAYMOND D. MORAND (East Essex): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a very few minutes to discuss one or two phases of this situation. The main criticisms that are offered at the present time to this bill are only two or three; one the appointment to the commission of a man with some political background. Now I have been in the house long enough and I know my own people long enough to realize that as it was necessary to appoint one French-Canadian upon that commission I doubt very much if you could find one who had not been in politics somewhere. I am quite sure that hon. members on the other side would not expect us to take one of their friends particularly, consequently, we have taken one from this side. However, that is not a new principle, that applies to the appointment of our judges, and I am sure we cannot and will not say that our judges are guided by political consideration in their judgments or the work that they do.

Another thing I find a little difficult to get quite straight in my mind is the objection that the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has to the station at Windsor. He complains that there was some political bias in respect to this station. There were two stations in that part of the country, that were thought to be somewhat political, but they were amalgamated and now there is only one. Is there no way to please hon. gentlemen opposite? Even for removing them they still find fault.

A fact that appears to be overlooked in respect to this question is that radio broadcasting is a business. It is not a department of government, it is purely a business. The hon. member for North Waterloo in connection with two of the clauses of this bill made reference to the Canadian National Railways. Why not carry the principle a little further? To my mind it is just as sensible to say that the Civil Service Commission should appoint the men working for the Canadian National as those employed by this commission. Can one conceive of the Civil Service Commission holding an examination for a prima donna for instance or someone who is going to appear before the microphone at a broadcasting station? The thing on the face of it is ridiculous. It might be that for a few appointments here in Ottawa such as stenographers, and so on, the Civil Service Commission might act, but from time to time this business of broadcasting will be taking over stations throughout Canada, will be employing technical men and artists, consequently it is surely ridiculous to think that the Civil Service Commission must pass upon whether these people can or cannot be hired and appear, or shall have their salaries set by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. EULER: I made an exception in the case of the technical officers.

Mr. MORAND: Well, others did not. To me that is so evident that I cannot imagine why such an argument is made. The Civil Service Commission are not losing anything they ever had, because they have never had anything to do with this new business. Again I say one might just as well expect them to appoint the engineers, firemen, switchmen and so on all over the Canadian National system.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Bring us something stronger.

Mr. MORAND: Maybe you would not understand it.

Mr. GOTT: Too deep for him.

Mr. MORAND: As far as the financial feature is concerned, it is simply a question of making definite the ideas which were both understood and written in the report which was unanimously brought into this house. The intention was, and I believe still is—and I think the feeling is quite unanimous—that money received from the broadcasting business should be used in order to give Canada proper programs and proper radio stations. That is all that is done here.

With regard to paragraph 2, I do not think it makes a great deal of difference in the practical working out of the matter whether parliament or the governor in council has this power; what goes to the governor in

council usually comes to parliament later, so practically there is not a great deal of difference.

We have been hearing a great deal with regard to changes in wave lengths and interference. Certainly there will be trouble. I do not think anything could better justify the action taken by the committee last year than this tremendous effort that is being made to halt the nationalization of broadcasting. It is my firm belief that if this action had not been taken last year it never would have been taken in Canada, because the opposition has been very great. It took a government with a great deal of courage to put through the nationalization scheme last year. Personally I am just as strong now in my belief that this is the proper way to handle the radio situation, and I think in all fairness we can ask the members of this house and the people of Canada to give the commission a chance to work out its own salvation and deal with a most difficult problem, even though there may be a good deal of trouble during the period of transition.

Mr. ECCLES J. GOTT (South Essex): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has been very critical of the operation of station CKOK in Windsor. I venture to assert that he has been prompted by the suggestions of United States citizens operating stations in the city of Detroit, and that the ammunition he has been using has been furnished by those operators. Let me quote from page 3696 of Hansard for April 14:

> Mr. Euler: My hon. friend will pardon me if I remind him that my statement was made in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy), I think it was, in which he attacked Ontario and Quebec with regard to tariffs. I had no intention of making a vicious attack; I do not think I ever made a vicious attack on anyone or anything in my life. Would the hon. gentleman say that this was a fair attack to be made by a western member?

I want to say that the hon. member for North Waterloo has made a decidedly vicious attack on the operation of station CKOK. The Border Cities Star of Saturday, April 22, quotes the hon. member as follows:

> I am not an expert in radio matters—

Mr. NEILL: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I should like to get home before the grass gets much greener. The hon. gentleman is entirely out of order. What has this to do with the bill before the house?

Mr. GOTT: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this is the first time I have addressed the house this session while the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) has been on his feet continually with regard to minor, petty questions.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand the hon. member to be quoting a report of what was said in this house.

Mr. NEILL: I understand that he is doing so, and surely that is not in order. My point of order, however, is that the discussion being carried on by the hon. member has nothing to do with the second reading of this bill, and I ask for your ruling on that point.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, since this house opened at three o'clock we have listened to amplifications of principles that had nothing to do with radio. Is it to be expected that men should sit here and listen to that sort of thing, with your permission, sir, without replying? The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) referred to the whole question of the operation of this station CKOK in Windsor, and the hon. gentleman who represents a nearby constituency is replying; that is all.

Mr. EULER: If I might make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, it would be to let the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Gott) go as far as he likes.

Mr. GOTT: The Border Cities Star of Saturday, April 22, contains this front page heading:

> United States Influence Seen in CKOK-CJGC Merger

There is also a picture of the hon. member for North Waterloo on the front page. The Border Cities Star quotes the hon. member as follows:

> I am not an expert in radio matters, but I am wondering why they should establish a station or continue a station at the extreme edge of the country rather than in central Ontario, thus reaching what is usually known as the western peninsula of the province. I wish the minister would say something in that regard.

In view of the fact that the minister did not say anything in that regard I will tell the hon. member that this is one of the most important sections of the whole Dominion of Canada, and I think it is entitled to a first class radio station. Station CKOK is one of the best equipped radio stations in Canada, and if the hon. member had his ear to the ground he would cease his criticism of it. The hon. gentleman seeks to imply that station CKOK has been really a United States station, while the fact is that thirty-five of the forty-two employees of that station

are Canadian citizens and residents of this country. I have here many newspaper clippings, but I am going to read only one to prove that the hon. member, to use a slang expression, is all wet with regard to station CKOK. I quote again:

Politics and "Influence"

CKOK, the border's broadcasting station, is under fire from the stronghold of local opponents. The management of the station has been panned and accused because it broadcasts the programs of the Columbia network, a United States organization.

Operators of the station have been accused of using "political influence" to get the licence to operate. Rather amused are some of the onlookers, who recall the election of 1930. The Conservatives were far from satisfied at the treatment of a local organization which it is believed was promised the radio licence by Mr. King, the leader of the defeated party.

In the face of this, however, the present owners of the station are still accused of operating only through "political" influence.

I rise merely to put this clipping on record and to ask the hon. member for North Waterloo if he will not give us a little cooperation and support, instead of continuing to criticize one of the best radio stations in Canada, so that CKOK may have a fair trial and the people of western Ontario may have a station by means of which they can hear Canadian programs instead of being compelled to listen to United States programs all the time. Station CKOK has reached out and obtained business in the city of Detroit, and I believe the jealousy which has arisen because of that fact has been responsible for much of the opposition to this station.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat has quoted something in which reference was made to myself as having promised to some one a radio licence or something of the kind. Seeing that I am in the house, and that it might in consequence be assumed that having listened to that quotation I agreed with it, I want to say now that never at any time, directly or indirectly, did I promise anyone anything of the sort or in that connection.

Mr. GOTT: I gladly accept the statement of the right hon. gentleman, but let me say that rumors to this effect were circulated throughout the county of Essex prior to the election of 1930.

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose Bill No. 99, an act to amend the Canadian Broadcasting Act, 1932. May I say that when the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific railway bill was before the house I opposed that measure. I opposed that legislation for more than one reason. In the first place I took exception to it because it came to the House of Commons in an indirect way. It came into this house through the Senate and my contention was that a bill of that nature ought to be brought before the Commons directly and not indirectly. I argued that it should first have come before the representatives of the people, men elected by the people, and not before the Senate, which is the result of indirect election. Because of the mistake by the government in that respect I opposed that irresponsible legislation. I opposed it for another reason, namely, that it was based on a report which had been prepared by a non-Canadian commission. The report was submitted by the Duff commission, which was not a full-fledged Canadian commission inasmuch as it included representatives from Great Britain and the United States. I pointed out that such representation was unnecessary, because in my opinion the time had come in the history of Canada when there was sufficient ability to be found right in this dominion to deal with matters affecting transportation and kindred subjects. I said that we should appoint our own board or commission, a purely Canadian body, to investigate the transportation problem and report accordingly.

I oppose the legislation now before us on somewhat the same grounds. I understand that there has been dragged into this discussion—and quite rightly—the report of Mr. Gladstone Murray, an expert of the British Broadcasting Corporation, a native Canadian but a man who thinks that there are some phases of the radio problem that ought not to be discussed in parliament. What an impossible thought! What will we hear next in this chamber. I differ entirely from that point of view; it is not the Canadian point of view. Every question touching the welfare of the Canadian people ought to be discussed in this house and settled by the representatives of the Canadian electorate, and we are in no need of experts, whether born within or outside of this country, to come to Canada and tell us what we should do—to tell us that the time has arrived when certain aspects of important parliamentary legislation ought not to be reviewed fully by the members in this chamber elected to represent the dominion as a whole.

I oppose this legislation for the further reason that there is an endeavour to take out of the hands of the Civil Service Commission appointments to the radio broadcasting commission. I do not believe that there is any support in the way of public opinion in Canada for action of that kind. I do not believe

there is support for it in the far west; certainly there is none in the middle west. Nor is there any support for it, in my opinion, in Ontario, Quebec or the maritime provinces. Consequently action of that kind is purely govermental, purely executive and partisan, and has no justification in public opinion.

Because these appointments are not to be left to the Civil Service Commission, because we are by this means doing our best to destroy the Civil Service Commission as a national organization that should function properly, because this bill proposes something that will militate against the successful operation of the Civil Service Commission, undermining its efficiency and permanency—because apparently my hon. friends are out to destroy it as far as possible by taking away from it the powers which it ought to exercise—I am opposed to the legislation which is now before the house. More than that, it seems to me that in the new section 14, subsection 1, wherein the expenditure of moneys is to be taken out of the hands of parliament, we are giving up one of the historic functions of parliamentary government. I cannot sanction anything that looks like a move in that direction. History tells us that parliament must have control of every dollar, every cent of revenue which is raised by taxes, and the moment we depart from that principle in the slightest degree we are in danger of destroying parliamentary government in this country, and I am opposed to any move along that line. Further than that, if we are to have parliamentary government in Canada, parliamentary government worthy of the name, we must see to it that parliament exercises proper control over such matters. There should be no control through commissions, executives and experts. The best expert opinion in Canada can be found in this house; we do not need to import experts.

Mr. ERNST: Speaking.

Mr. McINTOSH: Is the hon. gentleman referring to himself?

Mr. ERNST: No, I am referring to you.

Mr. McINTOSH: You are doing well if that is what you mean.

Mr. ERNST: I was judging by your own estimate of yourself.

Mr. McINTOSH: I suggest that the hon. gentleman should try to estimate himself properly. He will have quite a job on his hands. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we have not full control in this house over the revenues of the country then we have not complete parliamentary government in Canada, and any action on the part of any government that will tend to weaken parliament in this respect will meet with my opposition.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

With regard to this bill, from the point of view of its effect on the Civil Service Commission, I have some information which I wish to put on Hansard. It brings out the political relationship that exists at the present time between the Civil Service Commission, the Prime Minister of Canada, the government of this country and those who are seeking positions on the radio commission. The information I want to put on the record is this:

Sessional Paper No. 382
Canada
Department of the Secretary of State
Tuesday, April 25, 1933.

Return to an address of the House of Commons, dated 3rd April, 1933, showing:

A copy of all correspondence, documents. orders in council and certificates of the Civil Service Commission, respecting the appointment of Mr. E. C. Buchanan to the position of director of public relations to the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission.

C. H. Cahan,
Secretary of State.

Reference No. 268.
Mover: Mr. Gray.
Dated: April 25, 1933.

I will not read the whole return, but there are a few parts of it that bear on the main problem before the house, namely, the attempt to make this radio commission a purely political body. If that effort continues then we might as well as a parliament scrap the Civil Service Commission at once and be through with it. I have here a return dated Ottawa, November 24, 1932, in which reference is made by Hector Charlesworth, chairman of the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, to organization work—organizing the commission, or in other words, dealing with the filling of key positions. The Prime Minister's name is mentioned in this return, and I shall read the document as it has been submitted to the house:

Ottawa, November 24, 1932.

Dear Sir,—

In connection with the organization of the work of the radio broadcasting commission, it is becoming urgently important that the services of a director of publicity be secured as well as a director of programs. I have discussed the matter with the prime Minister, who assures me that the question is being taken up of an amendment to the act, whereby these and other important key positions on the staff of the commission may be exempted from the provisions of the Civil Service Act. In the meantime I should be glad if your commissioners would give consideration to the temporary employment, for a period of three months, of Mr. E. C. Buchanan as director of publicity at $6,500 per annum, and Mr. E. A. Weir, at present employed with the radio

division of the Canadian National Railways, at $6,500 per annum, as director of programs and station relations.

As I indicated above, the question of the permanent appointment of the incumbents of these positions will, it is hoped, be dealt with under an amendment to the act, but in the meantime I should appreciate it if the commission could see its way clear to sanction the above temporary appointments. It is important, in view of certain commitments about to be entered into, that these appointees should enter our service by December 1st.

Yours faithfully,
Hector Charlesworth,
Chairman,
Canadian Broadcasting Commission.

The Secretary,
The Civil Service Commission,
Ottawa, Ontario.

That letter was dated November 24, 1932. The next letter on the return is dated November 25, 1932, the day after the letter I have just read was written, from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission to Mr. Charlesworth:

Dear Mr. Charlesworth,—

By direction of the commissioners, I am enclosing herewith a report to council asking for authority, under section 40 of the Civil Service Act, for the temporary employment of Messrs. E. C. Buchanan and E. A. Weir in accordance with the request contained in your letter of November 24. I might explain that, in order to bring reports before council, it is necessary to have the signature of the minister in charge and I presume that the Minister of Marine is the minister through whom the radio commission will be expected to report to council. That being the case, the report should be signed by the Minister of Marine in the space provided for that purpose before being forwarded to the clerk of the privy council for the consideration of that board.

Yours very truly,
W. Foran,
Secretary.

The next is the report to council referred to in the previous letter. This is addressed to His Excellency the Governor General in Council under date of November 25, 1932: It reads:

Under section 40 of the Civil Service Act, the Civil Service Commission, on the recommendation of the chairman of the Canadian Broadcasting Commission, submits the following report for approval:

It is recommended that authority be granted for the temporary employment of Mr. E. C. Buchanan as director of publicity and Mr. E. A. Weir as director of programs and station relations for the radio broadcasting commission for a period of three months at such salaries as His Excellency the Governor General in Council may approve.

The chairman of the Canadian broadcasting commission reports that appointments to these positions are urgently required.

That report is signed by W. J. Roche as chairman and J. E. Tremblay as commissioner, and a space is provided for the signature of the Minister of Marine. The next letter is from the chairman of the radio commission to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission. It is dated February 16, 1933, and reads:

Dear Sir,—

I would call your attention to my letter of November 24 in which I asked you to give consideration to the temporary employment for a period of three months of Mr. E. C. Buchanan in connection with the public relations activities of the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission.

In view of the urgent necessity of the commission obtaining more publicity for the programs which we are now putting out, we would ask you to give this matter your attention in order to obtain the necessary certificate for Mr. Buchanan under section 40 of the Civil Service Act, Mr. Buchanan to be employed by our commission as director of public relations at a salary of $6,500 per annum.

It is considered that Mr. Buchanan's services should begin as and from February 15, 1933.

Very sincerely yours,
Hector Charlesworth,
Chairman.

There you are! There we have the chairman of Canada's Radio Broadcasting Commission, himself a well known Conservative propagandist, urging with all his power the appointment of Buchanan, a government extremist, as director of public relations at twice the salary he is worth or could draw in the open market.

The next letter is from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission to the chairman of the radio commission. It is dated February 16, 1933, and reads:

Dear Sir,—

Replying to your letter of the 16th instant, I beg to call your attention to the fact that your letter of the 24th November last referred to the employment of Mr. E. A. Weir as director of programs and station relations as well as of Mr. E. C. Buchanan as director of publicity. On November 25, the Civil Service Commission forwarded to you the necessary report to council, as required under section 40 of the Civil Service Act, covering the employment of both these gentlemen and has not been advised as to what action was subsequently taken either by the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission or by the Governor General in Council in regard to this matter. Is it your intention now that the question of Mr. Weir's employment should be dropped and a separate report made out in the case of Mr. Buchanan? You will understand that, until the salary has been authorized by the Governor General in Council, the commission is unable to issue any certificate of temporary employment under section 40 of the Civil Service Act.

Yours very truly,
W. Foran,
Secretary.

The next is a letter from the chairman of the radio commission to the secretary of the

Civil Service Commission. It is dated February 17, 1933, and reads:

Dear Mr. Foran,—

In reply to yours of February 16 I may say that the present situation with regard to Mr. E. A. Weir and Mr. E. C. Buchanan is as follows: The appointments of these gentlemen were held up owing to the decision of the Department of Justice that until the return of Colonel Steel in January our commission was powerless to make any appointments. Since then a new situation has arisen with regard to our relations with the Canadian National Railways whereby the appointment of Mr. Weir may be dealt with in a different manner from that originally decided.

With regard to Mr. Buchanan, now that our board is fully constituted we desire to engage his services as soon as possible. There is a clamour throughout Canada as to lack of advance information about our broadcasts. The Commission has also decided to drop the title "director of publicity" and use that of "public relations." The matter of Mr. Weir may have to stand in abeyance for the present, but we should like a new order on the lines I have mentioned in the case of Mr. Buchanan. The former certificate in each case may have to be cancelled. I believe that these orders are in the hands of the Hon. Alfred Duranleau if they were not returned to your commission.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Hector Charlesworth.

Following that letter we have a letter from Mr. Foran to Mr. Charlesworth. It is dated February 22, 1933, and reads:

Dear Mr. Charlesworth,—

The commissioners have had under consideration your letter of the 17th instant with reference to the case of Mr. E. C. Buchanan.

I am now directed to call your attention to the fact that when the temporary employment of Messrs. Weir and Buchanan was originally discussed with you the commissioners agreed to issue temporary certificates for three months in these cases on the understanding that new legislation was contemplated which would exempt these positions from the operations of the Civil Service Act.

The idea was to gradually destroy the act.

So far as the Civil Service Commission is aware, no steps have yet been taken towards the amendment to the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act but, if your commission is able to give the civil service commissioners an assurance that the act is to be amended without delay, the commissioners are prepared to issue a certificate as requested for the employment of Mr. Buchanan for three months from February 15.

The letter closes with the following very important sentence:

If it is intended, however, that the position of director of public relations should later be advertised for competition under the Civil Service Act, the commissioners decline to certify Mr. Buchanan's employment at the present time and are of the opinion that the position should be advertised immediately.

Yours very truly,

W. Foran.

That is the viewpoint of the Civil Service Commission, that is the viewpoint of its secretary and it is the viewpoint of anyone who wants to build up an efficient Civil Service Commission in Canada. As I say, that letter was signed by the secretary of the Civil Service Commission. The next letter is from Mr. Hector Charlesworth to Mr. W. Foran, the secretary of the Civil Service Commission. It is dated February 23, 1933, and reads:

Dear Mr. Foran,—

I have yours of February 22nd relative to our request for the appointment of Mr. E. C. Buchanan as director of public relations.

I beg to advise you that last evening we received personal assurance from the Prime Minister that an amendment to the Radio Broadcasting Act would be submitted before the close of the session covering this as well as other matters. In accordance with the terms of your letter I therefore ask that the certificate be issued for Mr. Buchanan as from February 15th.

Hector Charlesworth.

I shall not read further from this return. The point I wish to emphasize is that the Civil Service Commission tried to stand its ground, took the stand that it ought to take in order that it might function properly and successfully in the interests of the people of Canada, but it was prevented from carrying out its functions. It was prevented by political interference from doing what it thought it ought to have done, and that political interference came from the present government, came from the cabinet of Canada, came from the Prime Minister of this country, and because of that political interference the Civil Service Commission had to sidetrack its real functions and make appointments which should only have been made after advertisement and after competition. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, that is a very important and serious departure. If we are going to have the Prime Minister and the cabinet of this country go out and take the stand which I have shown the house was taken, I see no future for the Civil Service Commission in this country. It will be impossible for it to function as it should function, and it will become nothing more or less than a political commission. It is no wonder that we have heard argument after argument from member after member here this afternoon that the Civil Service Commission was gradually being undermined and destroyed, and it is being gradually destroyed by the government taking unto itself the making of appointments which are purely political, perhaps appointments which should not be made because of a lack of efficiency and a lack of those qualities that are necessary to give that

efficient service for which the people of Canada are paying.

I think I have made clear, Mr. Speaker, my stand and that of the party to which I belong in regard to the bill before the house, and its effect upon the efficiency of the Civil Service Commission. I hope that the government will take new ground and act differently towards the Civil Service Commission, instead of continuing to do what it has been doing for the last year or two, deliberately making it a commission that is becoming weaker and weaker every day.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): If no one else is going to speak I may say that since early this morning this house has been engaged in discussing the measure, the second reading of which I moved, and I venture to say that if anyone will take the trouble to look at Hansard he will find that all that is referable to this measure can be contained in a very few pages. The discussion has wandered on in that way.

First of all I would like to say that the observations made by the right hon. leader of the opposition as to the undesirability of this measure being brought in at this date give expression to a sound objection. It is an objection to which I attach a great deal of importance. It arises by reason of circumstances over which the government had no control. The last member who spoke (Mr. McIntosh) referred to the fact that there was an earnest endeavour on the part of the commission to get a particular individual to act with them, and that they spoke to me, and I suggested that that could not be done unless there were amendments to the act, which is true; but I did not desire to commit myself to amendments to this act with respect to matters of that kind unless I knew something more about it than I then did. As a result of the very kind thought of the government of Great Britain we were able to ask Major Gladstone Murray to come here. After he had agreed to come, he was detained and he did not arrive here until much later than was expected. He completed a trip over Canada, not accompanied by the commission, and made an interim report on the fifth of May, which was read to the house this morning. It became apparent that in his opinion it was desirable to make certain amendments to the act, and I intimated the other day that I would introduce those amendments, but I do so reluctantly at this stage of the session. But inasmuch as it has been represented to me that it is absolutely imperative, if we are to save this commission, that action of this kind should be taken, I brought the measure to the attention of the house yesterday and moved its second reading to-day.

Does this house desire to preserve the radio broadcasting business of Canada for the Canadian people? That is the first question. If that question is answered in the affirmative, then we must select the instrumentality of government by which we shall effect that purpose. It is not a department of government; it is a business, an industry. And in the same way that provinces select liquor commissions to transact their business, so in this instance the Dominion government believes, as shown by the statute that has been passed, that the instrumentality by which we can accomplish our purpose is a commission of three persons.

It will be observed that there is a great distinction between a department of government and a commission. A department of government, as the very words indicate, is responsible to this parliament in a narrow sense. A commission is an instrumentality set up by parliament itself to accomplish certain purposes and achieve certain ends. The liquor commission of Quebec makes no report to anyone except a report as to its operations. It buys, it sells, it receives money, it pays out money. The liquor commission of Alberta buys and sells without reference to the government and turns its profits over to the province. The liquor commission of Ontario, I understand, although I am not so familiar with its operations, conducts its business in exactly the same way. Why is that so? Because being instrumentalities of government, government has clothed them with powers and holds them responsible for the discharge of the powers conferred upon them, and the government must accept the responsibility as between the people and the legislature. That is this case. Whether we like it or not, that is what we have tried to do. It is folly not to recognize the fact that a very persistent and determined effort is being made to destroy this commission. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite are desirous of assisting in its destruction. We know how this commission is looked upon by private interests outside of this country. We know exactly the powers in this country that were so disappointed because the radio committee did not report in favour of private interests controlling broadcasting in this dominion. The report that was read this afternoon by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) indicates clearly what was in the mind of that committee when it dealt with this matter.

We have determined that we will not part with our broadcasting rights in Canada. We

have determined that at this stage of scientific development we are going to cling to those rights, but we are going to endeavour to give to the Canadian people some reasonable service in the way of broadcasting facilities. We have charged a license fee of two dollars. The taxpayer of this country is not responsible for the moneys expended by the radio commission.

The only persons who have an interest in that matter are those who take out their licences, and every user of a radio is supposed to have taken out a licence. That money we said last year, and we repeat this year, is money for the expenditure of which this commission should be responsible. It is money which partners in the enterprise have entrusted the commission to expend for them, and parliament has taken the necessary action to preserve this business for the Canadian people. If, Mr. Speaker, it is thought for a moment that this commission can successfully function if it has to come and report to this house in answer to a question as to whether Jane Smith was a contralto or a soprano, or whether she sang on a certain night, and what she was paid—it must be a failure inevitably and positively. There can be no doubt about it. Every thoughtful man knows it, every observer knows it; but that is the criticism made by the opposition and private interests. We may be asked, "What is the name of the announcer at station so and so; where was he born; what size boots does he wear?" We may be asked, "Did Jane Smith, or somebody else, come from New York to sing?" If that sort of thing is to continue I say to this House of Commons this afternoon: Gentlemen, you have destroyed the thing you desired to protect. That is as certain as anything in the world, and there is no thoughtful member of the house who does not realize it.

In the face of that fact we have one great illustration, the British Broadcasting Corporation. Sir John Reith became responsible as chairman of it, and the gentleman chosen largely to direct its activities was an Ontario born Canadian, and in him I think most of us feel a great sense of pride. May I say incidentally that if hon. members are disposed to discuss the question of salaries I advise them to consider the salary paid by the British Broadcasting Corporation to that gentleman, as compared with the salaries we pay in this country. I mention that in passing only. The British Broadcasting Corporation have had a wide experience; they have had a successful experience. They have dealt with technical problems of the first magnitude. They have dealt with the tastes, the desires and the wishes of their clientele, those people who own licences and radios throughout the kingdom, and they have established a great reputation.

But think of our position in this country. I am bound to say the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) put it fairly, as did the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). Look at our position. We live in the northern half of the American continent. Anyone who knows anything about the theory of radio broadcasting knows that the strength and the power of a station to transmit and send through the air the human voice so that it may be collected again and be made to sound like the human voice, is a matter purely technical in its nature. So greatly has science advanced that it has become simply a question of being able to determine with great exactness the strength and power necessary to project the human voice along certain channels to a given point where it is picked up and repeated, just as we hear it over the receiving instruments in our homes.

Let us put the position fairly. There are in the United States a large number of very powerful stations. If there is no arrangement made internationally between this country and the United States it follows, inevitably, that any stations we put up of lesser power will be choked by the confusion which will result from projections by high powered stations of the vibrations of the voice through the ether, as they say,—and now they say there is no ether—we will say through space, for the purpose of having the voice collected at another point. This confusion is inevitable, unless arrangements are made between countries. We have an international agreement.

I was rather hurt when I heard one hon. member state that the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) had had a good holiday at Madrid. Shall Canada be represented in international radio conferences? The Minister of Marine did not desire to make that long trip to Madrid at that time of year, strange as it may sound to the gentleman who made that observation in the house to-day. When he reached there, due to his mastery of both English and French, he, with his technical advisers, was able to take a very leading part in the transactions of the conference, a matter of gratification to most Canadians. He had with him a highly trained technician. I have not had the pleasure of knowing Colonel Steel for many years. I met him a couple of years ago, or more. But I do know this, that in other countries he is spoken of as one of the foremost technicians known. I thought we were exceedingly fortunate in getting him

for the technical position. I would not say that his training fitted him to deal with public relations, but for technical purposes he is qualified. At Madrid he was able to render great service.

In the meantime we desired to set up this commission. I desired to secure his services. He could not get away from Madrid. I cabled the minister, and although the minister found it difficult to get away, finally he came. Colonel Steel stopped in England, saw the English authorities who gave him full facilities with respect to the stations they had, and the great station they were building. The officials gave him every possible facility. I saw him myself, in December, in England. He was anxious to get back here and to obtain information as to the working of our own system. He came back to Canada.

The commission was organized under the chairmanship of Mr. Charlesworth. I have heard much criticism of Mr. Charlesworth to-day. I am not in a position to speak with any degree of authority with respect to Mr. Charlesworth, due to the fact that I did not know him intimately. I never have known him intimately. I was advised by friends who had wide knowledge of the matter—not of one political party—but to whom I had made application for information, that Mr. Charlesworth was, first, a man of letters and of wide culture, a sound critic and would understand something of the tastes of the Canadian people, that he had travelled throughout Canada and would be able admirably to direct the operations of such a commission.

An objection has been made so often in this chamber that it does not need repeating, concerning the appointment of Mr. Maher from Quebec. But those who know anything about what he has done since he has been appointed all agree he has acquitted himself admirably, and is a first rate official in every respect. I will say this, frankly,—I said it before, and I say it now—it is one of those unfortunate circumstances that he had been actively interested in political matters before he was appointed. That may make some of my friends opposite, as the hon. member for North Waterloo said, look upon him with suspicion. But I will challenge any hon. member of this house to say or to show that in the conduct of the duties and obligations of his position he has in any sense been political in any way, shape or form. I say that very frankly, because I think if ever a man desired earnestly to make for himself a reputation, and a reputation of which he might be proud, it is Mr. Maher.

There is your commission,—your technician, your chairman and your vice-chairman. There you have the problem, with this great country to the south with 120,000,000 people, and with all its powerful stations. You know the network of them,—the one outside of New York city, the very powerful one at Schenectady, the one at Cincinnati, then down the western coast, and as far as Texas. We have the one across the Texas boundary with strength sufficient to produce interference even in this country. There is your situation.

I say, sir, to my friends in this house that before this commission was organized, and there was no control of the national business of broadcasting, we were rapidly heading for chaos. Why? Because with the confusion of wave lengths, channels, and conditions incident to the very powerful stations just across an imaginary line, you have a situation which, unless it is taken up and dealt with firmly will mean what the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) described,—not only chaos, but a condition in which you are trying to repair your house and live in it at the same time. No one knows better than I, because I have endeavoured to follow this matter with care, being most anxious to preserve this broadcasting business for the Canadian people, the unpopularity for the moment of this commission. But I do ask the members of this house to be fair. I ask men who have had experience in business to be fair. We have been told this afternoon that there is no need of this house having experts about anything, therefore I know I am speaking to men who are experts in business as well as other matters —knowing that as I do, I ask any hon. member of this house whether he thinks it is quite fair, remembering that Colonel Steel did not get back from Madrid until the first part of this year, to launch such a campaign of attack against this commission as we have had here to-day? Would you think it fair in regard to any business that you were asked to reorganize? Which one of us asked to reorganize a business would make attacks at the end of a few months on the position in which the business then stood? I have watched this thing with care, and I propose to do so because I am tremendously interested in its success; for if it fails the whole principle of the people owning this great facility will have been destroyed. Colonel Steel assured me that undoubtedly in connection with our international agreements, in connection with working them out, in connection with the fact that we are trying to follow an orderly course prescribed by international agreement to bring

a measure of order out of chaos—and I use that word in no way offensively or critically—the discharge of that duty would take time. In the report of the committee three to five years was mentioned, but in less than that number of months we have this attack launched in the terms in which it has been made to-day against this commission. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the members of this house will not be a little fairer in dealing with this problem—because it is a problem. We have selected an instrumentality, and having selected that instrumentality let us give it a chance.

Now I come to the first point, the question of staff and personnel. Is it the desire of this house that the broadcasting commission should be required in the first instance to go to the Civil Service Commission to ask whether or not they may employ this or that band, this or that orchestra, this or that artist? That is the very negation of the principles and purpose for which this commission came into being.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No one would suggest that.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what we are trying to remove by this section.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: You are going much further than that.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, it does go further, and I am coming to that. Then we come to the question of technical officials. I think it is abundantly demonstrated that when you ask the Civil Service Commission with respect to technical officials they will tell you that they have no further information than the commission has itself. We are endeavouring in the bill to provide for broadcasting throughout the nine provinces. We desire to have powerful stations—for while this country has only 10,000,000 people and our neighbours have 120,000,000 odd, we have just as much air as they have—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, I was referring not to vacuum but to space. Leaving that for the moment I desire only to make it clear that what we are earnestly endeavouring to do is to provide that if it is thought desirable to lease a station, this organization of ours should not be destroyed in the very beginning of its life by having to wait until parliament comes together to authorize it.

When this measure was introduced in the terms it was last year, as the right hon. leader of the opposition has properly observed, we believed that parliament should exercise control in respect of capital expenditure. But in practice it is found to be desirable that within the limits of their income the commission should be able to lease or purchase with the consent of the governor in council. What are the safeguards? First, lack of funds. All the money they have is that which they get from the sale of licences plus what they receive from advertising and the sale of programs. What is the difference between the radio commission conducting its business in this way, with revenue derived from licence fees and the sale of programs and advertising, and the liquor commission buying and selling liquor in any province of Canada? What is the difference, as the hon. member for North Waterloo says, between it and the Canadian National? That is an instrumentality of government at the present moment, because we own it; it is a corporation which we have created by statute of this parliament to discharge a great public service.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Will the Prime Minister permit a question? Why then the dual system of having part of the money voted by parliament and the other part not voted? I have no objection if you leave the entire revenue of the radio commission in the hands of the commission to be administered, but do it either one way or the other.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. gentleman will let me finish what I am saying now I will try to meet his difficulty at the end of my observations, because I made a note of it as he went on.

Under those circumstances we have the safeguard of the limitation of revenue. And you have the provision for the approval of the governor in council in order to be certain that the expenditures made for purchases or leases shall not exceed the revenue received.

The other point dealt with referred to the mere matter of the change of the word "and" to "or." But I want to make a further observation. It has been reiterated, and I cannot help but think that those who are reiterating it have not the interests of national broadcasting so much at heart, that parliament has been voting a million dollars of the taxpayers' money to the broadcasting commission. If this house earnestly desires to save this business for the Canadian people, I cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that the million dollars voted is a million dollars paid by those who take out licences. There is not a dollar of taxes in that amount; every dollar of it represents money received from a select class, namely the licensees under the statute.

There is a criticism which one hon. gentleman started to make and did not complete, namely, that prior to this commission coming into being certain work was done with respect to collecting the licences on commission, and matters of that kind. In course of time I am satisfied that these difficulties will be ironed out and the obstacles removed to which reference was to be made. It will be the earnest desire of the government that they be removed and that there be single control with respect to these matters. But it takes time; it cannot be done in a single day.

I have this point to make to the hon. member for Rimouski (Sir Eugène Fiset). I realize that last year a committee made a report to this house, which with the exception of a single member was accepted by all. It is my most earnest desire that the radio business should come back to that position where as one voice we speak our determination to maintain it as a national undertaking. I am certain we can do it only by bringing about a common understanding and an earnest desire to have success follow the efforts of those to whom we have entrusted this work. I therefore suggest that the house pass this bill; that it limit its operation to the first of July, 1934, that we then call into being at the next session a committee to which this whole matter may be referred, in order that the house once more may speak for the whole nation and not for any party with respect to a matter of this kind. I confess that I felt somewhat distressed this afternoon to find all the opposition coming from my hon. friends across the gangway. I cannot think that that is in the interests of this great national undertaking.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: No words that I can use would exaggerate what I conceive to be the importance of this matter in relation to the body politic. I look upon it as one of the foremost means of education that the world has ever known, and I believe we must not permit it to be destroyed either by political differences or by the insidious efforts of private interests to destroy public ownership of this utility.

I might have said this before had I made any remarks when the motion was made for the second reading of the bill; the delay is excused only by the reasons I have given. I believe it would have been preferable to send this bill to a committee so that it might have had an opportunity of again hearing Major Gladstone Murray's explanations as to why he came to the conclusions he did with respect to this matter. But this I say in no too critical sense: When any government, after much solicitation, inconveniences itself as well as its instrumentality, the British Broadcasting Corporation, to secure the loan of one of our own distinguished sons, I think it is a little lacking in the courtesy that should be extended to him to have the criticisms and statements made that we heard in this house with respect to that gentleman. I say that to my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), whose remarks were wholly unworthy of him, I think, on an occasion such as this.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the bill should be given second reading, and in reply to the suggestion of the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) that it should be dropped I suggest that a clause be added providing that it shall expire on the first day of July, 1934. A committee will be appointed in due course to consider the matters here dealt with, and I cannot conceive that under those circumstances any great injury will be done to the Civil Service Commission or any other cause to which reference has been made to-day. During the interim we will provide an opportunity for those charged with the responsibility to discharge those obligations which the statute places upon them in the manner they desire, which will reflect credit upon themselves, I am sure, and give satisfaction to the Canadian people. Long before this commission came into being there were complaints with regard to radio reception in this city; it is well known that there are difficulties in the way of radio reception at particular points. All these problems are being studied, and I trust that they will be overcome. I hope we will sufficiently realize the importance of this matter not to confine our criticisms to purely political lines, but that an earnest effort will be made to promote the well being of radio broadcasting as a public utility in this dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With the consent of the house, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) has made a certain proposal to which there is no opportunity of making any reply.

Mr. BENNETT: That can be done in committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then in the meantime we shall vote against the measure.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well; that was what we expected.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Bennett) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Anderson (Halton),
Arsenault,
Arthurs,
Barber,
Baribeau,
Barrette,
Belec,
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Bennett,
Bowen,
Bowman,
Boyes,
Burns,
Bury,
Cantley,
Carmichael,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Coote,
Cotnam,
Davies,
Dickie,
Duguay,
Duranleau,
Edwards,
Esling,
Fortin,
Fraser (Cariboo),
Gagnon,
Gardiner,
Gobeil,
Gordon,
Hackett,
Harris,
Hay,
Johnstone,
Kennedy (Peace River),
Kennedy (Winnipeg South Centre),
Laurin,
Lennox,
Loucks,
Lucas,
Luchkovich,
Macdonald (Kings),
MacLaren,
MacNicol,
McGillis,
McGregor,
McLure,
Maloney,
Manion,
Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon),
Morand,
Myers,
Nicholson,
Peck,
Pickel,
Plunkett,
Quinn,
Robinson,
Ross,
Rowe,
Sauvé,
Senn,
Simpson (Simcoe North),
Smith (Victoria-Carleton),
Smith (Cumberland),
Spankie,
Speakman,
Spence,
Spencer,
Sproule,
Stanley,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stewart (Lethbridge),
Stinson,
Stirling,
Sutherland,
Swanston,
Tétreault,
Thompson (Lanark),
Turnbull.
Weese,
Weir (Melfort),
White (Mount Royal),
Willis,
Wilson,
Wright.—89.

NAYS

Messrs:

Beaubien,
Blair,
Boulanger,
Bradette,
Butcher,
Cardin,
Denis,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Donnelly,
Dubois,
Duff,
Dumaine,
Elliott,
Factor.
Fafard,
Fiset, Sir Eugène,
Fontaine,
Fraser (Northumberland, O.),
Golding,
Goulet,
Hall,
Hanson (Skeena),
Hurtubise,
Jacobs,
King, Mackenzie,
Lacroix,
MacInnis,
McIntosh,
McKenzie (Assiniboia),
McPhee,
Mitchell,
Motherwell,
Neill,
Parent,
Pouliot,
Reid,
Rhéaume,
Roberge,
Sanderson,
Séguin,
Stewart (Edmonton West),
Totzke,
Vallance,
Woodsworth,
Young.—46.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Baker,
Beaubier,
Bell (Hamilton),
Bell (St. Antoine),
Beynon,
Black (Halifax),
Bourgeois,
Cahan,
Casselman,
Cowan (Port Arthur),
Cowan (Long Lake),
Dorion,
Dupré,
Embury,
Geary,
Gott,
Guthrie,
Hanson (York-Sunbury),
Jones,
Laflèche,
Larue,
Lawson,
MacDonald (Cape Breton),
MacMillan,
McDade,
McGibbon,
Matthews,
Mullins,
Perley (Qu'Appelle),
Perley, Sir George,
Pettit,
Porteous,
Price,
Rhodes,
Rogers,
Ryckman,
Ryerson,
Short,
Simpson (Algoma),
Smoke,
Spotton,
Stevens,
Stitt (Nelson),
Sullivan,
Thompson (Simcoe),
Tummon,
White (London),
Bertrand,
Ahearn,
Mercier (St. Henri),
Raymond,
Euler,
Dubuc,
Fournier,
Rinfret,
Howard,
Ilsley,
Irvine,
Verville,
Ferland,
Bothwell,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Rutherford,
Lapointe,
Veniot,
MacLean,
Girouard,
Thauvette,
Gray,
Urquhart,
Mackenzie (Vancouver),
Dupuis,
Power,
Moore (Ontario),
Howden,
Munn,
Marcil,
Bouchard,
Macphail, Miss,
Hanbury,
Ralston,
Heaps,
Chevrier,
Taylor,
Heenan,
Casgrain,
Cayley,
Hepburn,
Malcolm,
Weir (Macdonald),
Brasset,
Jean,
St-Père,
Gershaw.

Mr. MacLEAN: I was paired, but I did not know that my pair was absent. I wish to withdraw my vote.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I was paired with the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Ryckman). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion for second reading.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ST.-PERE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Hastings (Mr. Tummon). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR: I was paired with the hon member for Brantford City (Mr. Ryerson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. SHORT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SIMPSON (West Algoma): I was paired with the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. WHITE (London): I was paired with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gershaw). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BERTRAND: I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto Northeast (Mr. Baker). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Ferland). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Thauvette). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Three-Rivers-St-Maurice (Mr. Bourgeois). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Gobeil in the chair.

On section 1—Appointment and salaries of officers and employees.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to say a word, first, as to the understanding there was yesterday, when we agreed to allow the appropriation for the radio commission to pass, namely, that when the house was in committee on the bill hon. members would have an opportunity to discuss any phase of the radio commission's affairs. I think the Prime Minister agrees.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. I asked to have the Minister of Marine here to-day with his assistant so that any questions that might be asked could be answered.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I take it therefore that it is open to hon. members to discuss any phase of the commission's affairs. At the moment we are on section 1. The Prime Minister suggested, on the second reading, and there was no opportunity to make reply before the vote was taken, that there should be added to the bill a clause to the effect that its provisions would be applicable only until the first of July, 1934. Of course, the addition of such a clause would be a mere subterfuge, it would simply enable the commission to go ahead and make all appointments under this section we are now discussing, without reference to the Civil Service Commission.

The Prime Minister devoted most of his speech to pointing out the absurdity—I think that is the word that might be used—of consulting the Civil Service Commission as to who should be appointed as a singer, as to her voice, the size of her shoes and in general the equipment of artists before anyone should be engaged. No one in the world would think of asking the radio commission to go before the Civil Service Commission for any such purpose. So far as artists are concerned, unquestionably the radio commission should have in its own hand the determination of selections, irrespective of the Civil Service Commission. What we are now asked to do however is not merely to give the radio commission the right to select artists independently of the Civil Service Commission but to appoint the administrative staff, officials, clerks, stenographers and employees generally who may be required, and to make such appointments regardless altogether of the Civil Service Commission. Now, the commissioners who have all been appointed by the present administration are Conservatives.

Mr. BENNETT: No. Mr. Bland was never known to be a Conservative.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking of the radio commission.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought the right hon. gentleman said the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I did I meant the radio commission. All the appointees are Conservatives and this house is

now asked to agree to these Conservative appointees making such appointments as are necessary under the radio commission, and for all time.

Mr. BENNETT: No, until the first of July.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, until the first of July, 1934, and that means that within that time all possible and necessary appointments will have been made. May I suggest to the Prime Minister an arrangement which I think would be fair? Let him designate the classes of persons whom one could not reasonable expect to be appointed by the Civil Service Commission and with respect to whom the radio commission should have the determining voice, and ask that these positions be exempted from the Civil Service Act. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the members of my own party, but if the right hon. gentleman is reasonable in that regard I venture to say we shall be prepared to accede to reasonable exemptions from the Civil Service Act. We cannot, however, agree to remove from the Civil Service Act the appointment of stenographers and clerks generally as well as others who may hold positions corresponding to those in the public service at large. Unless such an arrangement as I suggest is adopted, it will be making of the radio commission a purely political machine. The Prime Minister says that he does not wish to do that. This is an opportunity to test the sincerity of his word in that regard.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Just immediately before the vote the Prime Minister suggested that this would apply for only one year. It does not seem to me that that was a very good way in which to try to influence the vote of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not think there would be a vote at the time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I for one could not be induced to vote in favour of the bill under the circumstances. As the Prime Minister made his speech immediately preceding the vote, we had no chance to discuss the proposition he advanced. It does not seem to me that the proposal suggested of waiting one year is a good one. Once these men are appointed they will have a certain claim upon the government. We could not very well dismiss the whole staff at the end of a year and disorganize the commission, so it seems to me that now is the time to settle the principle involved. I voted against this bill because I believe the clause before us is an infringement of the rights and privileges of the Civil Service Commission. Again and again we have seen groups of employees taken out from under this commission. The Prime Minister has suggested that it would be absurd to ask the civil service commissioners to indicate who would be the singers and other professional performers, but I do not think anyone suggests that that be done. I recall that I asked a question a few weeks ago as to how many appointments had been made under the Civil Service Commission to the radio commission. I am not quite sure of the answer, but I think it was that one stenographer had been appointed. It seems to me that the Prime Minister's difficulty is more of an excuse than anything else.

Personally, I do not like the idea of proceeding to build up a patronage system. I voted for the bill last year because I believed in the public ownership of radio. I think we all did. We believed in the building up of a nationally owned and nationally operated radio system but I am afraid that it is developing into simply a Conservative owned and a Conservative operated affair.

Mr. McINTOSH: That is just what it is.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am afraid of it. Instructions have recently been issued according to the press that manuscripts of speeches must be submitted before permission to broadcast will be given. Apparently the papers have received their information from the radio commission. These instructions state that nothing must be said derogatory to the powers that be. I cited a case the other day where a man had been actually convicted in the city of Montreal for protesting against the action of the radio commissioners. It will be a very serious thing if we are to build up an organization which will have the powers of censorship. We all agree with the Prime Minister that radio is an institution of very great importance. We believe its educational value is very great and we understand that there must be some regulations with regard to who shall use the radio and what shall go out over the air, but I should like to feel that this censorship will be in the hands not of a group appointed by the party in power but of one consisting of disinterested men appointed by a disinterested body. I cannot see that we will be carrying out the original idea of public ownership if we allow this amendment to go through.

The Prime Minister bemoans the fact that there is not to-day the unanimity which prevailed a year ago. If there is not it is because of the actions of the present govern-

ment. If the government had made this organization non-partisan, I think it would have made a wide appeal to the people of this country. I know as far as I am concerned, I would be ready to do everything in my power to give added strength to the commission. But one hesitates to do that under these circumstances. I am in favour of public ownership and I am also in favour of appointments being made through the civil service; I am in favour of the public having all the advantages of a publicly controlled and operated institution such as radio but I fear the development of an institution which will have the powers of censorship and which will be under the control of one political party. We are talking redistribution and an election is in the air. What will happen at the next election if there is to be a censorship as to what shall be sent over the radio? The government has not yet given a clear-cut statement with regard to matters of that kind. If the papers are correct in stating that manuscripts of speeches must be first placed in the hands of the commission, I can see where we will encounter many difficulties.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Everybody will.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Everybody will be getting into great difficulty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think Mr. Maher would accept mine.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think we can all foresee that. Under these circumstances I do not think we should safeguard these matters a year hence, they should be safeguarded now when appointments to the commission are being arranged for. The Prime Minister has made an appeal to us on this side heartily to support radio. I would like to make an appeal to him that he put this matter in such shape as will enable us to support it heartily. I think the suggestion made by the right hon. the leader of the opposition that a clear distinction should be made between those who are to be appointed to manage radio affairs and the artists and the technical experts is a reasonable one.

Mr. BENNETT: The section could be allowed to stand and I will consult the Civil Service Commission to see if a clause cannot be drawn up to meet the situation.

Mr. NEILL: I should like to ask one question before this section is withdrawn, and it is not in connection with this particular policy. I should like to know from the minister what his policy would be in a situation such as this; the Vancouver musicians' mutual protective union recently passed a resolution which I will summarize briefly. They have heard that it is the intention of certain people to endeavour to influence the radio commission to appoint a national broadcasting symphony orchestra to have its headquarters in the city of Toronto. Naturally they object to that because they think that in these days of unemployment the work should be distributed throughout the country. As an evidence that the Vancouver musicians are capable of rendering work of that kind I have a cutting here from I think the Toronto Saturday Night of October 9 last, saying that "the broadcast by the Vancouver symphony orchestra proved a revelation of the musical talent available in British Columbia." So that shows that they are competent to do work of that kind. I just want to know that it is not the intention to monopolize the whole thing by one hook-up from Toronto, but that on the other hand our local musicians in the various centres throughout the country will have an opportunity to produce themselves and display their artistic abilities.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I think I covered that point this morning. It is the intention of the radio commission to employ artists in almost every city in Canada in order to give our young musicians and artists an opportunity to show what they can do, and to give a chance to everybody.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Section stands.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT: I have agreed to let the section stand, and I will consult with the Civil Service Commission and see if a clause can be drawn which will meet the suggestions that have been made.

The CHAIRMAN: Section stands.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. Mr. Chairman. I want to talk on it. It is bad enough to have my hearing denied without being imposed upon. I think I have a right to be heard. I haven't had a word to-day at all. I did not intend to speak to-day but I do want to say a few words on section 1.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 2—Powers of commission.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to speak as one who knows very much about radio. We had one in our house on the farm until we became too poor to

keep it in batteries. It is there now just to look at. It may not be much of an ornament, but it is a reminder of better days. Maybe we will be able to get batteries for it when conditions improve. But it does not require much knowledge of radio to be able to make some observations on section 2 of this bill.

At this point I should like to be permitted to indicate the tendency of the government's activities. So far as I can discern them, they are all in the direction of getting all the national services in their own hands—for what purpose, we can only conjecture. In order to amplify my remarks in regard to this particular section, may I say that it would seem that they are providing for all appointments to be made outside the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, thereby making the radio commission a political institution, if they so desire.

I managed to hear some of the remarks of the Prime Minister and they were deeply interesting to me. Not knowing much about radio, it was news to me to learn of the ease with which powerful stations can be established in the United States and drive less powerful stations in Canada off the map. If they can be established there, powerful stations could be established in this country that would drown out everybody else.

Mr. BENNETT: And cost a lot of money.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, it would take a lot of power, and it would cost a lot of money, but when politics is at stake, a little power here or there does not amount to much to a millionaire government when it comes to getting a monopoly of the air. But if this can be done in the United States, if their powerful stations drown us out and jam our instruments, what is to hinder the government of Canada, with all the power it will have with this radio system, with the government appointed commission all of whom are friends of the government—what is to hinder this government establishing a powerful radio station and putting all their opponents off the map?

Mr. PORTEOUS: We never thought of that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Perhaps I am displaying ignorance about radio, but I do not know that I am. I am not displaying any ignorance as to the capacity of governments to do this kind of thing.

Mr. BENNETT: You should know.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is exactly what was done by the government previous to 1896 in their election act provisions; I went through it, and I know. I do not need to be told; it is not something I have forgotten or that I have got from somebody else; it is something I know from practical experience as having been directed against myself.

May I illustrate right now some evidence of this? May I show what is going on now? I do not wish to make any assertions concerning the redistribution bill, but may I point out by way of illustration, to give emphasis to my remarks about radio, that the government is bringing down a redistribution bill which is the most ingenious and diabolical ever conceived by either man or devil.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is true. If a government will hobble me and behead me, —I am just talking about myself as an illustration—mutilate me and crucify me under one bill, for absolutely political reasons, why can they not do it—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): I ask the hon. member to keep in order, and to speak to the section before the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member's language is wholly unparliamentary—"diabolical" and "devil" and that sort of thing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: "Diabolical" is quite proper and parliamentary.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): It is absolutely out of order.

Mr. POULIOT: On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I remember that once in the house I used the word "hell" and it was not ruled out of order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I could use stronger language. I think you had better leave my language alone, for fear it gets worse.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): The redistribution committee has not made a final report, and no comments should be made concerning it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It does not have to be reported. The last map has been drawn, and I know what it contains.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): Order, please.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Then, we come to another illustration—by the way, if you are going to cut out illustrations to back up my statements, I am hamstrung; that is what is happening all along the line, and my good friend the chairman is going to join that parade.

Mr. POULIOT: Have you not got figures of speech?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What was done the other day by one of the most modest and mildest men in the government when the Indian bill was under discussion? Nobody needs to smile me off the map with regard to the object of this government in amending that bill. Under the authority given the government, that bill could be the means of enfranchising Indians by the wholesale just before an election even.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BENNETT: Respect for age is something, but this nonsense should stop.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The Prime Minister does not need to look cross.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He says it is nonsense.

Mr. BENNETT: It is a shame, that is all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: First there is redistribution, with our heads already in the noose; all you have to do is pull the rope. Is that not so? The axe is suspended right over our heads. I am showing the tendencies of this government to prepare all along the line for an election, so that they may hobble, hamstring and cripple their opponents as much as possible, thereby making them relatively impotent for that great battle. They are winning as many outposts as possible in advance, that is what they are doing. Nobody can fool me on the signs of the political times. If the government does not like my exposing them, it is not my fault. It is my business to expose them, and to warn the people of what is happening. They tried out, in a small way, the political stunt on the penitentiary bill to grab off all appointments from the Civil Service Commission. The government is getting a fine stand-in with the big fellows in the militia. I know what can be done through the police—I know, mighty well. We have not had mounted police in the west for over fifty years without our knowing that if you have a political appointee at the head, considerable political work can be done through him.

Mr. ROBINSON: You are talking from experience, are you?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Theory, do you say? I say when you have your own or your party's hide ripped asunder by it, it is not a theory. Now we will get back to the bill. I have given some illustrations to show what is going on. After the franchise being won by our forefathers a hundred or more years ago, partly through bloodshed, I object to hon. gentlemen opposite swiping it from me in broad daylight by any device, without a word of protest.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: You do not need to laugh. The man who laughs at that only displays his own ignorance, and he does not know anything about the political history of Canada, modern or remote.

Now, about this bill—but by the way, I have another illustration, the Canadian National Railways. What about them? We know about the legislation that has just passed—and all these things have happened in the last ten days. We know about the board of trustees, all appointees of the government. Did anybody ever hear of words being passed from the upper fellow, the man at the top, down all along the line, as to what the men at the bottom should do at election time? Anybody who has not heard of that should not be sitting in this chamber. He is too innocent to be living this side of the Jordan. There are three or four illustrations bearing directly on the political possibilities of this bill. Now my good friend the Prime Minister says it is nonsense for me to suggest—he himself put the thought in my mind—what could be done by these powerful radio stations. Did anyone in this house ever hear a more powerful, a more effective orator over the radio than my right hon. friend? I heard him in 1930 and I never heard his equal on the radio in my life. A clear, ringing voice—yes, I see he appreciates that—a clear, resonant voice, a wide vocabulary; he never needs to hesitate a moment for a word, as I have to, unfortunately. And he carried conviction because there was an element of sincerity in his voice that would deceive even the very elect. Put two or three speakers like that on a government radio system, with a powerful station that will jam off everyone else, and goodbye opponents—particularly if it is assisted by this gerrymandering bill already referred to if it is carried out; I do not know whether it will be or not. But there is only one thing lacking for a complete hamstringing and emasculating of the electors of Canada at the next general election and disfranchising them not by thousands but by hundreds of thousands, that is an election act such as we had in 1895 or that under the War Time Elections Act when every disputed ballot was put in an envelope and you had to prove at great expense that it was any particular candidate's vote. There is not one candidate in

fifty who is wealthy enough to stand the resultant expense. That is all that is lacking to make the government's election plans complete.

You will observe from my remarks that I do not know much about radio but I know a whole lot about Tories. I should know a lot about Tory tactics prior to elections; forewarned by past experience is forearmed, and I want to warn not only this house but the country at large what our good friends over there are preparing for us. What a commentary it is on the lack of confidence they have in themselves or the electors when they have to resort to these devices to fool the people and try to ward off the verdict against them that is bound to come if things are permitted to run their natural course.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, I had the misfortune of being called out of the chamber this afternoon and could not follow the speech of my right hon. friend. But fortunately I came back in time to receive his reprimand, I might even say his castigation, for having dared to say that Mr. Murray had been lecturing parliament in that interim report which was read this morning.

Mr. DURANLEAU: And that he should be sent home.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not remember having said that, but if I did not say it then I say it to-night. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie); my right hon. friend seems to be pleased or grateful for having had the loan of this gentleman, but I say we have too many loans of this kind. The Finance minister was saying the other day that we are still a borrowing nation; I knew that as regards finance, but I do not think we should borrow gentlemen from England or elsewhere to come and tell Canadians what they should do with their own national problems.

Mr. HACKETT: He is a Canadian.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is not living in Canada now.

Mr. HACKETT: He has been absent a short time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is it lacking in courtesy to resent its being said to members of this parliament that parliament should not have control in this matter, that, according to this gentleman, parliament is not qualified for that sort of work? Is it lacking in courtesy to resent that? I think my right hon. friend is wrong; his criticism should be directed the other way. Moreover he should defend parliament and the members of the house against the language of the chairman of his radio board, who has said somewhere that any man who thinks that the radio commission is not doing what should be done is either a liar or a fool.

Mr. BENNETT: Has the hon. gentleman authority for that statement?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I saw it in the newspapers.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: I have received no evidence of it, but in view of what was said here I am writing to ask what was actually said.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am pleased that my right hon. friend will try to remedy grievances of members of the house, and not resent too much the defence we have to put up against the reflections of this gentleman and others who are borrowed from elsewhere to come and tell us how to solve the problems of Canada.

There is one matter, however, as to which I agree with my right hon. friend; it is deplorable that there is no longer unanimity in this house—and I might say elsewhere—with regard to radio affairs in Canada. But whose fault is that? I have said that I have no confidence in the present commission, and I believe that the majority of the Canadian people have no confidence in it. Who is responsible for that? I am not responsible. I think the appointments to the commission were unfortunate. I think that what has happened since the commission has been appointed also is unfortunate, and that is the real cause of the unpopularity of that board with the Canadian people at the present time. My hon. friends the Minister of Marine and the Solicitor General have replied to me on the basis of statements I did not make, but I wish to refer to one argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine. I criticized, and I still criticize, the issuing of a licence to a newspaper in Montreal for radio broadcasting a month after the appointment of the commission, and two days before they were sworn in, without the matter being submitted to the commission. The very fact that this has been done is an indication that the government did not keep faith with the house and wanted to evade the provisions of the Radio Broadcasting Act. Under that act, section 8, it is the duty of the commission to determine the number, location and power

of stations required in Canada. And by subsection (c):

The commission may make recommendations to the minister with regard to the issue, suspension or cancellation of private broadcasting licences, and notwithstanding anything contained in the Radiotelegraph Act or regulations, the minister may issue, suspend, or cancel such licences.

What I more particularly object to is not the issuing of the licence to that newspaper, had it been done in the regular way by the commission or upon the recommendation of the commission. What I object to is that the licence was issued between the appointment of the commission and the swearing in of its members. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine said: well, it is a Conservative newspaper and it is a good thing that both parties have their stations. Surely this house would not subscribe to such a policy, that there should be an allotment of broadcasting stations in Canada on political lines, so many for the Conservatives, so many for the Liberals. The house never contemplated that when we adopted the Radio Broadcasting Act.

Mr. DURANLEAU: In your time it was only the Liberals.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Never. What Liberal station ever did that?

Mr. GAGNON: La Presse, the Toronto Star and others.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I never understood La Presse to be a Liberal newspaper. Let me say that at election times, and at other times as well, I have heard speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite over the La Presse station. That never has been considered a Liberal station. From La Patrie I think almost every day we have talks by gentlemen who call themselves Labour-Conservatives or others who represent an organization called the Federation of Labour, which is merely a Tory association, as all hon. gentlemen opposite know. I still say, Mr. Chairman, that to divide the licences in Canada on political lines, so many to one party and so many to another, is a wrong principle that cannot be accepted or subscribed to by this house.

There was another thing said by hon. gentlemen opposite in defence of this act; they say that Toronto had four broadcasting stations and it was not right that Montreal should have only two. What advantage is there in having so many broadcasting stations? It merely brings about confusion. I do not think it is of any benefit to the community that there should be several small stations; I do not think there should be a competition as between Toronto and Montreal or Vancouver and Winnipeg as to the number of stations in each city. Rather I think good service and quality should be looked for in the organization of radio broadcasting.

My hon. friend from Dorchester, who was one of the members of the committee last year, said that committee had reported that stations of less than one hundred watts should not come under the commission. Whatever may have been contained in the report of that committee it is the law which governs in the matter, and there is nothing in the broadcasting act accepting the report of the committee in this regard; all stations come under the radio commission.

There is another point to which I should like to direct attention. Some hon. member who discussed this question to-day praised himself and the house for having had the support of the radio league in this matter, and the name of Mr. Graham Spry was mentioned in this connection. I knew the radio league had suggested that instead of a board appointed by the government and paid for its services there should be a sort of honorary board on which all sections of the country and of the community would be represented by men who would be willing to serve without expense to the country, and the real executive work should be entrusted to a general manager. That was the program suggested by the radio league. In the April 27th issue of the Weekly Sun, which is edited by Mr. Graham Spry, who was the president of the league, I see an article headed "The Radio Commission". I am not going to read it all, but here is part of what Mr. Spry says:

The Canadian Radio League proposal, first advanced in detail in the Queen's Quarterly, January, 1931, provided for a voluntary commission to which a competent and experienced general manager would be responsible for the practical details of administering broadcasting. In this way, the formulation of policy would have been separated from its administration, as in the case of a company with its board of directors and its general manager and staff. There would have been the additional advantage that the voluntary board, selected by consultation between the three parties, would have represented different parts of Canada, would have been independent of partisan interest, and in a position to resist partisan pressure. This is the British scheme, and the British board, rather than the government, are held responsible for administration, thereby saving the government from criticism for the acts of its semi-autonomous commission.

The government of Canada, however, saw fit to establish a commission that combined the formulation of policy with its administration; then it appointed a commission, one of whose members was a former Conservative organizer. Subsequent acts and appointments of the com-

mission, rightly or wrongly, were taken by the public and the opposition parties to be partisan. The radio commission, therefore, became subject to political pressure and party criticism.

And so on. I think there was much to commend itself in the proposal of the radio league; certainly we would have avoided the situation in which we find ourselves to-day. My right hon. friend does not like it; no one likes it. We all supported the idea of nationalizing the radio, of public ownership; there was never such unanimity in the house as when the bill was made law during the last session of parliament. We were told by the right hon. gentleman that politics would not enter into appointments to the board which was to be created to administer radio affairs, but unfortunately we think faith has not been kept so far as that promise and that pledge are concerned.

Mr. BENNETT: We say that politics has not entered into it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot understand my right hon. friend when he says that politics did not enter, when he has put there to represent a large section of the community a man who not only was his candidate in the last election but who has been the organizer of his party for three or four elections. So far as I am concerned I do not believe that man can administer radio affairs in my district impartially. I do not trust the radio commission, as it is now constituted, for the next general election or for any other matter in my district. It is a sad condition in which to find myself; I should prefer to have confidence in that board. I agree with my right hon. friend that confidence is necessary for the success of radio broadcasting in Canada, but if confidence is lacking we are not responsible; the government is responsible, and I am sorry to say that until that condition is corrected it will be impossible for the people of Canada to get along well with the board which is in control of radio broadcasting, and until that condition is created we shall not have success or harmony.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has no objection to an exclusively conservative or liberal station, and he is quite right; however, there are people who are in a more unfortunate position than that; some have no station. I wish to apprise the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) of what happened to me. As Coppée would say: My story, gentlemen on the bench will be brief. Once, for my good or ill fortune, I delivered a speech, at Montmagny, on the Imperial economic agreements, and some enthusiastic person—there are always some—requested me to repeat it in Quebec. During two months, I received from station CHRC dilatory replies, followed by an absolute refusal; they gave no excuse or reason. I wish to inquire from the hon Minister of Marine, whether persons holding government licences to operate broadcasting stations have a right to refuse a private individual the use of their station, providing he does not offend public decency or order—I felt that I had offended neither the one nor the other—and providing that, in requesting the use of the station for half an hour, he gives them sufficient notice, such as a week, two weeks or even two months. My notice covered two months. I am totally at a loss to know why the gentleman refused me. I put a question on the order paper, two weeks ago, to ascertain the names of the owners of that station.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Was it station CHRC that refused?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It was station CHRC. The hon. member for Quebec East was more fortunate than I was because I listened to a splendid speech of his, broadcasted from station CHRC. I was unable to even put in a word. I wish to inquire whether these stations are under the government's control and whether they have a right, proprio moter, to prevent a citizen or even a representative of the people, as, for instance, the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), from addressing a larger audience than the usual one. Friends of the Conservative cause had requested me to repeat that speech in Quebec. You will always come across people that are more Catholic than the Pope. Evidently, in the eyes of these gentlemen of the CHRC station, I was guilty of heresy, if not in fact at least potentially. That is, I presume, the only reason which can be advanced for this refusal. So far as the merit of the ideas expounded, my speech was delivered in Montmagny before a highly intellectual and select audience, comprising representatives of the State and Clergy. Nobody was shocked. What I wish to know is whether these stations have a right to refuse, proprio moter, the use of their broadcasting stations, according to their whiffs and whims.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): May I put a question to the hon. member? According to rumour, was not the vice-president of the Radio Commission, in the past—previous to his appointment—one of the directors of the CHRC broadcasting station?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I am aware that he was. That, perhaps, may throw some light on the CHRC station's refusal to grant my request, because it is no secret, I have no reason to conceal it, I did not recommend the appointment of the present vice-president. I considered that there were persons, such as Notary Montreuil, of Quebec, and many others eminently qualified to fill that post. The appointment having been made, I do not intend to discuss it, I have no reason to approve or champion it. I simply expressed my views, at the time.

Mr. DORION (Translation): There is another broadcasting station at Quebec; the CKCV station.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I had applied to the CHRC.

Mr. DORION (Translation): That is, to the "Soleil"!

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That was bad enough; I had, first, applied to friends of the hon. member for Quebec Montmorency (Mr. Dorion), I was certainly not going to apply to a broadcasting station belonging to gentlemen who are really no friends of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency. There must be at this station persons very broad-minded as regards the distribution of patronage, but very narrow-minded as regards individuals who are conceited enough to honour the broadcasting station with their presence.

I have put a question to the hon. Minister of Marine....

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Did you apply to the Canadian Broadcasting Commission to obtain redress?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Did they refuse you?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): They replied that it was none of their business.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I understand that the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne), wants an answer. This is the first time that I hear about the refusal of this station to broadcast my hon. friend's speech.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I am not criticizing the minister.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I am amazed at this refusal, because usually stations are delighted to broadcast the always interesting speeches of the hon. member. However, it must be noted that the station referred to, the CHRC, is owned by a private company, it is a private broadcasting station—

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Quite so.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): —which was granted its licence for the period of twelve months, last year; and, 6, months this year, that is, since the new regulations are in force. Broadcasting stations must be operated according to the regulations of the Radio Commission. With this exception, the stations are independent of the Minister of Marine and the Radio Commission.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is what I wished to find out.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I hope that my hon. friend will be more fairly dealt with in the future, not only by that station but by all stations, because Canadians, as a rule, are always delighted to listen to the always very interesting remarks of the hon. member for Montmagny.

My hon. friend inquired as to the directors of the company which owned that broadcasting station. I have not yet this information. The hon. member recently put that question on the order paper and I immediately requested that this station furnish me with the facts of the case. As soon as I get a reply, I shall be pleased to get in touch with my hon. friend.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is what I wished to know. I have no reproach to make to the hon. Minister. I am aware that the Radio Commission is practically independent. I want to find out whether the broadcasting stations are independent of the Commission or whether they come under its jurisdiction. It seems to me extraordinary that the Radio Commission would grant a licence to a public station, which has a public franchise, and that this station would simply be the organization of one group or one party, or two parties—not of three or four. I would think that having obtained a franchise from the people, they are there to cater to the public, therefore, the Radio Commission should have over these stations a more efficient and complete control. If not, the commission would not serve the purpose for which it was created.

A broadcasting station—the hon. Minister stated—is owned by an independent corporation, and I understand, according to his remarks, that a station has absolute control of its program and the broadcasting hours placed at the disposal of the public.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Absolutely, providing it observes the regulations of the commission. For instance, an advertisement must not occupy more than 5 per cent of the time allotted to the program.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): In this case, it might, perhaps, be necessary to amend the Radio Broadcasting Act, in this respect.

I am very much of the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Quebec East, because in fact, that might lead to tyranny or partiality and this would totally fall short of the aim which we had in view when creating the commission. The radio broadcasting stations are established to cater to the public, the moment they observe our constitution, our laws—

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Peace and good order.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): —public peace, good order and decency; they are there to serve the public and to be at its disposal.

I wish to state that we have, at Montmagny, a small station owned by Mr. Marquis, a Liberal, who takes an active part against me during electoral campaigns, however, he is a loyal opponent who is always pleased to put his station at the disposal of any one, of any party, among others, of the member for Montmagny. The latter does not always help him, however, he understands the reason, the purpose for which he has this station and that it is the government which grants him his licence.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Hear! Hear!

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I wish to draw the attention of the minister and the commission to this fact in order that it may help him to obtain a more powerful broadcasting station, because he often broadcasts to the whole of lower Quebec, while the Quebec station is unable to reach that section of the country.

I suggest to the minister that there is ground to amend the act. The owners of broadcasting stations are public servants, because radio is almost a public utility—they hold a franchise—therefore, they are there to serve the public, and not to satisfy their petty spites, their personal views—

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Hear! Hear!

Mr. LAVERGNE. (Translation): —their preferences. I, for one, strongly criticize the CHRC station of Quebec, not because it affects me but because it affects others. I often had the occasion of broadcasting my speeches, speaking both in front and behind the broadcasting mouthpiece. What does one speech more or less—I would gladly dispense making them. I think it most unfair of this station and a renewal of its licence should be refused to them. That is why I wish to find out who are the owners, because, when I have their names, I shall have quite a lot to say as regards having this intolerable state of things redressed.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): I wish, sir, to support the attitude taken by the hon. member for Montmagny. If the government has full control of radio in Canada, then the commission, the authorities in charge must see that everybody has fair play, so far as radio service is concerned. The moment that a public man does not express subversive views against public order or peace, I think he is entitled to obtain from radio stations, holding a government licence and under the control of the commission, that his speech or utterances be broadcasted by Canadian public stations. The reason we established government control over radio, was so that everybody would be dealt fairly and justly, and I entirely agree with the hon. member for Montmagny in his remarks to the house.

Mr. HACKETT: The hon. member for Quebec East has told the house that the radio commission does not possess his confidence. I think it rather unfortunate that a body occupying as important a post as that confided to this commission should, before it has really entered upon its duties, be accused by a man of the high position of the former Minister of Justice of being entirely unworthy of the confidence of the country, and I think also it is extremely unfortunate that no allegation is made in support of the charge. It is true that the hon. gentleman singled out for his own personal charge the vice-president, and forsooth he said, "I cannot have any confidence in this man nor can anyone else have confidence in him because—heinous offence—he was on some occasion a Conservative candidate."

An hon. MEMBER: The only reason.

Mr. HACKETT: He goes further and says that this man has added to the crime by having been a Conservative organizer. I believe that the hon. gentleman is accurate in stating as a fact that the vice-president of the commission did at some time have something to do with politics. I should hate to think however that every member of this chamber is unfitted for any honourable post

because at some time he had sought and been found worthy of the confidence of the electorate of some constituency. I consider it most unfortunate that a distinguished member of this chamber should wish to point to every man in this house and say that because he has at some time been a partisan he is unworthy of high office. If he is going to apply that rule to this and other countries, what esteem can he have for the bench, what esteem can he have for the incumbent of any office that is worth holding?—because in democratic countries positions of high trust are invariably given to those who seek, and show themselves worthy of, the confidence of the people. I reiterate therefore that to say, without substantiating the statement, without bringing forth anything to justify such a charge, that this body which has recently come into office is unworthy of public confidence, designates, I fear, a type of mind and a partisanship which detract from the value of the judgment uttered in those words of condemnation. The hon. member says that Bill Murray should go home—and I speak of Bill Murray because he was at McGill with me, a boy from British Columbia, an active, energetic lad who has made his way in the world and is welcomed not only to Canada but to other countries where expert radio advice is sought; he is called in because he is supposed to know more about the technique of radio development than anyone else. When the hon. member refers to that gentleman as a stranger, and harks back to that cry that is sometimes heard in the back ranges, that he is a foreigner—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I never said that. Be fair; I never said that.

Mr. HACKETT: I am perfectly willing to retract.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You are carried away by your own eloquence.

An hon. MEMBER: Take your medicine.

Mr. HACKETT: The hon. gentleman said that we did not require any assistance or guidance from outside.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is not saying he is a foreigner.

Mr. HACKETT: If this government has fallen into that evil habit it has only fallen a victim to the bad example set by its predecessor. I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite where they went to get that lamented man who recently passed from us and who for some years headed our national railway system. Where did he come from? Then, if I remember well, there was a gentleman who came, not from Vancouver, not from Montreal or Toronto, a gentleman who had something to do with the investigation of conditions in the maritimes and whose name I believe was Sir Andrew Rae Duncan. Where did he come from? Who summoned him here from Scotland? If I remember well, there was also a report made with regard to the Hudson Bay terminal, a vast and costly report which was made by a most skilled and able man. He did not come from Toronto or Montreal, he came from England; his name was Sir Frederick Palmer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think that was a mistake.

Mr. HACKETT: It may have been a mistake but I am willing to do the hon. gentleman and his friends justice by saying that they went where they thought they were able to get the best man they could. Now that is all that this government has done. Let us therefore be fair to the radio commission and realize that it is trying to become something of which we shall all be proud. Let us give it a fair chance.

Mr. GAGNON: I will not detain the committee very long, but I want to say a few words with respect to this small station in Quebec which seems to have incurred the displeasure of my hon. friend from Montmagny A few minutes ago my hon. friend from Quebec East, when speaking about the radio broadcasting commission, reproached me for having quoted the report which was made last year by the committee that sat on radio broadcasting matters. I shall quote not only the report of the radio committee but also the law. I refer my hon. friend to chapter 51 of the statutes of 1932. Subsection (g) of section 8 of the act reads:

> The commission may, subject to the approval of the minister, assist and encourage the construction of small private stations.

But it is known that these small private stations of 100 watts and under remain the property of the owners. They may not be taken into the national scheme of radio broadcasting and will not be subject to the control of the Minister of Marine or the broadcasting commission except so far as programs and licences are concerned. It is a well known fact that the two small stations in Quebec city have not been taken over by the commission. In fact, no station in Canada has been taken over to form part of the national scheme of radio broadcasting. The commission contends that they cannot do this unless the law is changed.

I come now to the speech of the hon. member for Montmagny. He does not seem to

like station CHRC, but I do not think this station can be accused of narrow partisanship. I think that is demonstrated by the fact that the hon. member for Quebec East broadcast a speech over that station about a month ago. This was the speech which the hon. member for Montmagny referred to as being wonderful. I will call it a seditious speech. I think one is entitled to his own views in this regard. The hon. member for Montmagny may have his own views, the hon. member for Quebec East may have his and I may have mine. I think it was absolutely unfair to insinuate that that station has been unfair or unjust to any particular party. One of the small stations in Quebec is the property of Mr. Vandry, a well known Liberal, while the other is owned by a company. There happened to be some Conservatives acting as directors of this company, but I do not think that that would be sufficient to prove that the company was unfair. My hon. friend saw fit to overlook Mr. Vandry's station and broadcast over CHRC. That is his business.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I did not refer to any of these stations. My hon. friend is addressing me but I did not say a word about these stations.

Mr. GAGNON: I hope my hon. friend will not be offended if I refer to his conduct. L'heure Provinciale is not a Conservative matter. It was organized by the provincial government, which has decided to use CHRC. That is further evidence that CHRC does not play politics; although the directors are Conservatives they have the patronage of the provincial government. The hon. member for Montmagny put a question on the order paper in connection with the directors of this company. He is a very distinguished lawyer and he knows that he could obtain this information from the provincial secretary, whose duty it is to disclose the names of directors of any provincial company. CHRC is carrying on under a provincial charter. The hon. member for Montmagny may have cause to complain about CHRC but he should not complain in this house or insinuate that the Minister of Marine has been unfair. That is not the case. CHRC is a provincially owned station and if for one reason or another—perhaps for unjust reasons—the hon. member was not treated courteously, why did he not use the station of Mr. Vandry? The latter would have been much pleased to broadcast my hon. friend's speech. I think it is absolutely unfair to insinuate that station CHRC in Quebec city has been playing politics. If the hon. member for Montmagny has not been treated courteously by CHRC, this government cannot be blamed. It is only the directors of that station that could be blamed. When the hon. member for Montmagny insinuates that the vice-chairman of the radio commission was connected with that station, I think he was unfair. He knows very well that when taking his oath of office the vice-chairman swore he had no interest in any station, and he has no interest in any to-day.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of treading on the corns of the hon. member for Dorchester; I am exceedingly sorry if he thinks I have done so, because I did not want to arouse his ire. However, I thank him personally although I do not know whether he has done such a good service for the Minister of Marine. I do not know whether the hon. member for Dorchester was speaking for the government, but he forces me to again get up to say a few words. My quarrel with station CHRC was settled absolutely and I was satisfied with the explanations given by the Minister of Marine. I understand he was not to blame and I have no quarrel with him. However, I thought that I should put this matter before the committee as in my opinion the situation created was absolutely unfair. In saying that I do not refer to my own personal feeling. When the hon. member for Dorchester has been in parliament as long as I have he will know that it is more of a pleasure than a sorrow to put speeches on the shelf. Apparently the hon. member is acting as an advocate for station CHRC and I must tell him that he seems to be better informed about that station than the minister. He accuses me of having attacked the vice-president of the commission, but I did not do anything of the kind. The hon. member for Quebec East asked me if he was an owner of that station before his appointment and I simply answered "yes". Whether or not he is now an owner, I do not know, but I suppose he is not.

I may say to the hon. member for Dorchester that in this affair station CHRC acted without courtesy, without honesty and without courage. For two months they gave me dilatory answers. They were going to be paid and paid with the money of good friends of the hon. member for Dorchester. These people were anxious to have the speech which had been given in Montmagny broadcast in Quebec, and they were willing to pay the station. The action of this station constituted a slur either on the Conservative party or on myself. If it was only on myself, I am none the worse off; I can stand these things, but I think they have acted most unfairly. This is a public utility, to serve the public, and if

no one had been concerned but myself I would not have mentioned the matter. They have been granted a franchise and I claim that they are there to serve the public. If they have a right to refuse to serve the public then it is time the law was changed. They are not there to gratify their affections or their hatreds. They are there to put that station to the service of the public of Canada, that and nothing else, and if the law does not give the commission those powers, the law should be amended. If the law does give the commission those powers, that station should be reprimanded immediately because certainly we should be missing the aim in nationalizing radio if we allowed it to become a tool in the hands of those with influence or money enough to buy or rent a station. I do not care how many stations there are, and I do not care whether it is Liberals or Conservatives or Tories or Grits or anybody else that runs them; that is a matter of indifference to me, but I say that the people of this country have a right to the radio when they wish to hear it, and nobody can make me believe that station CHRC did not have half an hour to give to the hon. member for Montmagny, especially when people have told me that they received permission to broadcast for a whole hour the next day on only one day's notice. I have no hatred or love for that particular station; I am quite indifferent; I do not know who owns it, but I want to know who owns it if it is going to continue to be operated in that way. I want to know who got the licence and through what influence, and I want to see that they do not get a licence next year if they do not act differently.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If I may presume, Mr. Chairman, to talk a second time before the ninth hour is up on a subject I do not know a great deal about, I should like to take just five or ten minutes more—and do not be too harsh, Mr. Chairman, on my homely illustrations because that is the way I talk.

While I do not know much about radio I should know a lot, without presumption, about Tory-o, and that is what I am talking about, if I may; and I think the chairman is going to let me. I should like to give another illustration of what can be done by a government that wants to do it, and apparently this is that kind of government. I want to point out how easy it is for the government to do it, and I am going to tell the Minister that I had it worked on me once not by means of the radio but by monopolizing the press for advertising purposes. I will tell that story first.

When I ran a federal election campaign against a Progressive candidate for the first time in 1919 in Assiniboia in southern Saskatchewan, I found when I got into the constituency that every square inch of advertising space had been taken up in advance right through the election by my enterprising friends then called the Progressives. Imagine the helplessness of one going into a contest like that! Now if our innocent friends the Progressives will do that towards a brother farmer opponent, what won't the less innocent gentlemen now occupying the treasury benches do towards an opponent by means of the radio? The hon. member for Dorchester has talked about engaging a period of time on the air over a certain radio line or wave or whatever is the technical term, but we might find that the Liberals could not get on the air for six months to come. This government will know when an election is coming on six or four or two months before the writs are issued, and they can have every wave and everything else that goes with it engaged right through the election.

Mr. SPOTTON: They will have a wave of public opinion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, over the left. I know what my friends the Progressives worked on me in Assiniboia. I am not unduly suspicious when I suggest that the government might engage the radio in advance right through the election. A man would be worse than a fool who, having been burnt once, did not fight shy of fire a second time. So I say that I am not unduly suspicious. I am taking things as I find them and as I have found them for a half century, and they have not changed very much for the better during the last two or three years.

Here is something I cannot get over. I do not want to be too much at loggerheads with the Prime Minister, but he interjected a little time ago that what I was saying was nonsense. Well, let us see if what he was saying was not nonsense and actual bunk, and it is my business to debunk the right hon. gentleman. This radio commission had its foundations laid on party appointments. This commission is admittedly Conservative, and I am not finding fault with that as such. But good as it may be, and I know nothing about the gentlemen composing it, although I hear the chairman well spoken of—I understand that for a long number of years he was editor of Toronto Saturday Night, which I read occasionally because I rather like to

read it and find out what my opponents are saying. The foundations of the commission, then are admittedly Conservative and political; and how can you conceive that anything with a strictly Conservative foundation will be anything but Conservative? In other words, how can the superstructure be anything but political when the foundation is absolutely political? Is there a cackle over there? Did my hon. friends never hear about the principle of like begetting like? If the root be bad, what will the branches be? Unless something better is grafted on to the old root, the branches will be the same as the root; so I say that what the Prime Minister said about our criticisms was not only nonsense but it was absolutely asinine, the biggest bunk that I ever heard—to say that the foundation could be one thing and the superstructure something else absolutely opposite—neutral, non-political, with a Tory foundation. In saying that I do not want to be supercritical about the gentleman who occupies the position of chairman. The government has chosen that course, and it must not now pretend to be astonished because we expect the superstructure to be no better than the foundation. I think my conclusions are sound. I have not heard anybody get up since I spoke before and try to show that my other illustrations were not also sound. I invite anybody now to say how any government that wants to do it can be prevented from tying up the radio service in the way I have described, and just mark if it is not done.

It is only quite recently, Mr. Chairman, that the Conservative party in Canada has been noted to be friendly towards the nationalization of any utility. Everybody knows that the Canadian National was taken on by the government of that day because they did not know what else to do with it. Everybody knows that the present national radio system was taken over by this government because it was left in their lap by the preceding government. A commission had been appointed by the Liberal government to inquire into radio, headed by Sir John Aird, and the commission made a unanimous report prior to the retirement of the former government. Public sentiment was so strongly behind that report that when this government came into office it could not do otherwise than carry out the recommendations of the commission. The government made the most of it and accepted that report, and put its recommendations into operation with a magnificent speech on the general subject of nationalized air service by the right hon.

the Prime Minister. They did not like it particularly, because they are really only the foster parents. That is all they can claim to be of any of these great national utilities. Then why not turn the radio service to some further useful account, so that it could be used during an election? That is what they are going to do, do not make any mistake about it. They have not been slow in making use of other things, as I have already described. The leopard, as a rule, does not change his spots, or the Ethiopian his skin, just over night. I promised to take only five minutes—six minutes, possibly—and that time has now expired. I do not believe I shall speak longer, Mr. Chairman.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Expenditure of moneys.

Mr. COOTE: Before the section carries I should like to say that I had not the privilege of being in the house during the whole discussion of this bill. I did hear part of the Prime Minister's speech and it was because of what he said that I voted for the second reading of the bill. After what the Prime Minister said I thought the bill should have second reading and be allowed to go before committee of the whole so we could find out what need there might be for section 1 of the bill. It seemed to me that the Prime Minister made a very good case, and that while we could not question him on the second reading of the bill we could do so in committee. If the broadcasting commission in Canada is to carry on properly it seems to me that at least some of the sections in the bill are necessary.

In my opinion the present unsatisfactory conditions in connection with our national radio are due largely to the personnel of the commission, and I make that statement with a great deal of regret. I do not object to the government appointing men on commissions who may have been Conservatives in the past. Of course, when picking men, they should not pick those who have been preeminently Conservative, or have taken an active part in political life. It is important that the men chosen for these positions should be chosen because of their qualifications for the job. Our Civil Service Commission does not bear the reputation it should because we have never been careful enough in choosing the commissioners. It may be that the government was careful in choosing the radio commissioners, but I do not think the personnel of the commission is what it should be.

If half the reports I hear are true, I believe they are going too far in their censorship. Since the house adjourned at six o'clock, I have been told that certain people cannot have the use of the radio in Canada unless they first submit their manuscripts to the chairman of the commission, or some official of the commission, so that the commissioners may know exactly what is going to be said before the program is broadcast. That is going much too far. I do not believe the nationalization of radio will ever become popular if that practice is followed.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Would the hon. member allow a question? In what instance was that done?

Mr. COOTE: All I said was that since the house adjourned at six o'clock I was told that that happened in one case. I cannot give the particulars.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Is that the Rutherford case?

Mr. COOTE: I understand that there was another case. I do not believe any diplomacy has been shown in connection with the Rutherford case. Any man who is to be chairman of the radio commission in Canada should be particularly broadminded and have a bit of diplomacy in his make up. I am afraid that the experience of the present chairman of the radio commission in the position which he formerly occupied did not fit him particularly for the job which he now holds. He was writing editorials for a certain publication in Toronto. I do not believe any man in this house would suggest that restraint was exercised in the criticisms contained in the columns of that paper. He was a particularly critical editor. I have heard that remark passed very often about the gentleman in question—not that I have anything against him, but I do not think he was the ideal person to appoint to this very important position.

I hope the appointment will turn out all right, because I wish to see national radio a success. I believe that it should be nationalized. But if it is to be autocratically controlled in what I believe to be a rather narrow minded manner—and I am willing to be corrected, if the chairman has not been as autocratic as we understand—it is not going to encourage the belief of the people of Canada in public ownership. Nationalization can be a success only if it is carried on in the proper manner. The essential thing in making a success of nationalization is to choose the right type of men to control. I can only hope that because of the criticism which has been made in this house lately, much of which I believe is justified, the commission will be a little more careful in the way they conduct the business of radio in Canada.

Mr. EULER: I do not intend to make an address, but I should like to ask a question. During the rather interesting family squabble which took place on the other side of the house a few moments ago, I believe the hon. member for Dorchester made the statement that small radio stations of 100 watts or under are not subject to the control of the commission. I am quite sure that that is a mistake, and I should like the minister to confirm my opinion. I believe those stations are entirely under the control of the commission; if not, they should be.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member for Dorchester read only subsection (g) of section 8 of the act, which reads as follows:

> The commission may, subject to the approval of the minister, assist and encourage the construction of small private stations.

There is no doubt that those small private stations are under the control of the commission.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I quite agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Quebec East. All the stations in Canada are under the control of the radio commission. They obtain their licences, and they have to comply with the regulations of the commission.

Mr. SANDERSON: I should like to refer the minister to a question I asked him on April 28, on the orders of the day, in regard to the report of a speech that Mr. Hector Charlesworth, chairman of the radio commission, had made in Toronto on April 25. While I did not read the text of the speech, I gave in substance some of the statements the chairman was reported to have said. On that occasion the minister replied that he had no knowledge of the speech to which I had referred, but would look into the matter. I took the trouble to send across the floor of the house a copy of the Toronto Globe of that date, and the minister intimated to me by a nod of the head, at least, that he would look into the matter. I ask him now if he has read the speech, if he has taken it up with the chairman, and if he has endeavoured to discipline the chairman in regard to his utterances.

If the chairman of the committee will permit me I should like to state more fully the report to which I referred. The speech

was delivered in Toronto on April 25 in the Royal York hotel, before the advertising club. The chairman is reported to have said the following:

Vigorously defending the actions and policies of the Canadian radio commission before a meeting of the advertising and sales club in the Royal York hotel, chairman Hector Charlesworth yesterday challenged his opponents with the words of William Ernest Henley, "My head is bloody but unbowed." He declared that the commission would not deviate from the policies which it has formulated. "Anybody is a liar or a fool who says that radio in Canada is not in a better condition now than last year," he said.

"I have absolutely no apologies to make. We have a program which must be carried out. It is being carried out most economically. There is no doubt that the policies which the commission has adopted will soon be enforced in the United States," said the speaker.

I will not read any more, Mr. Chairman, but I should like to ask the minister, who I understand is in control of the commission and is the chief over the chairman of the commission; for no matter how eminent that chairman may be he reports or should report to the responsible minister of the department under which that commission functions—I ask the minister if he thinks that a public servant has a right to make a speech such as the chairman of the radio commission delivered in Toronto that night? Has the minister taken up the question of that speech with the chairman of the commission, as he promised he would? Has he advised the chairman that in future he had better control what he says when he speaks in public in regard to the position he occupies?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Does my hon. friend suggest that the chairman of the radio commission should submit his manuscript to the minister before he makes a speech?

Mr. SANDERSON: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not, but I think the minister, as a responsible minister of the crown, when a public servant under him makes such a speech as Mr. Charlesworth is reported to have made in the Royal York hotel at Toronto, should discipline him and tell him that in future he had better keep a bridle on his tongue.

Mr. POULIOT: He should turn his tongue seven times around his whiskers before speaking.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I think that ought to be withdrawn. There are certain amenities that should be respected. Has this parliament degenerated to that sort of thing? I just leave it to you, sir. If a member can talk that way about a man who cannot defend himself on the floor of this house, about his whiskers, then all I can say is that this parliament has reached a low level.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, Moslems consider the beard as sacred.

Mr. QUINN: Sit down, you jackass!

Mr. POULIOT: That sounds like Balaam's ass!

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is all right?

Mr. BENNETT: No, it is not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then you should protest.

Mr. POULIOT: Did you hear that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SANDERSON: I was directing a question to the minister—

Mr. BENNETT: I am raising a question of order which I desire to have dealt with. The observation made by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) is equally objectionable. It is my duty to try to remember something of the traditions of this house, and the observation made by the member for Temiscouata I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to have withdrawn, likewise the observation made by the junior member for Halifax.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member has already spoken on the point of order.

Mr. POULIOT: This is a different point of order, a new point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. According to the rules and regulations the language used by the hon. member for Temiscouata if addressing himself to a colleague would be out of order. Speaking of an outsider I do not know that I can call him to order, but I would ask the hon. member for Temiscouata and the hon. member whose constituency I did not catch—

Mr. QUINN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I made the remark and I gladly withdraw it. It was made in the excitement of the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: —at the same time I do not think I have authority on this point to call him to order. I would ask the hon. member for Temiscouata to remember one thing; in England the House of Commons is considered a gentleman's club, and that should apply to Canada also.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. POULIOT: Let him shave and I will withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. SANDERSON: Now that the storm has subsided I will come back to my question to the Minister of Marine. Has he drawn to the attention of the chairman of the radio commission the report of his speech delivered in Toronto on April 25, as it appeared in the Toronto Globe which I sent across to the minister? Has he taken it up with the chairman?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Mr. Chairman, in my estimation the president of the broadcasting commission has the right to defend himself against the attacks that have been made upon him by people outside of this house. He has been attacked; the commission has been unfairly attacked by papers in this country, especially papers owned by those who are opposed to state control of radio and the chairman has the right to defend himself. That is my view. I spoke to the chairman about this speech to which my hon. friend has referred, not because I wanted to give a lesson to the chairman, but only to have the information. He told me verbally that he had been misquoted by that paper. As my hon. friend knows, it is only part of his speech which is reported. But I hold, Mr. Chairman, that the radio commissioners have the right to defend themselves.

I am surprised to hear so much criticism without any single, serious fact or matter of reproach against the commission. I challenge my hon. friends on the other side of the house to give a single fact to show that these gentlemen have not performed their duties since they have been in office. We had an illustration of the quality of those criticisms from one member of this house a minute or two ago. He had been told a few minutes ago that the radio commission ruled that the manuscript of speeches was to be submitted to the commissioners before they were broadcast.

Mr. COOTE: By some people.

Mr. DURANLEAU: And when my hon. friend is asked who are those people, he does not know. Hearsay evidence is worthless. Is that fair to the commissioners? Are they not at least entitled to have specific charges? Why not give these gentlemen a fair chance? It is evident that there is no real ground for these criticisms. I am sorry that so much of the time of this house has been taken up with petty criticisms, none of them serious; and I say that the speeches of my hon. friends today in this house are the best proof that these gentlemen have done their full duty since they have been in charge of that commission. If my hon. friends opposite have no other charge to lay against the commission, I say the commission must have done wonderfully well because nothing serious has been uttered against it. This afternoon I gave the house a full explanation of what the commissioners have done since they have been in office, of their policy for the future, and nobody objected to what I said; no one criticized their program for the future. Everyone seems to be satisfied. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that these criticisms will stop, and I am sure that within but a few months the commission will demonstrate that they deserve the office with which they have been entrusted. My hon. friends say, "Well, some of them were politicians." I challenge my hon. friends to show one instance since the commissioners have been in office—and I refer particularly to the vice-president of the commission—in which that gentleman has shown any political preference to anyone. I think he has been absolutely fair to everyone. I repeat, they are trying to do their best to serve the people of this country; why not give them a fair chance for at least a year? This is a new business, a new undertaking. They may make mistakes; they are human, but they must be granted a reasonable time to show their competence to administer this new enterprise with success. I hope, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend will be satisfied with the answer I have given.

Mr. SANDERSON: If I understood the remarks of the minister correctly he said that he had brought to the attention of the chairman of the radio commission the report appearing in the Toronto Globe of April 28 of a speech delivered by that gentleman in the Royal York hotel, and that the chairman of the radio commission said he had been misquoted. Is that correct? Did the minister say he had been told by the chairman of the commission that he had been misquoted in that report?

Mr. DURANLEAU: That is what I said.

Mr. SANDERSON: Is that what the chairman told the minister?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have not entirely mastered the beautiful language of my hon. friend but I hope I made myself clear.

Mr. SANDERSON: I am sorry if I have misunderstood the minister. I should like to

know whether the chairman of the radio commission told the minister, his chief—because the minister is or should be over the chairman of the commission—that he was misquoted in this report. If so I am quite willing to take that explanation. Did Mr. Charlesworth say he had been misquoted?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have given my answer; it was very plain.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, I frankly deplore the suggestion of the hon. member for South Perth that this commission should be under the direction or control of any minister of this or any other government. Technically, of course, I know he is not subject to that control, nor does the act give the minister any power of direction or discipline other than the authority vested in the governor in council to dismiss the commissioners for cause.

As a result of the castigation the commission has been getting to-night—a castigation which very frankly I think was coming to it—I trust it will develop some tact and some character of administration in connection with broadcasting that will endear it to the people of this country, and make them have some respect for and confidence in it. I should like to see radio broadcasting so controlled by such a commission that, as in Great Britain, a debate of this kind could not and would not take place. I hope that day comes, but remember that after all the commission has succeeded in creating widespread distrust and dissatisfaction, and certainly it must mend its ways if the nationalization of radio is to be a success. I think all our comments should be confined, so far as possible, to facts; I agree with the minister in that regard. Personally I have heard all sorts of rumours. Some I have discovered to be quite untrue while others have had sufficient foundation to justify the attacks that have been made on the commission, as I said a little earlier in the evening. I do feel that hon. members of this house would be well advised to give this converted journalist, this excellent technician and this third person, whose character and qualifications have been eloquently discussed in this house by others who know him better than I do, time to get their breath, to sense public feeling in the matter and to develop a publicly owned broadcasting system along the lines sincerely desired by the committee last year.

I do think a mistake was made—I am free to admit it at this stage—in combining the administrative and policy-creating powers in one commission. It seemed almost impossible to avoid doing that, though I agree that it would have been better if we had been able to accept the suggestion advanced by the president of the Canadian Radio League, which was quoted earlier this evening by the hon. member for Quebec East. In my opinion the commission failed seriously in one respect; that was in not making it perfectly clear to the public from the beginning, and not after the trouble had arisen, that the million dollars in the estimates were not and never had been taxes and were not coming out of the pockets of the taxpayers as taxes. From the commencement radio licences have been a charge on users of radio receiving sets in order that they may secure certain services in the way of a check-up on interference, closing down interruptions caused by high frequency currents, telegraph stations, leaky transformers and so on. I could testify personally to the efficiency of the Department of Marine in that aspect of their work, but during the years when the Department of Marine was carrying on that work a large surplus of money was accumulating that should have been credited directly to radio broadcasting and radio users. I understand that it went into the consolidated revenue fund and was used for general purposes. I am of the opinion that sooner or later this or some subsequent government will have to see that this money does not go into the consolidated revenue fund but is kept separate for the use of the commission and is used freely by the commission, as it is in Great Britain. Again I direct attention to that illustration. The commission should be allowed to build up its capital plant and to develop along the lines that I am sure every Canadian wants to see. Unfortunately the commission let the newspapers get away with gross misrepresentation in this connection, and I should like to direct attention particularly to the Toronto Globe. Even after that newspaper had been informed of the actual facts in connection with this sum of $1,000,000 it persisted in carrying on, in its editorial columns, a bitter and vicious attack on the ground that this was an expenditure of public money dragged out of the public by taxes. This principle should have been recognized in the very beginning.

Now for a moment or two I come to the bill itself. Section 1 is distasteful; I do not think the elimination of the operation of the Civil Service Act in the matter of appointments is wise or proper. I am willing to concede that a difficulty exists in this case, however. For example, Mr. Chairman, when the commission decides to take

over an existing radio station they will find there the general manager, the radio experts and technical men and others, probably forming a most efficient unit. I grant at once, it is unthinkable that these men should have to go back to the commission to receive what one might call eligibility as the result of an examination, and I submit that if a compromise could be reached in the matter it would be the wisest step from the point of view of all interests concerned.

I suggest to the Prime Minister that in the consideration of this aspect of the matter, the radio commission be permitted to retain those persons who are sufficiently desirable and are now employed on the staffs of any broadcasting agency that may be taken over by the commission, but that all new appointments of any kind, from technical men down to stenographers, shall be made through the medium of the Civil Service Act. It is not fair to say that the Civil Service Commission is incapable of undertaking the necessary tests in connection with appointees to the radio commission. It has done it most successfully in connection with the experts of the Marine department who have been administering the Radiotelegraph Act and who were in that service before this commission was ever thought of. I have never heard any complaint against these technical men, and it is just a slight step from radio-telegraphy to radio broadcasting; the general principles underlying both are the same. So that I do not think it can be contended successfully that there are technical reasons why the Civil Service Commission should not function in this case. I am satisfied that with the co-operation of the Marine department and the commission it can be made to discharge its responsibilities.

With that one criticism I have nothing further to say against the bill, but I do suggest that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine would be well advised to consider seriously making the whole commission more like the British broadcasting system.

I disagree with the criticism launched at Mr. Gladstone Murray. It was my pleasure to hear him last year and I had the pleasure also of examining him on the committee. I met him this year again, and I think that as Canadians we can be very proud of a fellow Canadian who has raised himself to such a high peak of efficiency in the mother country. Personally I sincerely congratulate the government on having secured the services of Mr. Murray if only for a short time. I do not think they could have secured a better man for the work he had to do, and if his letter may have a tinge of the lecture about it, it is perhaps as well. There are many of us who need lectures on many matters.

Mr. MacINNIS: The Labour members present in the house when the vote was taken on the second reading voted against that motion, and they did so not because they were opposed to the bill in its entirety but solely because they were opposed to the amendment in section 1. The hon. member for Bow River has put our case so well that it is not necessary for me to say anything further in that connection. I agree with everything he has said, and with this part of the question disposed of we should certainly have no objection to the rest of the bill.

May I say that neither in the house nor outside have I ever uttered a word of criticism of the commission. I think we should give the commission an opportunity to organize radio broadcasting in this country. In the short time they have been operating they have done some very good work, though possibly they have also made some mistakes. Personally I am quite willing at the moment to give them credit for the good work they have done and to overlook the mistakes they have made so far. It may be that the discussion that has taken place in this house to-day will not be lost on the commission, but in saying this I must add another word. There is another commission in this country, the Civil Service Commission, and we should also give that body an opportunity to carry on its work, which is to provide staffs for these various organizations. As a matter of fact, we are every day robbing the Civil Service Commission of any dignity it may have had, and it is not to be wondered at if it does not function as efficiently as it is supposed to do.

We are not opposed to this bill in its entirety but only to the amendment proposed in section 1, the amendment to section 4 of the act. If some modifications were made in that regard, which would leave the bulk of the staff under the Civil Service Commission, we should have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. CARDIN: During his speech this morning the Minister of Marine mentioned the fact that an agreement had been reached with the United States in regard to the division of wave lengths. The agreement was made in 1932, and he said it was very profitable to Canada. Would he favour the committee with a copy of it.

Mr. DURANLEAU: A statement was made last session to the house by the Prime Min-

ister, giving the agreement in detail. It appears in Hansard. However, I will look into the matter and if what appears in Hansard is not altogether satisfactory to my hon. friend I will try to supply the necessary information.

Mr. MITCHELL: I think it will be generally agreed that the entire discussion on this bill has been political. On one side we hear it said that if the Liberals were entitled to stations so were the Conservatives. In my judgment that is absolutely opposed to the best interests of broadcasting in this dominion in its widest sense. If the allotment of stations is to be put on the basis of political parties, then why not go to the logical conclusion and throw the thing wide open and have complete chaos? I believe that anyone has the right to broadcast provided that in his material he keeps within the confines of the statutes of the country, because it must be remembered that radio is essentially different from any other medium of disseminating information or political agitation. It is comparatively easy to keep up a newspaper, or to rent a hall or, like the Labour party, to speak under the canopy of heaven; but broadcasting channels are naturally limited, and in my judgment the quickest way to destroy this great educational facility is to have it made a football of party politics. Frankly, I believe that the discussion in this house to-day has been a good thing for the nationalization of our broadcasting facilities in Canada if it has done nothing else than to clear the air and to teach members of the house and the people of the country that this institution must not be turned into a political football.

I would like to say a word or two in connection with the civil service aspect of the employees of the commission. This afternoon the Prime Minister made reference to the liquor control boards in the various provinces. I do not intend to discuss the boards in the provinces outside of my own. After all is said and done, the manner in which they approach any problem is influenced by the practical experience which we have had in relation thereto. Never since the inception of the liquor control board in Ontario have I heard of anyone but a Conservative being employed by that body.

Mr. MORAND: Why pick on Ontario?

Mr. MITCHELL: I live in Ontario and I do not know anything about the boards in the rest of the provinces. I am afraid that if power is given to this radio commission to have complete jurisdiction over the technical and clerical staffs, in the very nature of things the same condition will exist. Man being what he is, this will be the natural course. If the same policies which have been pursued in other provinces with respect to commissions absolutely divorced from government are followed by this government, there will be only one result. This question should stand far above the conflict of political parties. I believe that radio will exert an enormous force in the control of the destinies of this country. Its powers of education should be treated as almost sacred. There are many practical problems which will confront this commission and in my opinion the broadcasting of political information is one. Absolute fairness should govern in this regard and the rights and privileges of every political party, irrespective of colour or complexion, should be respected, provided its doctrine fits in with the framework, the constitution and the laws of this country. I would not like to see happen in the next elections that which has happened in the past in my province when those who had the most money got the best facilities and naturally had the best audiences. Now that radio is being nationalized, each political party irrespective of its financial standing should have ample opportunity to make its views known to the people of this dominion.

An hon. MEMBER: We will not get it.

Mr. MITCHELL: Someone says, "we will not get it," but in my judgment the people are entitled to that and they should demand it.

Mr. MORAND: Will the hon. gentleman tell me what constitutes a party?

Mr. MITCHELL: You should know as you belong to one. You had better ask that question of yourself.

Mr. MORAND: You do not belong to one.

Mr. MITCHELL: You do not know, you are just guessing. I shall support the third reading of this bill provided adequate consideration is given to the civil service aspect of the matter. I think it is within the intelligence of the government to so amend this section as to prevent the intrusion of politics into the permanent staffs of the broadcasting stations and the commission itself. There has been nothing but chaos in this country and the one to the south ever since the inception of radio, and I believe that this commission should be given ample opportunity to work out channels and wave lengths so that radio may be enjoyed by the people in every part of this dominion, not only by those in the larger centres.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is a provision in the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act which

had much to do with the unanimity which prevailed last year when the bill became law. Apart from providing for the appointment of a commission, the act provides that the governor in council after consultation with the provincial authorities shall appoint nine assistant commissioners, I believe one for each province. It would be the duty of these assistant commissioners to organize advisory committees in the various provinces and to act in conjunction with the private stations. There would then be a general council convened from time to time which would be composed of the members of the central commission, the assistant commissioners and representatives of the advisory committees. This council would formulate the policies of the commission and deal with such other matters as concerned radio broadcasting. I should like to know whether any steps have been taken towards the appointment of these assistant commissioners and the organization of these advisory committees. I believe it would be in the interests of good administration of the law if this provision was put into operation.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I explained to the committee that the technical member of the commission, because of his being detained in Madrid, was not able to carry on here until January. I explained that the commission had been endeavouring effectively to organize and to discharge its functions; that Major Murray came to this country at the request of the commission made through the government. I stated that he had made a trip through Canada unaccompanied by any member of the commission in order that it might not be said that he had formed any view which was in any sense influenced by the commission. The commission has been desirous of inspecting all radio facilities in Canada by visiting every province of the dominion but because of parliament being in session and the very unjust and unfair observations which have been made throughout Canada with respect to the million dollar appropriation, it has not been able to carry into effect its original plans. As soon as it is possible to do so, it is proposed to put the provisions of the statute into effect. I introduced this legislation believing as I did that the best interests of national radio would be served by the appointment of assistant commissioners. These men would not be paid officers of the commission, and they would surround themselves with those who would give a proper bent and direction to what I might call a high national policy with respect to radio—education, improvement in art, and all that goes with a more liberal appreciation of the outside world. I believe that that can best be effected through the methods that we have provided in the legislation itself, and that is why the provisions are there.

So far as the debate this afternoon is concerned it has to every possible extent that you can measure endeavoured to discredit the commission. The bill was taken up this morning; it is now ten o'clock, and I say that whoever looks at the record of to-day's proceedings with respect to this bill and reads what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to this commission and its efforts to discharge its duties, will certainly not believe that those proceedings have been such as to promote the interests of national broadcasting in Canada. To criticize a commission is one thing, but to give it an opportunity to work is another. Some hon. members may be under the impression that the members of this commission are office boys sent out by a minister. The minister has no control over the commission, neither the Minister of Marine nor the Prime Minister. In that sense they are not errand boys or office boys nor yet servants or agents. They are a commission appointed for a purpose, and I indicated what that purpose was. The commission present their report to the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Marine presents it to parliament, but to suggest that the commission must be called in and be told, "You naughty boys, you must not do so and so," is to do violence to the whole underlying principle of the legislation. There has been nothing in this debate to-day to suggest what I conceived a year ago to be an earnest effort on behalf of the Canadian people to launch a great enterprise, free—shall I say?—from the carping criticism arising out of acute political differences that apparently would destroy the commission. It is too bad. The whole debate this afternoon and all day has been sharp and acute, indicating divisions upon political party lines. Certainly every effort that a government could make was made last year for the purpose of avoiding that very thing.

As to the observation that was made by the former Minister of Justice and by another member this afternoon, that the chairman of the commission said that any man who thought so and so was either a fool or a liar, I have not yet received any evidence of his having said it, but if he said it I am prepared by a minute in council to indicate in the firmest terms that that sort of talk is not worthy of members of the commission. I am ready to do that in the strongest possible

terms because I realize that the public have no right to have said to them by anyone who occupies a position in connection with a public commission words of that character.

The way in which this discussion has been carried on to-day will certainly militate against the usefulness of the commission. Its task is difficult. Why? Because, I repeat, there is opposed to it at every point the powerful private interests of the American continent who do not wish to see it succeed, and who see here the greatest experiment that ever has been made because, in emulation of the British broadcasting system, we are endeavouring to free ourselves from all the difficulties and dangers that have followed upon private ownership. When I hear the hon. member for Melville make the attack that he did, and he was the only one, I want to say that the genesis of the whole idea of public ownership of these utilities came from Sir Adam Beck who was a member of the Conservative administration in the province of Ontario, and to-day the great hydro-electric system that has grown up in that province is the target for abuse and attack by every private interest on this continent that is connected with electrical energy and power. And, this radio is being made the butt for the same kind of attack, inspired and influenced by the same private interests on this continent.

If we are going to succeed we can succeed in only one way. Appreciating our responsibilities, we must realize what the stake is. Failure would be one more mark against public enterprise, one more failure on the part of the people to do collectively what the individual can do in private life, one more vindication of the claims of private ownership against public ownership. I am convinced beyond peradventure that if the Canadian people are to derive any benefit from radio they must continue their ownership of it as they now have it, and they can only do that not by sharply dividing the House of Commons on questions of pure partyism, by thinking in terms of Liberal or Conservative or Progressive, as I pointed out this afternoon, but by supporting the commission in its task.

I cannot conceive it possible that the former Minister of Justice was sincere in what he said this evening. I do not usually question his sincerity as he so often does mine, but I put this to him: When a member of the House of Commons is appointed to the bench and takes his oath of office, do I say I have no confidence in him because he opposed me in the House of Commons? I could give illustration after illustration of

appointments to the bench from the ranks of that party during the nine years they were in office. There was one case of a leading organizer of a great party in one province appointed to the bench, fresh from his seat in the legislature, and another case of a member of the House of Commons appointed to the bench. But would I stand in my place and say I have no confidence in the ability of that man to write honest judgments? He took the oath of office. And Mr. Maher took the oath of office that is the only oath of office you will find in the statutes because it made express provision for negativing those very faults that in practice we found had arisen. I have not lost confidence, for instance, in gentlemen that I have seen promoted to the bench in the country in which I practised law simply because they happened to belong to the Liberal party. During the years in which I was most active in the practice of my profession, from 1897 onwards, all the appointments to the bench in that country up until 1911 were made by a Liberal government, and made mostly from either defeated candidates or Liberal members of the legislature or of parliament, and I cannot conceive it possible that I could ever stand in the legislature or parliament and say publicly that I had no confidence in the bench because of them.

Yet here is a gentleman who was a professional man, and not only a professional man but trained in that profession which usually gives men a wide vision and a large outlook. Those who live in the great outdoors and carry on surveys and have to do with the natural resources of a country, the forest and the stream—no small insular views influence their judgment in the main. They are men accustomed to seeing the wide horizons, the deep forests, the great lakes and rivers, and they usually have wide and large views of the country and of their responsibilities as citizens. That gentleman was appointed to this position. It is true he had been the candidate of the Conservative party and an organizer in a small way in the district in which he lived. He was appointed and took the oath of office, and there stands the challenge that was made by the Minister of Marine and which has not been answered. There is yet to arise any living man who has said that since he took that oath of office he has acted in any way as a partisan. Think of the effect, not of an ordinary member of this house, but of a gentleman who for years was a minister of the crown, with all the authority that attaches to an ex-Minister of Justice, standing in his place and making the condemnation he did of this gen-

tleman. I say that that strikes at the very foundation of confidence. Then we have the magnificent spectacle to-night of a member of the opposition standing in his place and saying that his confidence in the commission was shaken because the chairman was not shaved, and deriding his whiskers. That is what parliament has fallen to. Now, one can ask oneself the question, in all seriousness, whether under those circumstances it might not be fair to look at the merits of this bill, just as it was presented to this house, with no ulterior object or motive. The letter dated May 5 which was read by the minister this morning suggested—I say suggested, because there was no endeavour to lecture this parliament—with a frankness which I thought did credit to the gentleman, means by which he believed certain purposes could be achieved.

I said this afternoon what I desire to repeat to-night, that in as far as section 1 is concerned I proposed to ask the Civil Service Commission if they have any suggestion to make as to how that situation could be met. For I say, in all frankness, that those who are charged with the responsibility should be able to select the instruments to effect their purposes, and if they cannot do it as to technical men, if they cannot get a broadcasting program without the assistance of the Civil Service Commission, what is going to happen? Do they have to have the approval of the Civil Service Commission before they may employ a singer, or a pianist, or a flute player?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The same old story.

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly what this means. It is all very well for the hon. member for East Hamilton to shake his head. But I say to him, as I said this afternoon, that what we are endeavouring to do is to remove that incongruity and make it clear that this commission may employ the persons it desires without having, for instance, what has happened in this house—

Mr. MITCHELL: Why not do that with the Post Office Department?

Mr. BENNETT: Does anybody suggest that in this house it would be the proper thing to ask who are the directors of a company which has a licence?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Why not?

Mr. BENNETT: Why so? It is not the business of the minister to write letters and to discover that fact. That is not his job.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is our job to find out everything that concerns the public welfare.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member's conception of public welfare is so well known that I shall not discuss it. He knows exactly what I mean,—just $100 per annum. Now, let us go one step farther: I just wish to say one thing more, and it is this, that just as sure as you are going to ask in this House of Commons, "Who was the announcer? Where was he born, and why—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: If you are going to ask all these questions you are going to have a complete failure. Can anybody imagine in the British House of Commons questions of that kind being asked with respect to their broadcasting corporation? There is a pattern to follow. We are endeavouring at least to make our institution worthy of it. I say in all seriousness, that I cannot conceive it possible that there could be in the British House of Commons a discussion such as has taken place this afternoon and evening with respect to our broadcasting legislation. It will be recalled that recently, in December, they did appoint new commissioners. Lady Snowden was appointed, and she was replaced by a Mrs. Hamilton. I forget who the other appointee happened to be, but I remember seeing it in the press. A letter was written to the press saying that this was not the fair thing to do, that the government had acted improperly. A dignified protest was made on behalf of Lady Snowden, and that was the end of it. That is the position. Anyone who follows the press of that country knows it.

I suggest that if we are going to give the radio commission a start, let us at least give it a chance. That is all I have asked this afternoon; that is all I have said. The protests which have been made by hon. members opposite would indicate that their love for it was so great they were willing to destroy it. They indulged in such violent criticisms of the commission as to arouse lack of confidence in and public suspicion as to the motives behind the operations of the commission in regard to this property. Not a tittle of evidence has been adduced in this committee by any person—I repeat, by any person—that in doing their work they were actuated by political motives.

So far as this section is concerned, I asked before dinner that it should stand in order that an opportunity might be afforded to consult with the Civil Service Commission to prepare a clause that would protect the commission on the one hand, and ensure that this body which we have set up might be able successfully to function and discharge the duties of a national broadcasting organization.

Mr. LAPOINTE: After those very nice, mild words of my right hon. friend perhaps he will answer a very simple question I asked him as to whether or not the government has taken any steps to appoint assistant commissioners in the various provinces to help the work of the commissioners, men who would organize advisory committees and would see that the object of the bill or of the law which was enacted last year is achieved.

Mr. BENNETT: I said they had not been appointed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Instead of replying to this very simple question my right hon. friend has complained about the violence of our criticism. We are used to the mild words of my right hon. friend and the suavity of the objections he usually makes against arguments or suggestions from this side of the house. Let me repeat that we believe in the nationalization of radio broadcasting. The work of the committee last year came as the result of an investigation made by a commission appointed by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin), the then Minister of Marine. It was the work of that investigating commission which brought about the report of the committee last year, and the legislation for which my right hon. friend is modestly taking the credit.

Mr. BENNETT: Pardon me; a committee of this house sat and made a report, and upon that the government produced legislation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend said, "I did it."

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have the judgment of Hansard for it.

Mr. BENNETT: You can see what it says.

Mr. LAPOINTE: However, we supported that legislation, and if the situation exists which the right hon. gentleman deplores, we are not responsible for it. I repeat, it is because of the work, first, of the government in the appointments which have been made and, second, because of what has taken place since.

My right hon. friend has said that as a former Minister of Justice I must know that judges have been appointed to the bench who were active in their respective political parties before their appointments, and that they are good judges. Of course, Mr. Chairman, but you will remember that last year we discussed the bill, and were all intent on having an impartial body. We wanted to have something in which the whole country would have confidence. It was suggested to the right hon. gentleman that the appointment of the members of the board might be made after consultation among the leaders of the different groups in the house. My right hon. friend said he would consider that suggestion, but if it were not accepted at least we could rely upon his statement that the appointments would be absolutely non-political. The members of that commission have to deal with something which is very important to every Canadian citizen. The broadcasting business has become part of the very life of all citizens of Canada. We all want to have a fair, square and impartial deal about it. It was the duty of the government to have on the commission men in whom everyone would have confidence. I still say that the appointment to the commission, as representing an important part of the citizenship of Canada, of a gentleman against whom I say nothing, but who was an active politician, who had not only been a candidate but had been organizer for his party in my own district for many years, for many successive elections, whose words I have myself heard on the radio abusing the party of which I am a member—I say that appointment was not keeping faith with what was said in the house last year when the house voted unanimously to enact the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act. I have nothing to withdraw of what I have said in that respect. I only hope that circumstances will be such that the confidence of the country in the radio board can be restored.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What do you want? My hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. Cotnam) seldom speaks, but he shouts interruptions. I hope he will not do so when I speak.

Mr. COTNAM: Mr. Chairman, I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement, as the member for North Renfrew did not happen to be saying anything at the time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure the hon. member for Quebec East will accept the word of the hon. member.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will certainly withdraw the remark; I am sorry my eyes and ears deceived me.

I hope my right hon. friend will be able to amend section 1 in the manner suggested; it would improve the bill to some extent. But

as my last word I repeat that I have nothing to withdraw of what I have said to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a remark or two.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The Prime Minister got off something a while ago and I want to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. There is a motion before the committee which is not debatable.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, that is the way they get out of it—take to the tall timber!

Progress reported.

Mr. BENNETT: If it will please the hon. gentleman, I may tell him that I have to leave for the hospital, if that is what he wishes to know. I have put it off as long as I could, but I was asked to go and that is why I am leaving the chamber now.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Post Office—Outside Service—Salaries and allowances, $15,381,845.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $14,161,500.

Miscellaneous, including $5,000 to provide for payment of compassionate allowance to employees injured while in the performance of their duties or to other persons injured while performing duties in any way connected with the postal service or in protecting His Majesty's mails, or to the dependents of such employees or other persons who may be killed while so engaged, payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, and payment of $205 to S. R. Kirk, $1,076,030.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, in 1928 prorogation was delayed several hours on account of a remark of the then leader of the opposition on the Lord Nelson and Nova Scotia hotels in Halifax. The Conservative party held up Mr. Veniot's estimates for over two weeks one year. I do not intend to do that, but what I intend to do, sir, is to have some satisfactory explanation from the Postmaster General. Yesterday evening he gave a statement about his accomplishments during the past year. I have only a few words to say. He said he did not accept my figures—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I ask the members of the committee not to listen quite so loudly.

Mr. POULIOT: It is their enthusiasm.

(Translation): As this quotation is in French, I shall continue my remarks in that language:

First, the member for Témiscouata stated that 662 postmasters had been notified that complaints of political partisanship had been lodged against them. Nineteen had sent in their resignation.

Were they cases of political partisanship? I put the question to the Postmaster General.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member repeat his question?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): With pleasure. So long as I am not obliged to repeat all my questions. Does the hon. minister recall that 662 postmasters were notified that complaints of political partisanship had been lodged against them?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes, so far as I can recall.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): And that 19 had resigned? Did they lose their positions because of political partizanship?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes. The 19 that resigned were postmasters that confessed to political partisanship. They admitted their guilt.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Very well! Thank you! Now, 606 post offices were closed and 321 new post offices were opened. Does the hon. Postmaster General admit that the 606 post offices that were closed were kept by postmasters appointed by Liberals or a different government than the present one.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member for Témiscouata will agree that it is impossible to answer on the spur of the moment his question.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I can understand that the hon. Postmaster General is unable to state whether these officials were appointed by the Liberal or Conservative party; however, on the other hand, were the 321 new post offices handed over to friends of this government. Were they recommended by members who sit on the government benches or by persons who are in charge of patronage in each county?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): By various persons. I suppose that they are friends of this government. There is nothing wrong in that—as they are numerous.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Then, sir, will the Postmaster General deny that he closed post offices kept by postmasters appointed by other governments than his? I am not only

referring to Liberal governments because postmasters appointed by Sir John A. Macdonald were dismissed. Does the minister admit that the post offices which were closed were kept by persons appointed by other governments than the present one?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I have not all the information in this connection. I could not give a complete answer. As to the new postmasters appointed under my administration, there are some who are not considered as friends of our party. For instance, there are returned soldiers, as in the Shelburne case —Mr. Kennedy—and others. I might also mention the Rimouski case, that of the returned soldier Couillard.

Sir EUGENE FISET (Translation): Quite so.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Would the hon. Postmaster General inform the house, whether the change of site of a post office is equivalent to the dismissal of the postmaster?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): That all depends.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The answer has the same meaning as "certainly and probably." I should like to receive an answer from the minister in this respect. When a postmaster is in charge of a post office and the latter is transferred across the street, without the postmaster previously being notified, I wonder if that is equivalent to a dismissal?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): That means that the site has not been considered as convenient and, therefore, a change is requested.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote to the hon. Postmaster General a letter which he, himself, wrote to Mr. Foran, the secretary to the Civil Service Commission, with reference to the post office of St. Arsène. It is in connection with changing the site of the post office.

As regards the absence of an order in council, I need only mention that, under section 7 of the Post Office Act, the Postmaster General has power to remove or suspend any postmaster and that this prerogative is not affected by section 52 of the Civil Service Act. This is a point on which the Department of Justice gave a ruling to the Civil Service Commission on the 24th of August, 1921, at their own request. Mr. Rioux's dismissal was, therefore, quite regular.

May I draw your attention, sir, to the fact that the hon. Postmaster General refers to dismissals of postmasters. I shall not insist further on the subject.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

There is, however, another matter which has amazed me, it is the statement which the hon. postmaster made yesterday. He said that 770 postmasters had been dismissed under Conservative governments—in the plural. He made that statement yesterday, May 10. Yet, on November 16, he stated that 814 employees had been dismissed in his department. He contends that they were dismissed because of political partisanship, bad administration, unsuitable site or other reasons, but this did not refer to post offices closed. It is a question, at present, that affects all the employees of the department, I recognize the fact.

I shall repeat the figures I gave the other day—it will be very brief: "Dismissals following threatening letters, 19; post offices closed, 606; change of site, 96; dismissals for political partisanship, 522; total of persons beheaded since August, 1930, 1,243.

The hon. Postmaster General stated yesterday, with reference to Sully, page 4849 of Hansard:

Mr. Sauvé: The case of Mr. Jean has been settled to his satisfaction. He accepted $100.
Mr. Pouliot: When was the case settled?
Mr. Sauvé: Recently.
Mr. Pouliot: What exact date?
Mr. Sauvé: Last week. The order in council was signed and the case is settled.

I wish to inquire from the minister on what date was the order in council signed.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The order in council has been signed and it is before the council. The memo to pay the sum is before the council.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Does the hon. Postmaster General consider that there is a difference between a memo of a minister and an order in council?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Sometimes, yes, there is a difference. I meant recommendation.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is it not a fact that a memo is signed by the minister and an order in council by the clerk of the privy council?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Always. The recommendation is made by the minister.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is the minister certain that it will be sanctioned by the council? I understand the minister sent in his memo?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member knows the routine and is perfectly aware of what I meant. What I state is the truth.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is not an answer, sir. The hon. Postmaster General may be sincere, however, I wish to show that he does not know his business and that the answer he gave me yesterday was entirely inaccurate. The following is what he stated: "The case of Jean is settled." That is an assertion; it is not "certainly," "probably," "assuredly."

Mr. Sauvé: The case of Mr. Jean has been settled to his satisfaction. He accepted $100.
Mr. Pouliot: When did this settlement take place?
Mr. Sauvé: Recently.
Mr. Pouliot: On what exact date?
Mr. Sauvé: Last week. The order in council was signed and we have settled the claim.

There was no order in council signed. I understand the hon. Postmaster General prepared a memo to submit to the council. I wrote to him on April 25 that the question of Sully would be discussed in the house; I requested him to bring the file to the house, and if he had brought this file, he would have been in a position to give a more reliable answer, when the question was discussed. Does the Postmaster General contend that Jean has been paid? He has not been paid.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I did not contend that he had been paid.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): He cannot be paid before the order in council is passed.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I contend that the department recommended the payment of $100 to Jean and that the latter accepted this sum.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): But he has not yet been paid, because I received a telegram to-day, sent from Sully, at 4.20 p.m.

Jean-François Pouliot,
Ottawa.
I have not yet received anything.
Isidore Jean.

Then if Jean has not received anything, the case is not yet settled.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The case can be settled without Jean receiving payment. It is an understood thing that he will be paid.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Has the hon. Postmaster General any guarantee that the amount will be passed by the council? Was the matter discussed in council; did the council state: we shall pay Jean $100?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I cannot answer that question and the hon. member has sufficient knowledge of the duties incumbent to a minister, and the discretion he must show, not to persist in his question, whatever may be the advices he receives.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am not persisting in any way.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I have a similar case to submit. In the parish of Ste. Rose, a returned soldier was appointed postmaster, two years ago. He was put to considerable expense but never got the post office. He was never reimbursed. I am wondering if his case were submitted to the council, whether he would receive the same treatment as was meted out in the case quoted by the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): If Mr. Jean is not paid before the next session, I authorize the hon. member for Temiscouata to then reproach me of it.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I have no need to be authorized by the hon. Postmaster General, I can do this on my own responsibility. The minister is not my tutor. I shall ask him but one question with reference to Sully: Why did he not submit this case to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member takes me so much by surprise that I cannot answer the question on the spur of the moment. At all events, if he will be patient, I shall give him the reason later on.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Was the box of Amédée Lesieur patented when the order in council to purchase 10,000 rural mail boxes was passed.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes, I think so.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Then I shall prove to the Postmaster General that he is wrong and, moreover, that he deceived the House on two occasions, on March 22, 1933, and on May 10, 1933. He stated on March 22, in answer to a question.

(Text):

Patented equipment submitted found satisfactory and suited to the needs of the department.

On May 10, 1933, that is, yesterday, at page 5203 of Hansard, he states that he did not call for tenders because they were new boxes, recently patented. The order in council was passed on December 12, 1931; however, the hon. Postmaster General's memo was prior to that date, namely, November 5, 1931. He then stated that the quantity of available rural mail boxes in the maritime provinces and Quebec were exhausted.

This box is a greatly improved one, is patented and cannot be purchased elsewhere,

and is particularly adapted to use in the postal service.

The minister states that the price of $2.75 per box is considered fair and reasonable.

The memo presented by the minister is dated November 5, 1931. Will the hon. Postmaster General state whether this is exact? The order in council No. 2799 was passed on December 12, 1931, and the patent 319,598 was granted in February, 1932. Now, sir, under whose name was the patent registered? Was it under the name of Amédée Lesieur or that of the Government of Canada?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I beg your pardon?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Was the patent for the beautiful casket, we have here, registered under the name of Amédée Lesieur or that of the Government of Canada which purchased 10,000 samples?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): It was registered under the name of another gentleman whose name I cannot recall; the sale was made to Mr. Lesieur regularly and legally.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If it were registered under the name of another person whose name the hon. Postmaster General cannot recall, then, I must insist that I be furnished with all the facts.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall furnish them.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I think that the officials who are at his side should know these facts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order! The hon. member should remember that we are not in committee of public accounts.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): No. Mr. Chairman, we are not in committee of public accounts; however, we are in committee to discuss the estimates of the Post Office Department. The case is similar to that of this morning, when it was asserted in the House —when the Radio bill was discussed—that the representatives of the people must control the moneys expended by the various departments. I know that the Chairman of the Committee holds those views.

I do not wish to be disagreeable to the minister. I am doing this to save him from trouble, annoyance and embarrassment. It is with this aim in view that I ask these questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Questions should be more to the point.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall give the hon. member the name of the person, to-morrow; I had it this afternoon, and, I think, I sent it over to him.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I shall send over to the hon. Postmaster General the first page (4206) of the Hansard of April 12, 1933, where Gilbert Viau is mentioned. There is a return, No. 292, S.P. 367. I would request the hon. Postmaster General to inform the house whether Gilbert Viau, final sorter into lock boxes, city delivery branch, Montreal postoffice, referred to in a question and in this return is the same person.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Has the hon. member not got his photograph?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): This is not a joke; I request the hon. Postmaster General to answer me properly.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I cannot answer such a question.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The minister cannot answer?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I wonder why the hon. Postmaster General cannot answer. In fact, I know he is the same man. I put the same question in both cases with reference to Gilbert Viau, final sorter into lock boxes, city delivery branch, Montreal postoffice. There is something very extraordinary, in both returns, I should like some explanation as I cannot understand them. In one, we find that Viau was born at St. Martin on December 21, 1884; age: 34. That is in return S.P. 367.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): He remains young!

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): He was born on December 21, 1884. I wondered whether the minister would notice that fact, and I find that the hon. member for St. John's Iberville (Mr. Rhéaume) is sharper than the Postmaster General. On October 24, 1918, Gilbert Viau was 34 years old. On April 12, 1933, according to the statement of the hon. Postmaster General, Gilbert Viau was 50 on December 21, 1932. On October 24, 1918, he was 34 years old, being born on December 21, 1884. On April 12, 1933, he was 50, he was supposed to have been born on December 21, 1882. This gentleman makes use of "Jouvence" water. This reminds me of a very brilliant child known as Pic de la Mirandole. He was two years old; some one asked him his name and age: What is your name? Zan! What is

your age? Two Zan! When Gilbert Viau was born, he was two years old! Now, sir, is Mr. Moffat still the owner of the Montreal post-office cafeteria?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Who is the owner of the cafeteria now?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Mr. Loiselle.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is he the hon. Postmaster General's chauffeur?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is he employed in the Post Office Department?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No. He is stoker (chauffeur), he stokes his stove!

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is he employed by a person named Laurent, who has a contract for the delivery of parcel posts?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, not to my knowledge.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): What is his christian name?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Guillaume or William.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): What is his family name?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Loiselle.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Why did Mr. Moffat lose his contract?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): We decided, at the time, to make a change.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Postmaster General could rise in his seat to answer my questions.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order!

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): If the hon. member will resume his seat—It was because we had decided to make a change.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member for Témiscouata is aware that a member cannot rise when another member has the floor, it is contrary to the rules.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I wanted to see whether the minister would rise, I would have resumed my seat immediately; I wish to observe the rules.

An hon. MEMBER (Text): Why not put the whole thing on Hansard, at once.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Macdougall) could speak French he might take part in the discussion. Meanwhile, it is better for him to keep quiet and when he does speak let it be with reference to the discussion.

Who delivers the postal parcels in Montreal?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): A person by the name of Ernest Laurent.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Since when has he been delivering them?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): For over a year.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): How much more than a year?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): A few months.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): One year and a few months?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Over a year, yes.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): who recommended Mr. Laurent to the hon. minister?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): He is a well known man.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If the member knows him well, I think he should give the house his name.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Ernest Laurent. He is the more so known, that he had this position, this contract, years ago. He lost it when your friends came into power.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): He will lose it again next time.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): How many vehicles has he to deliver the parcels?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I know that he has enough to do the service well.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): How many has he?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I cannot give the number. That is not my business.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): How much has been paid to Laurent by the Post Office Department since he has been on the payroll?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I have not the vouchers with me. The hon. member will admit that I cannot possibly have the public accounts with me. I was not notified that this question would come up.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is it a permanent contract—

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Temporary.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): —a contract for a specified period between the Postmaster

General and Laurent, or is Laurent temporarily employed?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): It is a temporary contract, by tender.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is it not a temporary contract, since October 28, 1930?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): That is possible, yes, in that month.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): At the minister's good pleasure?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Is it not a fact that Laurent receives 70 cents per hour, according to his contract?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): He now receives 80 cents per hour.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): 80 cents?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Has the hon. Postmaster General increased Laurent's salary by 10 cents per hour, since March 17?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member is not observing the rules of the house. We are not in committee of public accounts. We cannot spend the time of the house in questions and cross-questions of that kind. The hon. member fully knows the rules of the house. He may put questions and he certainly has a right to criticize all the expenditure of the department and its administration; however, it is not the spirit of the committee of the whole, of the finance committee to put cross-questions of that kind; the place for that is the public accounts committee. Let the hon. member criticize, let him request certain information, but I cannot allow such a cross-examination.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I have but one observation to make to the chairman: The minister who has his estimates voted with the least difficulty is the Minister of Public Works. We follow the same routine when he brings down his estimates; we put questions to him and he always answers.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I am not the Minister of Public Works, I am the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Would you kindly inform me, sir, under what rule I am debarred from questioning the minister when he submits his estimates? Am I obliged to make a 40-minute speech or am I free to question him on matters relating to his department?

[Mr. Pouliot.]

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member has been long enough in the house to know that a cross-examination like he has just made cannot be directed against ministers. He may criticize; however, the examination of accounts is discussed in the public accounts committee.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am not criticizing the minister.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Whether the hon. member has any ground of quarrel or not with the minister has no bearing on the matter; but the observance of the rules of the house has.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): What rule, sir, prevents me from putting questions to the minister?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I have no objection to the hon. member putting questions to the minister.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): You have no objection that I ask questions to the minister?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): This questioning might be quite proper in the public accounts' committee. In my opinion, it is discourteous and not in order in this committee.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, will you quote the rule of the house on which you base your decision?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): It is the rule which governs general discussion. I quoted it the other day in the house. I have given my decision. The hon. member has had the whole session to look up the rule.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If you wish me to deliver a speech on the subject, the Postmaster General will get nowhere.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): That does not concern me.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member may proceed and show that he is better disposed.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Yes, he could show a better observance of the rules.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I would request, sir, that you make allowance for his future good intentions.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I base my decision on rule 41, "decorum during debate."

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): What, decorum! In court, it is the practice followed by every lawyer.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): We are not in court.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): We are in the highest court of the country.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member is mistaken. The inquiry he is making should take place in the public accounts' committee.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The public accounts' committee is but a subcommittee of the house.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I am not seeking a lesson in parliamentary procedure from the hon. member, I state that he is out of order.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am not trying to teach the hon. chairman a lesson any more than he himself does to the judges when he pleads before them. At present, I am expressing my viewpoint and I contend that, as representative of a constituency in Canada, I am entitled to put any question to the hon. minister.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member is not entitled to put any question to the hon. minister nor is the minister obliged to answer it.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): In court, we cannot ask suggestive questions.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): We are not in court.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am, at present, discussing a point of law. The minister does not figure in this, it is just as if he did not exist, moreover, it is the usual practice, the minister does not figure at present—I am simply discussing a point of law, a question of principle.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I must call the hon. member to order. I gave my decision, he has but one thing to do if he is not satisfied: appeal from my decision.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): May I put two questions to the hon. Postmaster General, in this respect?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I am unable to judge. The hon. member is too old a parliamentarian, he knows that he cannot proceed in that manner.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Quite the contrary, it is because I know that I can proceed in that manner that I am doing so. However, if you insist—

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): That is not my opinion.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I respect your opinion, sir, however, I think you are wrong.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): If the hon. member is not satisfied, he may appeal from my decision.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Very well, sir, I appeal from your decision.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Very well.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I do not wish to be disagreeable to the chairman. As it is almost 11 o'clock—I have too much esteem for the chairman—he is aware of it also—to say things which would be unpleasant to him.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): It is not a question of esteem; it is a question of duty.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If he performs his duty, I carry out mine, in my own way. We are both sincere; however, we do not agree on this subject.

I shall ask the hon. Postmaster General why Laurent was awarded a temporary contract since October, 1930, and why tenders were not asked for such an important contract?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member knows that this is often the practice. The Laurent contract is renewable at the minister's good pleasure; I think it is a fair one and that Mr. Laurent has greatly improved that service; and, thereby proved a saving to the department. For instance, in the changes connected with our garage, at Montreal, we saved more than $6,000.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): May I inquire from the minister whether it was not to keep Laurent in suspense that no tender was called for and that the contract is temporary, instead of being for a specified period?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I have just stated it is because he gives a good service, I have no further knowledge of the matter.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Then, sir, I am not joking, I shall request the right hon. Prime Minister to continue this inquiry in the Court House, in Montreal, with the files that are there.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member explain his insinuation?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): It is not an insinuation, but an advice which I am giving to the Prime Minister. If he wishes to look into the matter, he can verify the facts in the files of the Montreal Court House. And should he not wish to go there, he had best send a judge or lawyer and he will be given all the details. As I am not allowed

to question the hon. Postmaster General, I shall drop the matter.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I request the hon. member for Témiscouata to further explain and not leave the house under the impression of his insinuation. Does the hon. member contend that Mr. Laurent is involved in certain court cases which renders him unworthy of occupying a position in the department, and, thereby, unworthy of having a contract? I wish to know.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I stated what I had to say. It is my turn to leave matters take their course.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member has already been before the court.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Yes, and I won my cases. Thank heaven! Come with me and you will see!

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 12, 1933.

The house met at eleven o'clock.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table a number of orders in council passed pursuant to the relief legislation.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table the authentic texts of the draft conventions and recommendations which were adopted at the sixteenth session of the international labour conference of 1932, in accordance with the provisions of article 406 of the treaty of Versailles and the corresponding provisions of the other treaties of peace; also the text of an order in council which has been adopted dealing with the competence of parliament and of the provincial legislatures respectively with regard to the subject matter of these draft conventions and recommendations. The texts of the draft conventions and recommendations, together with the order in council above mentioned, have been transmitted to the lieutenant-governors of the several provinces.

NEW ZEALAND BUTTER

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, under the order of motions I might be permitted to table a reply to the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) who asked at page 4746 of Hansard a question regarding the quantity of butter imported into Canada from New Zealand since 1930 when this treaty came into effect. The question is not quite accurate, and so in my answer I have divided the information into two periods, one period dating from the cancellation of the first treaty and the other period approximating with the coming into force of the new treaty. I would suggest that this be printed in Hansard as an answer to the question, as I promised the hon. member yesterday I would do so today.

BUTTER IMPORTATIONS

Mr. MARCIL:

Could we be advised of the quantity of butter which has been imported into Canada from New Zealand since 1930, when this treaty came into effect?

Mr. STEVENS:

The terms of the Australian treaty were extended to New Zealand by order in council and later withdrawn on October 12, 1930.

Canada's imports of butter from New Zealand entered for consumption from October 1, 1930, to March 31, 1932, with amount of duty collected were:

Period	Amount		Duty Collected
	Pounds	$	$ cts.
October 1, 1930 to March 31, 1931	2,532,696	652,799	47,996 35
April 1, 1931 to March 31, 1932	72,984	17,404	5,254 85

A treaty was negotiated with New Zealand and went into effect May 24, 1932.

Canada's imports of butter from New Zealand entered for consumption from April 1, 1932, to March 31, 1933, with amount of duty collected were:

Period	Amount		Duty Collected
	Pounds	$	$ cts.
April 1, 1932 to March 31, 1933	806,947	125,020	40,641 47

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SATURDAY SITTING

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister I beg to move the following motion standing in his name:

That on Saturday the 13th May, instant, the house shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning. That in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock p.m., there shall also be an intermission from one to three o'clock p.m., and that both the order of business and and procedure shall be the same as on Friday.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I understood this was a motion which would not be pressed without the unanimous consent of the house. If there was any prospect in the world of our getting through with the business to-morrow in time for prorogation on Monday I think it might be advisable to have this motion passed, but unless there is that probability it would be infinitely better I think to allow us to reserve our energies for next week. We have had a very busy week sitting morning, afternoon and night, and unless there was the certainty of our getting through to-morrow I do not think this motion should be pressed. I know that is the feeling of all hon. members on this side.

Mr. RHODES: Would there be any objection to having the motion pass on the understanding that we rise at six o'clock?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If we do not get far enough to-day to make probable a completion of the business by to-morrow night, I think hon. members will wish to have the week-end off, particularly those who had intended leaving the city to-night. I do not see why if we are to sit again next week we should come back here for part of the day to-morrow.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): I am sorry the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) is not here but I think I am expressing his opinion when I say that if there is no prospect of our finishing the business of the house this week, and I do not think we have any reason to believe that that can be done, I think it would be a mistake to ask the house to sit on Saturday. The members of the house have been working hard all week, and I do not see why we should sit on Saturday unless we can finish up the business. I hope the minister will not press the motion.

Mr. RHODES: In view of what has been said by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition and the hon. member for Macleod I shall not press the motion, but I should like to reserve the right to move it at a later stage in the day if it is thought desirable that that should be done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was just going to suggest that the motion be allowed to stand, and if there is any certainty or real probability of our getting through this week, I think everyone would be willing to sit until midnight to-night and to-morrow night.

Motion stands.

LEGISLATION BEFORE THE HOUSE AND TO BE INTRODUCED

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in order to get a correct view of what business remains for the house; there are still three or four orders which appear on the order paper, also two or three items of supply remain to be passed, then there are the French agreements and the shipping bill to which reference has just been made and redistribution. Are there any other measures apart from those that are likely to be introduced this session?

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): As at present advised I think there are no others, certainly none of a major character.

SEED GRAIN DISTRIBUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOSEPH A. BRADETTE (North Timiskaming): If my information is correct the federal government distributes seed grain in the western provinces. Would it not be possible in view of the large number of settlers who are unable to buy their seed grain this spring, that a distribution of seed grain should be made in northern Ontario?

Hon. ROBERT WEIR (Minister of Agriculture): The federal department does not distribute seed grain excepting under the subsidies of the province. The subsidies for Quebec and Ontario are used in one particular way on the recommendation of the people who are in the best position to advise. There is a small part of the subsidy in the west that is used to distribute newer strains of grasses which are returnable.

CANADA-FRANCE TRADE AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) if the report in the press is correct that a treaty has been signed with France; if so, will it be tabled forthwith?

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State): An arrangement has been made to sign the treaty at 12 o'clock to-day, and I hope that if the printers are up to date copies of two treaties, or rather of a trade agreement and a convention between Canada and France concerning the rights of nationals and commercial and shipping matters, will be laid upon the table within a short time thereafter. The bills to approve the same will by leave of the house, be introduced forthwith. I think one bill with its schedule will be printed early to-day, the other schedule is very long and there may be a delay of some hours in respect to the second bill.

GOVERNMENT LOAN, $750,000,000

REDEMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS AND PURCHASE OF UNMATURED SECURITIES

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill No. 103, to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I happened to be out of the house yesterday morning when this bill received second reading and was passed in committee of the whole. There are two or three observations that I would like to make and I would like, if I may, to direct a question to the minister. I have not yet had the privilege of reading Hansard so that I have to depend on what I have heard with regard to the statement of the minister yesterday.

I want to suggest to the minister that from this time on no bonds of the dominion should be issued payable in gold. I made this suggestion to the Minister of Finance of Canada eight or nine years ago. I am afraid he did not see fit to act on it at that time.

Mr. RHODES: I did not catch the suggestion.

Mr. COOTE: I say I made the suggestion to the Minister of Finance eight or nine years ago that no bonds should be issued payable in gold or in anything but lawful money of Canada. I want to suggest to the minister, if he has not already so decided, that the bonds to be issued under this act should be payable only in lawful money of Canada, not in gold or in foreign funds.

Then I suggest to the minister that these bonds contain a provision under which the government may call them in at any time. I think the minister will realize the wisdom of such a provision.

Incidentally, I also urge that our money policy be such as to maintain as nearly as possible stable purchasing power for money which is paid in interest to the bondholder. I think that would be one of the first steps to lower interest rates in Canada. I do not think it necessary to remind the minister of the necessity of lowering these rates. One step has already been taken by lowering interest rates on savings bank deposits. The chief factor governing interest rates in Canada, particularly on long term obligations, is the rate paid on Dominion of Canada bonds. I would just like to remind the minister that our public debt, that is provincial, municipal and dominion, now amounts to over six and a half billion dollars, which at an average rate of five per cent—I think we are paying more than that—means an annual interest charge of $325,000,000. I just mention these figures to impress upon the minister and the house the necessity of lowering interest rates.

Lastly, I want to suggest to the minister that the new loan should be floated at a very much lower rate of interest. I think he should fix three per cent as the rate to be paid on these bonds. I believe that rate is justified by the price level obtaining in Canada now. Whatever the government may decide as to the rate, the principle enunciated by the Prime Minister three or four years ago should be followed now, and banks and insurance companies, particularly insurance companies, should be compelled to invest a percentage of their reserves in such bond issues. I understand that the minister must meet this year treasury bills amounting to $110,000,000 bonds maturing, $169,000,000, and budget deficit $100,000,000, roughly $380,000,000 in all. My last suggestion to the minister is that if he does not get sufficient subscriptions from the public to cover this amount at the rate of interest I have suggested, he should issue enough Dominion notes to make up the balance. He has now ample precedent for that in the action which has been taken in the United States, where the president is authorized to issue three billion dollars of United States notes to retire maturing obligations. I think that as the government has been following a so-called "sound money" policy for the last two or three years, that of keeping our money good in the United States, the minister might now very well follow the United States precedent and meet part of these maturing bonds with an issue of Dominion notes. If public subscriptions are not sufficient, he should at any rate meet the remainder with an issue of Dominion notes. I think the rate of interest should not exceed three per cent.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Sullivan in the chair.

War veterans' allowances, $1,650,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was understood that under this item the members of committee would be free to discuss any matter they may wish to take up with respect to the minister's department.

Mr. RHODES: Mr. Chairman, the right hon. gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. COOTE: Under this item I should like to direct the attention of the minister to complaints that have come to me, and I suppose to other members of parliament also, from different soldier organizations. I think the chief complaint is that the scale of relief afforded by the department to pensioners has not been equal to the scale afforded by many municipalities to those receiving unemployment relief. I had a communication from the Canadian War Disability Pensioners' Association of Winnipeg in which they say:

> No clothing allowance is made to the needy pensioner whereas the civilians receive the necessary clothing in greater Winnipeg, either through the Greater Winnipeg Welfare Association or through the city council.
>
> Many of our needy pensioners have been out of employment for an extended period. They are not only needy and destitute but many of them and their families are without clothing absolutely to protect them against this climate. If they appeal to the welfare association of the city or municipal councils, they are told they must look to the Department of Pensions and National Health. When they go to the department they are told that there is no provision for clothing. The result is obvious. Many of our needy pensioners are without clothing, and it is impossible to provide their children with the necessary clothing to permit them to attend school.
>
> The matter of clothing is not a matter of minor consideration but a very substantial one.
>
> During the past week the temperature has registered in Greater Winnipeg continuously below zero ranging from 20 to 35 degrees.

Then they have another complaint with regard to dependent children:

> The scale of relief allowance to the dependents of needy pensioners applies only to boys sixteen years of age and under and girls seventeen years of age and under. If they exceed that age no allowance is made in respect thereof, even if they are unemployed and dependent, whereas relief to civilians is based upon the number of dependents in the family irrespective of age.

I think those matters should be cleared up by the minister before this item passes. While I am on my feet perhaps I might direct attention to the next complaint as well, which has to do with the purchase of fuel:

> Civilian needy in greater Winnipeg are enabled through a special arrangement by the city of Winnipeg to purchase their fuel at what might be termed "wholesale prices," in any event at prices substantially less than the retail price, whereas needy pensioners must pay the retail price which it can be conservatively stated is at least 25 per cent in excess of the price paid by the civilian needy on direct relief.

The first question I should like to direct to the minister is with regard to the clothing for pensioners in Winnipeg. Is the department continuing to pursue that policy of refusing to give a clothing allowance to pensioners and their families?

Mr. MacLAREN: The subject to which my hon. friend refers has reference to unemployment relief and not to war veterans' allowances. The committee will observe that in the vote for unemployment relief this year there is an increase of $375,000, and last year there was also a large increase. In past years it has not been the practice to distribute this unemployment relief during the summer months but because of unemployment conditions of late this relief has been distributed the year round, though to a lesser degree in the summer when the same expense is not incurred with regard to the provision of fuel.

The policy pursued in the distribution of unemployment relief at present is that the amount distributed to pensioners—and of course these are small pensioners, because men who draw large pensions are able to get along without this relief—shall be not less than the amount allowed in the district or municipality in which the pensioner lives. Conditions vary in different portions of the country, and there has been no attempt to fix an exact amount for all parts, for the reason that as local conditions vary the amounts granted by local authorities varies also. Substantially, however, there is not a very great discrepancy. When I say that the department has been granting not less than what is allowed locally, in point of fact in some cases it is rather in excess of the local amounts. In no case has there been a reduction. If a municipality has lessened its allowances the department has not followed suit.

I am afraid a general conversation was going on in the committee which prevented my hearing much of what my hon. friend read, but I gathered that he was presenting complaints with regard to the distribution of clothing.

Mr. COOTE: The distribution of clothing in Winnipeg, where no clothing allowance was given the families of veterans though such an allowance was given by the city to their own unemployed.

Mr. MacLAREN: The policy followed in Winnipeg is practically the same as that followed in several other communities. The department does not issue clothing; it has not been thought advisable to do so. It would mean that the department would have to go into the purchase of clothing and carry on the organization necessary in connection with its distribution. This would mean that such operations would take place in a number of the large communities of Canada, and this has not been done. Unemployment relief never has been distributed in the form of clothing either directly or indirectly but recently, following our policy of doing not less than is done by the municipalities, clothing has been distributed to pensioners and their dependents in certain centres, including Winnipeg. Provision is made for dependents up to the age of sixteen in the case of boys and seventeen in the case of girls, and that is in keeping with the Pension Act. Over these ages they are subject to the care of the municipalities. That is the view taken by the department. I can understand complaints arising with regard to boys over sixteen or girls over seventeen, because they do not quite realize the principles on which we are working; but we do not hold ourselves responsible for any dependents or children of pensioners over the ages I have stated. The department has been most careful, indeed anxious, to give as much relief as it can, and it has made an arrangement with local organizations, Winnipeg among them, whereby they purchase the clothing and distribute it, the amounts being paid out of this vote. On the whole, I think the plan has succeeded reasonably well, although we have received complaints which we have found to be quite inaccurate. On the other hand, we have had very considerable evidence of greater contentment and satisfaction within the last few months.

Mr. COOTE: When was the practice adopted of distributing clothing relief in Winnipeg? Has it been recent?

Mr. MacLAREN: In March of this year. It has involved travelling and interviewing on the part of the officials, and the making of many arrangements. The arrangement was made in March of this year, when the amount expended was $5,741. Since then, in the two succeeding months, the amount has naturally been less because the needs have been met.

[Mr. MacLaren.]

Mr. COOTE: The letter which I have was written before March and I have been waiting for an opportunity to bring this matter up on the minister's estimates. I regret that this clothing allowance arrangement was not put into effect in Winnipeg earlier than March because the climate there is severe and the pensioners have been under great disability. In regard to dependent children over sixteen and seventeen respectively, will the municipality give an allowance to the parents?

Mr. MacLAREN: I will not venture to speak for all the municipalities, and I do not think I am expected to answer yes or no to that question generally. I do know however that in many areas they accept that position. In any event, the department is not empowered to go further than the provisions laid down in the Pension Act. The position is accepted in many places, I daresay not in others; but it is partly because it is not understood and partly because they are not willing to accept that interpretation.

Mr. COOTE: I should appreciate it if the minister would have some of his officials ascertain whether that is being done in Winnipeg. If not, I suggest that the situation should be thoroughly canvassed between the department and the city officials there in regard to this point.

Mr. MacLAREN: I am informed that that is the case in Winnipeg. I know that when I visited that city some months ago the situation was discussed at a meeting attended by the mayor and representatives of various organizations. I am informed that Winnipeg accepts the situation.

Mr. DONNELLY: I understand that those returned soldiers who are receiving pensions and are living in the dried out district in Saskatchewan cannot obtain any assistance from the relief commission in that province because of the fact that they are soldiers receiving pensions. What steps has the government taken to look after these people?

Mr. MacLAREN: Unemployment relief has been one of the most difficult subjects which the department has had to deal with, and in fact the officials in charge of some of our large hospitals have told me that there is more time taken up and there are more difficult problems to settle in that connection than in all the rest of their administration. An endeavour was made to get this distribution to our pensioners and their dependents carried out through the provinces, inasmuch as they have organizations, and they have the unemployed who have to be clothed. The

provincial government of Saskatchewan has taken on the distribution of clothing to our pensioners and their dependents and has been operating since January or February—I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. DONNELLY: I am not thinking so much of groceries or clothing. What I am referring to is the fact that a good many of these returned soldiers are farmers and this is the time for them to buy their seed, as well as to make necessary repairs to machinery preparatory to putting in their crop. The relief commission will not give them any assistance because they are pensioners. What has the government done in such cases, in order to provide for seed and so on for these soldiers and to help them to make the necessary repairs to their machinery in preparation for the summer?

Mr. MacLAREN: The distribution of funds for the purchasing of seeds does not come under this department at all; it comes under the soldier settlement establishment or some other suitable organization. No attempt whatever is made by this department to meet that situation, but we do try to take care of light, heat and rent and, in a few instances where the municipalities do not supply clothing, we give some assistance. Our care is to relieve absolute distress and to help the men to carry on in the meantime.

Mr. DONNELLY: My object in raising this question is to bring to the attention of the minister and of the Minister of Labour the condition that exists in southern Saskatchewan. If a man happens to be a returned soldier receiving a pension he is worse off than if he were not in receipt of a pension, because without a pension he could get relief; he could obtain seed and be assisted in making repairs. If he is a returned soldier, however, the relief commission in the province will not come to his assistance for the reason that he is in receipt of a pension; they take the view that the soldiers' organizations should look after him. It is impossible for men in that position to get this measure of relief which is so much required at this time of the year in this area, where conditions have been severe in the last three or four years.

Mr. MacLAREN: I quite recognize the difficulties. Personally I do not care for the arrangement. I should have hoped, speaking for myself and not for the government, that ultimately the whole matter of unemployment relief would be administered in an entirely different way and perhaps through a different department.

Mr. DONNELLY: All I am asking the minister to do is to bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Labour in order that some arrangement may be arrived at to give these people a certain measure of relief and a certain measure of fair play.

Mr. MacLAREN: I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think the time has come when some further consideration should be given to the manner of dealing with unemployment relief for returned veterans and pensioners in particular. I have received a number of letters from the Non-Affiliated Veterans of Canada in Montreal. They write to me stating that they find that representations made to the department in connection with their complaints have been quite unavailing. Their letter of March 13 reads as follows:

> Following up our recent resolution to obtain justice for our disabled front line veterans who, because of their disabilities and unemployment conditions generally are forced to apply for relief to the Department of Pensions and National Health. We have held an open meeting for front line veterans, March 12, at 1877 Wellington street, Montreal. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:
>
> "Whereas, the total amount of relief granted by the Department of Pensions and National Health in Montreal and district to the disabled veterans is $30.60, this sum is with pension included, that is to say, that, if a man draws a war pension of $25 per month, he would be granted $5.60 plus $2 for each child.
>
> "Whereas, the average low shelter rental in this district is $18 per month.
>
> "Whereas, if a rent is paid the disabled veteran has only $12.60 per month to provide food, fuel, light, clothing and medical attention for his family.
>
> "Whereas, if a rent is not paid the landlord may seize and sell under authority of the Quebec lease law, leaving the disabled veteran destitute.
>
> "Be it resolved that the existing conditions are intolerable and that the federal authorities duly consider all phases of the situation and render a decision favourable to the disabled veterans, who have fought and suffered that our Canada may be the land of their ideal."

Following the receipt of that letter and resolution I took up the matter with the minister and asked a question in the house with respect to this situation. The minister assured me that an investigation had been started and would be pursued on the following Monday, my question being asked on a Friday. On March 21 I received a further letter from this same organization, which reads:

> At an open meeting for the front line veterans, held under the auspices of the Non-Affiliated Veterans of Canada, at 1877 Wellington street, Montreal, March 19, the following resolution was unanimously adopted and a

request was made that it be sent forward to the ministers of the government and members of parliament:

"Whereas, in view of the fact that the lower rate pensioners and their dependents in this district are facing starvation until they receive their pension cheques at the end of the current month.

"Whereas, we have already forwarded two resolutions to Ottawa outlining the situation in this district and have received no satisfactory reply from the Department of Pensions and National Health.

"Therefore be it resolved: that the Department of Pensions and National Health be asked to take immediate action to alleviate the distress that exists amongst the disabled veterans.

"Be it further resolved: this organization of service by veterans in France can produce concrete evidence that disabled veterans in this district are being evicted from their homes and have appealed for assistance both to the federal and municipal authorities and have received no help."

We would feel very grateful for any assistance you may be able to render us.

I found out that there was some sort of an investigation being held in Montreal by the department. I solicited further information from my correspondent, the president of this association, and his letter of March 29 contains the following paragraph:

An inquiry at the local relief office to-day brought no information as to an inquiry here into conditions. If there is any way in which we can be of service to you to show our appreciation, kindly let us know and we will try to oblige you.

The letter contains also the following paragraph:

The veteran in this district, according to a schedule issued by the department for a married man without children is allowed $30.60 per month which is divided as follows: rent $15; light $2; fuel $5; food, $8.60. This food amount must cover a month of thirty-one days. The result of this is that the veteran must use some of his rent money for food and other essentials, and so the landlord goes short and misery begins by way of bailiff sales.

I again communicated with the president of this association and under date of April 11, he wrote as follows:

I will try and give you some idea of the investigation or rather camouflage that has taken place. On March 22nd, I was requested to go to the D.S.C.R. and meet the district administrator for Montreal, Mr. Boyd. Upon arrival there with the secretary of our branch, we found the deputy minister of pensions, Mr. McKee and his second in command awaiting us. Mr. McKee informed us that being in the Montreal district and having received copies of our resolutions, he thought he would like to see us and immediately opened up a conversation regarding the relief question, the result of which we were informed that no more relief could be granted other than that he would ask Mr. Boyd, district administrator to canvass the civic relief authorities and other charitable organizations with the object of trying to get some clothing for pensioners and their families, but so far there have been no apparent results.

On Friday, March 31st, we were called back to the D.S.C.R. in reference to eviction of pensioners from their homes; which we had called to the attention of the ministers and members of the House of Commons in our resolution of March 19th. Mr. Boyd informed us he had been instructed from Ottawa, that upon sufficient data provided by myself or secretary representing the N.A.V.O.C. branch number one, Montreal, to the effect that a pensioner on relief was being evicted, he would take the matter up at once with the view of either having the eviction order cancelled or make arrangements for the man to get another house and failing in that, he was to report the matter back to Ottawa.

In dealing with the rent situation, the tactics are plain enough. In the past the average pensioner has been in the habit of buying his eats and other necessities first and leaving the landlord whatever might be left which we have, no doubt, would be little or nothing. Therefore, it is an easy matter for Mr. Boyd to go to the landlord and make arangements guaranteeing the rent of fifteen dollars ($15) as the administration intends making the pensioner produce the receipt for the rent before they grant him any further relief which means, in most cases, women and children will have to go hungry in order to pay the rent and draw the small amount that is left after that.

Coming back to the matter of investigation, I might state that we were not informed that anything of that nature was taking place so were not prepared with any evidence also the system of calling up members of different organizations and button-holing them at different times is no way of trying to solve the problem, but merely a means to find a loop-hole for the department of pensions to crawl out of.

I must admit that my only authority is my correspondent who represents himself to be the president of this association.

Mr. MacLAREN: Could I have his name?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): William G. Brookes, president, Non-Affiliated Veterans of Canada. I was not satisfied that this case was not like many others which have come to my attention where there has been exaggeration and at times misrepresentation upon the part of correspondents. I replied under date of April 12 and asked him to send me particulars of specific cases in order that I might have something concrete to justify further protests. I was forwarded a letter signed by R. Laycock and Mrs. Mary Laycock of Verdun, Quebec. This letter reads:

With regards to my relief, there seems to be a decidedly strong rumour about that we are to be subjected to another cut in our relief through the D.S.C.R. This hardly seems possible, and I wish to protest it strongly, when one stops to consider the cost of "bare" living commodities, that is with what we are receiving: $32.75 per month which, no matter how carefully one tries to manage leaves nothing for clothes, not to mention light, gas or rent.

I can readily understand that would be the case in Montreal.

Most decidedly it is my wish to protest this talked of cut in our relief.

That was something entirely new to me. On April 17 I received the following letter from Mr. A. H. Johnson:

Dear Sir,—I receive a pension cheque for $25 and a relief cheque for $5.60, making a total of $30.60 as the sole income for a family of two adults, my rent amounts to $15 per month and leaves me a balance of $15.60 to take care of all my other expenses such as food, clothing, medical attention and household necessities.

I have repeatedly complained that this amount was inadequate, both to the Department of Pensions and National Health at Ottawa and to the local district office but have received no satisfaction whatever, the department only answers that the pensioner on relief is in somewhat of a preferred position to that of the civilian in this district, but when one realizes that our municipal aldermen have stated that the amount of relief granted by the city is only sufficient to keep a person from starving, one may readily realize why there are so many children and adults waiting for admission to hospitals suffering from malnutrition and tuberculosis.

A pensioner is in constant fear of accidents or sickness or death overtaking one of his family. Where can he turn for assistance? Charity only applies to civilians in this district.

Everyone that I have interviewed in this matter, leaders of public opinion, have all been impressed with the situation and have all agreed that the matter is one for the federal authorities to deal with and the local Department of Pensions and National Health say it is a matter for Ottawa to deal with.

Faithfully submitted,
A. H. Johnson,
Pension No. 32910
Regimental No. 105344.

I have a further letter from Mr. H. Lafond, who states:

An average rent in Verdun—

This is simply corroboratory evidence.

—that is sanitary and decent surroundings for a flat of four rooms is $20 monthly, five rooms, $23 to $25, and six rooms, $28. Anything under that is old houses and not modern.

That was submitted by my correspondent or by the organization merely as evidence that $15 to $18 was certainly not a high rental to pay and it would hardly provide suitable accommodation for even these people who are in such serious circumstances.

A further letter from Mr. Frank Wrigley states:

On or about June the 15th last I applied to the local Department of Pensions and received relief for June and July to the extent of $21 for each month—

That is June and July, 1932.

—over and above my pension of $35 for a family of five. August the following month I was closed off all relief. I appealed to the local administrators and received a $10 loan on my pension. I was instructed to let my rent go as the landlords had been very lucky up to that time.

Rather amusing that he should have been instructed to let his rent go.

September of the following month I appealed to Captain Boyd, the administrator, who told me he could not advance me a further loan owing to lack of funds, he promised to send an investigator up, but the investigator has not arrived yet.

November, my wife in an advanced stage of illness, was suddenly taken seriously ill, I came home one night and found that she had been lying helpless for over half an hour owing to premature childbirth. I could not afford proper medical attention so was obliged to render first aid and dispose of the remains myself. I had neither food or fuel in the house, I kept the children home from school on that account. I sent a note to the principal of the school explaining the reason for their absence. I understand my letter was referred to the Verdun Protestant School Board. All I could obtain from the Pension department was a fuel order and was now obliged to beg and borrow from friends and run into debt with merchants, the same which I cannot see any hopes of paying and am being continually hounded for payment of same.

December I received and have been receiving since, a relief chit of $6.50 over and above my pension each month. After paying monthly rent of $20 which is obligatory under the ancient and obsolete law of Quebec yearly lease law, I have the magnificent sum of $21.50 left to provide light, heat, food and clothing, medical attention and other necessities for a family of five.

Then this trenchant sentence is added:

Will Mr. Bennett tell me how to do it?

He continues:

I have been without underwear all winter, also holes in my footwear, owing to being a chest case I appealed to Captain Brennan, chief medical adviser, for local department of pensions. Doctor Brennan informed me that was an economic question and a matter for further legislation, as there was no provision made for cases like mine, but from a medical point of view I should not be going about in such a condition. In answer to my questions he also informed me that in my case if I caught cold and took seriously ill I would be granted hospitalization with full pay and allowance, and in the event of my death my dependents would receive a pension. The present government are evidently firm believers in the old song "Old soldiers never die."

I have been notified by my landlady to vacate my present home owing to my inability to meet the terms stipulated in my lease. I am without funds to rent another home and am completely at a loss as to where I am going to stay, according to Captain Boyd no

further loans can be advanced to any pensioner who is on relief and distinctly told me I was up against a stone wall.

Hoping the same will be of some assistance to you.

I have a whole file of letters, some not so bad and some even worse than that. I hesitate to place them all on the record of the house, and with what I have already read I rest the case for these men. I want to ask the minister two questions, first, why he did not see fit to do me the courtesy of letting me have as soon as it was available, a copy of the report of the investigation that he promised me would be held—if he had done that, a great deal of trouble might have been saved—and, second, what is the report of the investigators?

Mr. MacLAREN: Certainly I shall supply all the information possible to the hon. member for Bow River. I do not wish him to have any feeling that anything is being concealed from him or any other hon. member. This matter was brought to my attention some time ago by the hon. member for Bow River and as a result an investigation was held; I think he already knows that. The assistant deputy minister made at least two visits there in order to look over the situation carefully. We also had a very distinguished social welfare official who, in addition to the local representative, studied the matter. The result is that the information gained does not sustain the substance of the letters which my hon. friend has read. On the contrary there is much to show that they are not correct. In the meantime I would ask the hon. member for Bow River if he would kindly send that correspondence to the department to be investigated as it is obviously impossible to answer it in the house. If he will do so, the matter will be carefully considered. I have under my hand from the assistant deputy a memorandum under date of April 5, which I might read to the committee. It states:

With reference to complaints received, alleging that unemployed soldier pensioners in Montreal were on the verge of starvation and that many were threatened with eviction from their homes owing to the inadequacy of relief allowed by the department:

I would advise that a careful investigation has been made and, as a result, I am satisfied that the departmental schedule of relief is sufficient to provide adequate food and shelter.

Regarding the threatened evictions, investigation has brought to light only one authentic case where it was subsequently shown that the pensioner had failed to pay rental although in a position to do so.

The departmental scale of relief in Montreal, to which pension may be augmented, when the need exists, is higher than that provided to non-pensioned veterans and civilians.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

As there will no doubt be further discussion on this subject, in order not to delay the house I have been asked to proceed with bill No. 78, and I therefore move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

The house in committee on Bill No. 78, to amend the Pension Act—Mr. MacLaren—Mr. Sullivan in the chair.

On section 1—Definitions.

Mr. ARTHURS: Mr. Chairman, this bill No. 78 as it appears before the house to-day is largely amended from the bill as originally introduced. Bill No. 78, in effect, is a bill to reorganize the administration of the pension department. It has nothing to do with pensions in the ordinary sense. It was found that after the amendments to the Pension Act of 1930 the courts as then organized became greatly congested, and in consequence an investigating committee was appointed in 1932 to inquire into the whole procedure. The members of the committee included five officers of the department, five representatives of the returned soldier bodies, and one judge. Unfortunately, perhaps, they disagreed on many points, but in some essential points they were in entire agreement, and based on their report the original Bill No. 78 was introduced and was afterwards sent to a committee of this house of which I had the honour to be chairman.

The unanimous opinion of the committee of 1932 was that there should be only one court of first instance, thus shortening the procedure. This court, according to the bill as it was first presented to this house, was to be completed by an enlargement of the board of pension commissioners. Hon. gentlemen will see by the amended bill that our committee have recommended that a new body be formed to be called the Canadian pensions commission, this body to consist of not less than eight or more than twelve persons, in order that there may be sufficient personnel to carry out the idea of the present quorums and be able to meet the soldier at home. That principle has been consistently followed throughout the bill. Therefore the board of pension commissioners as at present existing and also the tribunal will be done away with by this act.

There are other essential changes, not necessarily amendments, but in the bill itself. I might refer to the reviewing officer, which was

another very important feature and was very thoroughly considered by your committee. The reviewing officer under this bill is a man appointed for the purpose of protecting the public to a certain degree, and also of seeing that justice is done the returned soldier. In the past objection to the judgments of the various quorums has been taken by various persons, largely employees of the board of pension commissioners. This was objected to, and in the original bill it was suggested that the reviewing officer should be placed under the control of the pension appeal board. This would apparently be more satisfactory, but it has been considered better to have an entirely independent officer, and so it will be found that in the amended bill as presented to the house to-day this official is to be appointed directly by the governor in council and to be responsible to no particular body.

So far as the pension appeal court is concerned the recommendation of the committee of last year was followed. It was found that in that court there are at the present time between 1,300 and 1,400 cases awaiting appeal, far too much work for one quorum. This bill therefore provides that ad hoc members may be added, some judge who shall be paid only for the time engaged, thus allowing two quorums to be formed and two courts to be working at the same time, and in this way it is quite possible that they will be able to catch up with the congestion.

The most important part of the whole bill and of this legislation is that we have probably not yet reached the peak of our pension troubles. There are at the present time 1,490 cases already prepared to come before the tribunals, and these cases are coming in at the rate of approximately 3,000 per year. So the committee will understand how necessary it is that these quorums should be able to carry on and help to relieve the congestion at the earliest possible moment. I may also say in passing that if our recommendations are carried out and this measure meets with the approval of this committee a good deal of the red tape in connection with the trial of these cases will be done away with. There will be a great deal less formality and that will be much better for the returned men.

In conclusion, I think I voice the opinion of every member of the committee in saying that the work was done by your committee most earnestly and with no desire except to serve the interests of the public and at the same time the interests of the returned men. Not only that, but I think that in every change, certainly in every material change, we were absolutely unanimous, and had the entire concurrence of the representatives of each of the veteran bodies, all of whom were present at the hearings.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word or two of concurrence with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs), the chairman of the committee on pensions. The committee may recall that I was personally responsible, when the original Bill No. 78 was first brought to the house for the suggestion that this bill should be referred to a special committee. And I think if ever a course was justified it was that course, because there is a tremendous difference between Bill No. 78 now before the committee and the bill in its original form. The main changes, as stated by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, have been endorsed by the unanimous vote of the committee, with certain reservations which can be expressed during the discussion, and also endorsed by the bodies of ex-servicemen representing all the organized associations in Canada. So while we have all received numerous letters and telegrams from the various provinces protesting against Bill No. 78 as introduced, I think generally speaking the bill now before the committee should give satisfaction. Speaking only for myself I may say quite frankly that I would have preferred to see the present legislation functioning for at least another year, but seeing that the majority of the investigating committee last year, the Audette commission, including General Ross and Colonel Sherwood, recommended legislation along this line, possibly there was substantial reason for change. I wish to make one observation, that we have adopted in the first place the principle of merger between the board of pension commissioners and the tribunals. Most of the telegrams received have objected to abolition of the tribunals and retaining the board. I ask the committee to observe that these objections have been met by your subcommittee. The new body, the Canadian pension commission, is to consist of not less than eight and not more than twelve, in the discretion of the governor in council. I think I am voicing the opinion of the committee in saying that although the number of members is left to the discretion of the governor in council, the number of cases now awaiting decision or coming up for hearing in Canada absolutely justifies the number being twelve instead of eight. But that is left to the discretion of the governor in coun-

cil who will be acquainted with the number of cases calling for attention. The hope of the committee is that this legislation will largely remove the congestion referred to in the report of last year and also will remove the unsatisfactory condition that prevailed in regard to the number of appeals taken. A very important feature of this bill is that there is no appeal from a favourable decision of the commission as such, that is a decision favourable to the applicant. There is an appeal from the travelling quorum which hears cases throughout the country. And the reviewing officer, who in the old bill was subject to the appeal court, is now an independent officer subject only to the governor in council. He will advise which of the cases in which judgment has been given in favour of the applicant by the quorum in the field should be appealed by the crown. So I think the legislation in general should work in the interests of the veterans. We have endeavoured to ensure that the personnel of the tribunals and of the board of pension commissioners shall have equal chances in the discretion of the governor in council, and also that the clerks and under-staff shall be in the same category. So that the objections which we have all been receiving from our various ridings have been as far as possible met by the committee.

May I say in conclusion that I agree with the hon. member for Parry Sound that the spirit manifested by every single member of that committee was a desire to serve the best interests of the ex-servicemen, consistent of course with the interest of the state.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would not be out of place if I follow somewhat on the line taken by the two hon. members who have preceded me, that is make a somewhat general statement, on this first clause of the bill, as to the nature of the changes which were made and our reasons for making them.

As the house is well aware, the legislation of 1930 was the result of the recommendations of a committee of this house which worked I think very diligently and very carefully. As a result of the labours of that committee the entire administration of the act was changed in 1930 and a new body was appointed called the pensions tribunal, having in mind this important feature, the desire of the applicants and all those interested in them that cases should be heard in the different parts of the country and that those claiming pension should have the opportunity to appear in person and have their cases dealt with in that way. This was brought into effect. The number of cases was so great that the original tribunal of nine, which provided for four quorums of two and a chairman, were found insufficient, and later three temporary members were added, whose terms I think expire this year, making a body of five quorums, with the possibility at times of six in case of congestion. We had hoped that this would have settled the matter and brought permanent satisfaction, but it did not. Complaints became widespread on two main grounds; first as to congestion and delay, and second as to the great number of appeals taken from the decisions of those travelling courts. So we met again, the intersessional commission having meantime gone into the matter. I think I can agree fully with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in expressing my appreciation of the government's action in acceding to our request and referring Bill No. 78 to this committee, and secondly in expressing my opinion, which I think will be generally shared, that that request and that action were amply justified by the changes which have been made in the bill. I assume that every member of the house, like myself, has been in receipt of various letters and telegrams and resolutions during the last few weeks, based upon the bill as at first presented, and protesting against what they looked upon as the abolition or partial abolition of the tribunal. One feature was demonstrated very markedly throughout last year, that whatever other dissatisfaction there was, the men were very well pleased with that feature which provided an open court and gave them the opportunity of appearing in person. That was the one feature of the 1930 legislation against which no complaints were brought, and which the men desired to have perpetuated. Bill No. 78 as brought down provided for the merging of those two bodies, or rather the disappearance of the tribunal by its merging into the pension commission. It provided that instead of the present bodies, the board of pension commissioners with three members and chief medical officer, who I think by order in council is now a member, making four members of the board of pension commissioners, and twelve members of the tribunal, nine being permanent and three temporary, there should be one body consisting of eight members, and that it should be composed of the present board of pension commissioners in full, appointed for a term of years to complete the term for which they are now appointed, I think seven years, and four members of the tribunal to be appointed for three years only as stated in the statute. May I say quite frankly that many of us felt that this was

not entirely satisfactory, because it did provide, first for diminution in numbers and second for the total disappearance of the tribunal in three years. To this we could hardly agree. However, as has been the case in the past, and as I am glad to say has always been the case in every pensions committee brought together in this house, in spite of divergent opinions when the committee met, in spite of various ideas held, we presented a unanimous report, one in which we all concurred, in which we all agreed. It must be pointed out, however, that in the report of this committee with regard to the organization of the new board a great deal is left to the discretion of the governor in council. As has been said, the bill as brought down provides that this new body, under this new name, shall consist of not less than eight or more than twelve members. May I say that it was my opinion, and I think the opinion of many others, that in view of the work which had been done and the work which apparently must be done, a minimum of twelve would be absolutely necessary.

May I present the situation, Mr. Chairman. Up to the present time we have had the board of four pension commissioners performing their duties faithfully and conscientiously. They have been working hard, and I think they have done as much work as four men could do. Then we have had twelve members of the tribunal in the field, also working hard, hearing every case they could, but still the congestion was not overtaken. Under this new legislation, before the present amendments, provision was made for a total of eight members. Assuming that four members would be required to carry on the work of the commission as it has been carried on heretofore that would leave only four members, or two travelling quorums, available for work in the field. I think it is obvious that at the present time at least two quorums could not do the work which five quorums failed to do.

My main purpose in speaking at this point, Mr. Chairman, apart from my desire to concur in the statement that we were in accord in our final report, is to urge upon the governor in council the necessity of using the discretion here conferred by appointing the full number of twelve in the first place. Without going into statistics, and without wasting the time of the committee by quoting figures, may I state the facts briefly. Last year some 3,200 new cases were brought forward and sent to the tribunals for their attention. During the same period the five, and at times six, travelling quorums finally disposed of some 3,600 cases. It has been suggested, not only by members of the committee but in remarks made by members of the pension appeal court, that the travelling quorums of the pension tribunal, in their anxiety to overtake their work, perhaps had been acting too hastily and had not devoted sufficient time to each case. I think they averaged about five cases per day, and it was suggested and urged from many sides that four cases a day was as much as any one quorum could properly handle. So it is a very simple problem in mathematics to work out how many cases per year can be dealt with by so many quorums, and I think it will be agreed by most hon. members that four quorums is the least that can really handle this work. It is true that we agreed to leave this matter to the discretion of the governor in council in order that the bill might be satisfactory, but I should like to urge the governor in council to use their undoubted discretion and the knowledge which they possess to make certain of two things: First, that this congestion will not reappear, that the numbers will be adequate and the personnel satisfactory, and second, that the complaints which have been made so frequently as to the number of appeals taken from the decisions of those quorums—now that those appeals will be within their own discretion and on their own responsibility—will be brought forward no longer.

I am glad to have been able to take part in this discussion; I hope that this bill, properly interpreted and administered, will end many of the complaints that have been made and give satisfaction both to the returned men and the taxpayers. As the different sections come forward, of course, they can be discussed in detail and I may have something more to say then.

Mr ROSS: With the principle of the bill so ably presented I am in accord. I could not be otherwise, since it is practically the method I proposed to the committee in 1930. That proposal was turned down; it was decided to enter upon the experiment which we are now discarding, and that experiment has cost this government and this country $1,371,000 in cash. The tribunal was not a name of which I was very fond, because returned men always liked the name "pension board." Owing to the difficulties which have arisen ever since the close of the war many returned men felt that the pension board was not sufficiently sympathetic to their applications, but now that this bill proposes to change the name it may be, and I trust will be, that a better feeling will exist among the returned men.

I have always felt, Mr. Chairman, that our legislation was good. No other country has pension legislation equal to that of the Dominion of Canada, but the trouble has been that somewhere the administration fell down. I am sure that any person who served on any of the committees appointed since 1922 has felt that there was some sort of antagonism or lack of cooperation on the part of the different organizations. That became very acute when we introduced the tribunals and the appeal court. Now these two bodies have been merged, and I hope we can look for a more sympathetic administration of the act.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, I think difficulties have existed with regard to the administration. I directed the attention of the committee to a lack of consideration which, if rectified, perhaps would clear up some of those difficulties. It was stated during one of our meetings that in notifying an applicant that his application had not been accepted, the name and address of the person concerned with appeal appeared on that notice. I disputed that statement. I have before me one of the forms sent out in such cases, which is as follows:

> I am directed to inform you that the act of 1931 amending the Pension Act provides:
> "Should the application be not granted the commission shall refer the case to the chief pensions advocate and the chief commission counsel for presentation to the pension tribunal if the applicant or any person on his behalf duly authorized so requests in writing."

When that notice is received very often the person interested does not know what it means, and many of these notices are not answered. As a result, many applications are lying there inactive. I would direct the attention of those in charge of the administration of this legislation to the fact that some effort should be made to get rid of these ten or twelve thousand cases now in the inactive list. It might be that if these cases were divided up as between different areas the persons concerned could be advised by advertisement that no action had been taken with regard to their applications and that, if they would get in touch with some official of the commission, they would be informed more definitely as to what might be done. I am perhaps more interested in this phase of the question than in anything else. We have still kept the principle of examination and inspection, and with a little more trouble, and more details given in the paper sent to the applicant who has failed, I think we could clear up a good many of these ten thousand cases.

Mr. MacLAREN: I wish to express my complete appreciation of the work of the committee. They have come together on this bill and have been very thorough and assiduous in their duties. The work they have done has shown a fine spirit of unity on a subject in regard to which there are so many diverse opinions. I was visited yesterday by representatives of the Associated Veterans. They came to inform me, as representing their organizations, that the bill met with their complete approval. Both of these factors, both the finding of the committee and the representations from the Associated Veterans, are undoubtedly gratifying and will encourage the department to do its best in carrying out its part. In any case, it is reassuring. Finally, if I were making any general observations, I would ask for the fuller confidence of parliament, of the returned men and of the public generally in the administration of this act. I believe it is warranted; I do not think it would be misplaced but on the contrary would have a very beneficial effect not only on the department but on the feeling of the people throughout the country.

Mr. GEARY: What the minister has just said is something which I think should be borne in mind by this committee, namely, that the soldiers' organizations as represented before the committee undoubtedly displayed a spirit of conciliation and of compromise, and evidenced an endeavour to arrange the matter having in mind not only their own interests but the interests of the taxpayers as well.

There have been two main troubles with the administration up to date; one was congestion in the hearings by the tribunals and the other was the appeal. The appeal was probably the sorest point of all and it arose because the commission was really appealing on its own behalf. Perhaps what has been said had some basis in truth; the soldiers felt that the sympathy of the commission was not always with them. The commission appealed without knowing what it was appealing on in many cases. There was pressure at times, the record was not always available, and appeals were put in without regard to whether they were justified or whether there was proper cause of appeal or not.

The merit of this bill, to my mind, is this. The number of appointees may be eight or twelve, and hereafter such matters as delay or congestion in the first court, and the question of appeal from that court, will be up to the governor in council. That is the essential feature of the bill as we now have it. There is no delay anywhere at all except in the officials appointed by the governor in council.

They may appoint enough or they may appoint too few members to go about the country hearing cases. Further, either the reviewing officer is proper and right in advising appeal or he is derelict in his duty in advising too many appeals, in which case the governor in council will have to stand the brunt of the criticism that may be brought to bear.

These are the achievements of the committee; these are the things that the house will have achieved in passing this bill. The soldiers have had good cause for complaint in a great many instances, but I believe that the opinion of the country is still in favour of all the promises made to these men being carried out. There is no disposition on the part either of the country or of this government to cut them down. We hear occasionally of pensions having been wrongly granted to persons—men who did not deserve them. May I point out, however, that this is not to be laid at the door of the soldiers. Pensions may have been badly awarded, there may have been injustice in that direction; but that to my mind has been the fault of administration in the granting of pensions and not a fault which must be laid at the door of the soldiers' organizations. They simply desire to see that the soldier shall get a fair deal in the matter of pensions.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am happy to associate myself entirely with the remarks of the other members of the committee, and I am particularly happy to concur fully in the very able remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Canadian Pension Commission.

Mr. DUFF: This is the section referring to the change in the act to provide that instead of there being a pension commission and also a pension tribunal these two bodies shall be amalgamated and a commission to be known as the Canadian pension commission appointed. I notice in subsection 2 of section 3 that the number of commissioners to be appointed by the governor in council must be not fewer than eight though it may be increased to twelve. While every right-thinking man in this country is willing to see that every consideration is given to the claims of the returned soldiers and that the amounts due them for pensions are paid, nevertheless it seems to me, in view of the magnitude of the amount which this country is voting every year for pensions to returned soldiers, that the government in the present condition of the country's finances should carefully consider what action ought to be taken in connection with this section of the bill.

In the past we have had a board of pension commissioners, and I do not think that anyone who has taken any interest in the work of this commission will deny them credit for the splendid work they did during the number of years they functioned. It is rather strange to me to hear some hon. members say, in spite of the fact that, in addition to the board of pension commissioners which for so many years carried out its work so well in the interests of the returned soldiers, and the fact that an additional body of twelve men was appointed after the act was amended in 1930, that now there are more complaints and more claims than there were when the work was done entirely by the pension commission. It seems to me that while everyone is anxious to do everything that is reasonable and possible for the returned soldiers, the government should be very careful to take every step it possibly can to economize in this matter. Let me say to the Acting Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, that in my opinion it is necessary to try first how well the work will be done by eight men, before the additional four are appointed. Before those additional four are appointed, making twelve in all, the governor in council should make an experiment with eight men. It seems to me it would be in the interests of economy to appoint the three pension commissioners. These men know the work and could be appointed with advantage. It seems to me it would also be in the interests of the taxpayers of this country to provide only for a board of eight, which would be sufficient to carry on the trials.

This pension commission has been acting for a great many years and in the main has given satisfaction not only to the people of this country but to the returned soldier. It is quite true that there has been criticism of certain amounts paid to returned soldiers, but that is to be expected in the administration of such vast sums of money. There have been criticisms made that they have not always given the amounts which the returned soldiers or the men at the head of the organizations demanded, but it seems to me that that should be in their favour. In any business it is impossible to satisfy everyone and the Minister of Finance and every member of this committee knows that where government money is concerned, either for this or any other purpose, there is sometimes a temptation to ask for more than should be given. It seems to me that the members of parliament are as much to blame as anyone

else for the fact that since this act came into force a number of years ago we have spent vast sums of money and are to-day spending something like $55,000,000. I am not averse to spending every dollar that is necessary, whether it be $55,000,000 or $100,000,000, but the Minister of Finance has to find ways and means of raising the revenue and in view of the conditions prevailing at the moment I think every effort should be made to see that no money is paid to returned soldiers which is not deserved. I suggest to the Minister of Finance that a complete investigation be made into the payments to returned soldiers. This could be made either through this pension commission or in some other way. I am convinced that many men are receiving pensions who should not receive them while there are other poor devils receiving amounts entirely inadequate. If the whole matter was gone into I am quite convinced that the Minister of Finance would be able to save tens of millions of dollars.

The pension commission and the tribunal boards will go out of office immediately this bill receives royal assent. In view of the good work done in the past by the pension commission, I think in the appointment of these eight officials first choice should be given to the three members of the present pension commission. After a man has been engaged in a certain line of work for a number of years it is pretty hard for him to go back to something else upon being thrown out on the street. I should like the Minister of Finance to give serious consideration to this matter. Why do I say this? First, for the reason I gave a moment ago, that these pension commissioners have given the best years of their lives to this work. Of course, there is bound to be criticism in the expenditure of such a vast sum of money but the fact remains that these pension commissioners are in a position entirely different from that of the members of the tribunal boards. These boards were a new experiment and they have been in operation for only a few years. If the minister cannot make a definite statement to-day I ask him to take into consideration the appointment of the present commissioners to the new pension commission.

Mr. RHODES: In administering subsection two of section 3 I am sure it will be the purpose of the governor in council to keep in mind the considerations which have been presented to the committee by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff). It is the desire of the governor in council, as it is of the members of this committee and the people of this country, that full justice should be done to the returned soldier. On the other hand, we must keep in mind the heavy burden which is imposed upon the taxpayers of this country. As my hon. friend will understand, I cannot give him any definite undertaking but we all appreciate the representations he has made, not only with respect to the personnel of the old pensions board but with respect to other matters. I can assure my hon. friend that the attention of my colleagues will be directed to his observations and that they will receive my careful and sympathetic consideration.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Will the Minister of Finance give the same assurance with respect to the members of the pension tribunals?

Mr. RHODES: I am sure it will be the desire of the governor in council to see that all interests are properly considered.

Mr. DUFF: According to their merits.

Mr. MacLAREN: As this bill will become operative by proclamation, the difficulties referred to by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough will not arise. The hon. member referred also to the necessity of a review being made of all pensions. My understanding is that the board of pension commissioners have been working for the past few months upon a review of all cases.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to repeat what I have said already but I wish again to urge the importance of the right of hearing being held in open court and the necessity of having a body sufficient to provide the necessary quorums. As far as the personnel of this body is concerned, I am sure the governor in council will keep in mind those men who have obtained experience in this work and who only a few years ago were appointed under a ten year contract. The bill in its original form provided for the reappointment of the board of pension commissioners and I hope in the appointment of this new body the governor in council will consider the number which I have suggested and which is provided for in the bill. I hope they will also keep in mind, as they undoubtedly will, the personnel of the pension tribunals. Apparently these men have achieved a unique success, something rarely accomplished. They reviewed many cases some of which they accepted and some of which they refused but I have heard only of a few cases of dissatisfaction in connection with unsuccessful applicants whose cases were heard by these tribunals. Men have told me that while they were disappointed in not having

their cases accepted they felt that they had had a fair, honest and impartial hearing. If their cases were rejected, they felt that they were not strong enough to stand. I hope these men will be kept in mind in the appointment of this new commission. The government is under some responsibility to the members of these boards as they have served only three years of the ten year statutory contract under which they were employed. I repeat that to my mind the important part of this legislation is the retaining of the feature of the open court and the providing of travelling quorums before which the applicants can make a personal appearance. This can be done only by adequate appointments to the board.

Mr. COOTE: Not being a member of the special committee, I had not intended to say anything upon this subject, but the remarks of the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough prompt me to say a few words. Many veterans and their friends throughout the country greatly regret to see the pension tribunal done away with. It was because of the dissatisfaction existing in Canada that the pension tribunals were established and there is a great deal of dissatisfaction now because so many cases in which favourable decisions were given by the tribunals have been appealed and the appeals are held up for such long periods. I think in one case which I brought to the minister's attention, an appeal has been pending, if I remember rightly, for nearly two years. While of course I agree with the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough that the government at this time should do everything to practise true economy, I want to remind the hon. member and the committee that this government has gone to the limit in living up to our obligations to those who purchased government bonds to finance the war, but in many cases, in my humble opinion, we have not gone nearly to the same limit in living up to our obligations to the men who went overseas and fought in the war. I say that because of individual cases which have come to my attention. I have under my hand the correspondence in regard to one case where a man served three years and ten months in France with practically no leave, and with every day of that leave spent in hospital in England. He is incapacitated and he cannot get a pension. Although he was physically fit when he was taken on, he was discharged as medically unfit, of course the board claiming that this was due to defective eyesight which they stated was congenital.

I have another case of a man who spent four years in France; he was buried in an explosion caused by a shell. He has suffered ever since with a weak back and pains in his legs. It would seem to anyone that this man's disability was due to the injuries he sustained when buried by the shell. He was refused a pension by the pension commissioners. His application was heard by the tribunal and allowed. His case was then taken to the appeal board where, after a delay of a year, it was heard and he was refused a pension. In many of these cases when they come to the appeal court, the clause under which the applicant is supposed to get the benefit of the doubt is absolutely ignored. The men feel and I feel that the board of pension commissioners should be enlarged to take in the present members of the pension tribunal so that we may clear up the thousands of cases that are waiting for hearing. I should like to urge upon the minister that the full board of twelve be appointed so that they may deal with these cases as promptly as possible and clear up some of this dissatisfaction which I think rightfully exists among many veterans who have applied for pensions.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I have just a word to say about subsection 14. This was amended in the committee to read:

> All officers, clerks and employees on the staff of the board of pension commissioners for Canada—

Then there was added:

> And of the pension tribunal . . . shall be and become during pleasure, officers, clerks and employees on the staff of the commission.

The amendment was one about which I felt strongly. It was my desire that the officers, clerks and employees of the pension tribunal should receive the same consideration as those of the pension board. By that I mean that there should be no discrimination. Some misunderstanding has arisen in certain quarters as to just what that means. My sole desire is that the staffs of both the pension board and the tribunal should be placed on an equality when it comes to the question of administration and that the same consideration should be extended to the employees of both boards, without any discrimination whatever.

Section agreed to.

Sections 3, 4 and 5 agreed to.

On section 6—Pension appeal court continued.

Mr. DUFF: With regard to 10B on page 6, subclause (1) reads:

> The governor in council upon the retirement of any member of the commission, or the court, who has served upon one or other of such

bodies during at least twenty years, or who has so served during at least ten years and has reached the age of seventy years, or is physically or mentally incapacitated, and is not entitled to superannuation under the Civil Service Superannuation Act, may grant to him a pension for his life not exceeding one-third of the salary to which he was entitled as such member.

It will be noticed that if he is over seventy years of age, after serving ten years, he receives 33 per cent of his salary, but if he is not seventy years, but might have served ten or more years, he gets nothing. In view of the principle laid down by parliament on several occasions and especially in the last few days in regard to the appointment of the tariff commission, where a salary of $15,000 was asked for the chairman for the next ten years and where, after that ten years had expired, he was to receive a retiring allowance or pension amounting to $7,500, and in view of the fact that certain members of this new pension commission, or, in fact, of the old commission, will soon retire, they should be entitled to the same treatment, I am going to move the following amendment to 10B:

That all the words after the word "least" in the third line of subsection (1) of clause 10B be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"ten years, may grant him a pension for his life not exceeding one-third of the salary to which he is entitled as such member, or two-thirds of such salary to any member of the commission who has, as aforesaid, served fifteen years and upwards, provided any such member is not entitled to superannuation under the Civil Service Superannuation Act."

I am not asking for the same consideration as has been given to the chairman of the tariff commission; all I say is that a member of this board, after serving ten years, may be granted for his life a pension not exceeding one-third of the salary to which he was entitled.

Mr. RHODES: It is one o'clock. May I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the money phase of this motion?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sullivan): Yes, it is out of order.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at one o'clock.

Mr. MacLAREN: I just wish to make one observation on the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough. I think there is merit in what the hon. member says. I propose to bring the matter to the attention of the government, and I hope it will be dealt with at some more favourable time. I think it is of sufficient merit to be fully considered, but it should wait until some more favourable time. That is my own personal view.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan, Port Arthur-Thunder Bay): The amendment is to strike out all the words after the word "least" in the third line of subsection 1 of clause 10B and to substitute the following therefor:

"ten years, may grant him a pension for his life not exceeding one-third of the salary to which he is entitled as such member, or two-thirds of such salary to any member of the commission who has, as aforesaid, served fifteen years and upwards, provided any such member is not entitled to superannuation under the Civil Service Superannuation Act."

Mr. DUFF: Perhaps in view of the fact that a monetary question is involved, the amendment may be out of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cowan, Port Arthur-Thunder Bay): It is.

Mr. DUFF: By changing only a few words I submit, Mr. Chairman, the amendment would be in order. The Minister of Pensions and National Health was good enough to discuss my amendment with me and he has just said that the government will take it into consideration, but if this section passes as it is I submit that it will be impossible to deal with the proposal in my amendment until the next session of parliament. May I suggest to the minister that instead of dealing summarily with the amendment now and passing the clause, he let the clause stand until to-morrow so that he will have an opportunity to consider the matter further and perhaps agree to my suggestion. He admits that there is merit in the amendment.

Mr. MacLAREN: I did not have the idea that it would apply this session.

Mr. DUFF: Do I understand that the minister is willing to allow this subsection to stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have not been able to hear what the minister was saying on this side.

Mr. MacLAREN: I do not think the section should stand. I have said I am impressed by the reasons expressed by my hon. friend, but it is a matter that requires a good deal of consideration by the government, and I said I should have much pleasure in bringing it to the attention of the govern-

ment with my favourable comments. I think that is as far as the hon. gentleman can expect me to go.

Mr. DUFF: I cannot agree with the minister. I can understand, of course, that it may be necessary for him to give further consideration to my amendment, but certainly my amendment is very much more modest than the proposals contained in certain legislation which we have passed in this house in the last two or three years or in the legislation which was proposed to this house within the last day or two. I remember when I was very much younger and one of a big family, when some of us tried to get from the other the biggest slice of bread and molasses my mother used to say, "There should be no step-bairns in our family," and as far as government officials are concerned there should be no step-bairns, but everybody should be treated alike. Within the last day or two the government introduced legislation whereby parliament was asked to vote for the chairman of the tariff board—I am not talking personally at all—not only a salary of $15,000, an increase from the $12,000 which the former chairman of the board received, but in addition that he should receive an annuity after drawing $15,000 for ten years. As far as I am concerned there are entirely too many pensions being paid, whether it is to the chairman of the tariff board or anybody else, because the ordinary person in this country who has to pay taxes receives no pension at all. He is engaged in farming or mining or fishing or in mercantile life, and, if any of us does not make enough for our old age we have to go to the poor house or grub along as best we can without any pension. Yet the government proposed to give the chairman of the tariff board a salary of $15,000 for ten years and an annuity, and if the chairman of that board cannot save sufficient for the future out of a salary of $15,000 a year for ten years, I say that he is not fit to be chairman of the board. In addition, besides providing that the taxpayers of this country should pay the chairman of the tariff board a pension of $7,500 per year or fifty per cent of his salary at the end of ten years' service, that legislation originally proposed pensions also for the other two members of the board and now my good friend the Minister of Pensions and National Health says that he cannot agree to my very modest amendment to provide a pension for these men who have given good service to this country as members of the pension board, although my amendment proposes that they shall receive a pension of only one-third of their salary.

Clause 2 of this bill makes provision for the salaries which the members of the new Canadian pension commission shall receive. The chairman is to receive a salary of $7,000 and each of the other members of the board $6,000 per annum. I am willing to admit that in these times under present conditions $7,000 or $6,000 is rather fair remuneration in the public service. But how can the minister or the government justify not accepting my amendment when the chairman of the pension commission is responsible for the expenditure of $55,000,000 per year, and when he receives a salary of $7,000 and the other members of the commission $6,000, as compared with $15,000 for the chairman of the tariff board and $10,000 each for the other two members of that board? The minister is part of the ministry and an adviser to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and I ask him how can he justify waiting for another year. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the members of this new board, whether these gentlemen who have been members of the pension commission for the last ten years or the new members who are going to be put on from the tribunals, with the serious responsibilities they have to assume, are entitled to as much money from the taxpayers of this country as the members of the tariff commission. Yet my hon. friend says when I move a modest amendment to give these men not so high a pension when they retire after ten or fifteen years, that it cannot be dealt with this year, and asks us to pass this bill and the matter will be considered later. I say that is not fair either to the members of the pension board, the members of the tribunal or the members of this house. I say to the minister that in fairness to everyone concerned he should allow this clause 10B to stand for further consideration.

Mr. HEAPS: In the course of the proceedings this morning, I listened very attentively to the plea of the hon. member who has just sat down for the utmost economy in pensions. He pleaded that as much as twenty-five per cent could be cut off the pensions list of the Dominion of Canada. Yet the amendment he now moves is one which if accepted would have the effect of increasing the amount spent by the government on pensions. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite in favour of giving employees in the service of the government a reasonable retiring allowance, but I think that instead of starting at the top we should start at the bottom. I am getting sick and tired of listening to pleas on behalf of men in the employ of the government who are receiving very high salaries, and to whom in addition

to the high salary we are asked to give other large sums in the way of pensions. During the past two days we have listened to a plea for high pensions to men receiving $15,000 a year, and to judges receiving salaries of $8,000, $10,000 and $12,000 a year. We have been told that thrift is one of the great virtues. I am under the impression that if we are to have thrift it should start among those people who enjoy these very high salaries; men in receipt of $8,000, $10,000 and $15,000 a year should be able to save a little for the rainy day. We are always hearing that people receiving $700, $800 and $1,000 a year should be taught the virtue of thrift. I think these people receiving high salaries are still better able to put something aside to tide them over. As I said, I am not opposed to the principle of retiring allowances, I am heartily in favour of it.

May I point out further that the engine driver or the crew of a train that brings the hon. member here from Nova Scotia is performing just as useful service to society as the man who takes office on the pension board. After all their work deals with the spending of money, but the train crew have entrusted to them the very lives of a number of human beings. It is true, I do not for a moment deny it, that the man sitting on the pensions tribunal is performing a very important task, but not one bit more important than that of the men driving the trains. These men at present are entitled not only to certain emoluments, but as they come under the Civil Service Commission they have also a claim on the superannuation fund; at any rate if not they are receiving fairly good salaries. I think this particular time is not one in which it is essential to provide them with retiring allowances. We have been told for the past two or three years in this house that these are times for the practice of the utmost economy. I do not know of any more extravagant expenditure at this time than providing these very extravagant retiring allowances for men in receipt of high salaries, so I think if we allow this question to stand for the time being there will be no harm done.

Mr. MacLAREN: I would like to point out that the government has consented to pass this bill as it stands. I do not think it would be desirable to make any changes if possible to avoid doing so. Therefore I would favour the passage of this section as it stands, and as I say I will bring it before the government for future consideration.

Amendment negatived.

Subsection agreed to.

[Mr. Heaps.]

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Owing to the confusion in the house I was unable to hear what section was called. Do I understand that section 6 was declared carried?

The CHAIRMAN: We are taking the bill subsection by subsection. Subsection 10B is carried.

On subsection 10C—Appointment of civil servants.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MacLAREN: Mr. Chairman, with the animation that is prevailing in the house you have got a little ahead of me. I wish to amend the wording of this section. There are several words omitted in the last line on the page. It reads:

—his tenure of office as a member of the commission or of the . . .

I wish to amend it to read as follows:

—his tenure of office as a member of the board of pension commissioners for Canada, of the pension tribunal, or of the . . .

Those words were omitted in error.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

Subsection 10D agreed to.

On subsection 10E—Medical and clerical assistance.

Mr. REID: I wonder if the minister would answer an important question that I would like to put now. Perhaps it does not come under the bill, nor do I wish at this time to raise any question regarding the matter of pensions, but among many organizations of returned men a feeling prevails that the private soldier who receives a pension is called up each year for examination, but that such examination is not required in the case of those who were officers. My question is, do those who were officers and who are in receipt of pension come up for examination periodically the same as the private soldier?

Mr. MacLAREN: As far as I know there is no difference made between members of the forces as to examinations and reexaminations on the ground of rank. There is a difference regarding the nature of the disability. For instance if a man has an amputation of the thigh, that remains, requiring no verification. But there are conditions which may vary, and they call for more repeated examination.

Subsection agreed to.

Subsection 10F agreed to.

On subsection 10G—Veterans' bureau continued.

Mr. DUFF: Under subsection 3 it is provided that the pension advocates shall be appointed under and pursuant to the provisions of the Civil Service Act, at such salaries as the governor in council may prescribe. I should like to know from the minister how in the name of all that is good and holy pensions advocates can be appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Surely the ministry, this parliament and the country will have sufficient confidence in this board to permit them to appoint their own pensions advocates without referring to the Civil Service Commission. If appointments are carried on in this way it may take three or four months to get an appointment through, and in any case the Civil Service Commission would really take the recommendation of the minister or of this new board. So far as I am concerned I think this is a mistake; in fact I think the whole Civil Service Commission is only camouflage, and in this more than in any other law it is more of a camouflage than ever. If the appointment of officials to penitentiaries is not to come within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission; if the appointment of officials and soloists, to whom the Prime Minister referred last night, is to be carried on by the radio commission surely the same practice can be followed here. There should be no delay in making these appointments; if a soldier is suffering because he is unable to be represented before the board he should not have to wait two or three months for the Civil Service Commission to advertise the position and appoint an advocate.

I say this is a great mistake, in spite of the fact that it is carrying out the unanimous report brought in by the eminent gentlemen who formed this committee. Personally I do not like the idea of unanimous reports of this kind; I think it would be much better to have divided opinions, but since these eminent gentlemen did bring in this recommendation that the pensions advocates should be appointed by the Civil Service Commission I respectfully submit that they must have been asleep at the switch when this went through. I hope the minister and the members of the committee will agree with me.

Mr. ARTHURS: I think the hon. gentleman is labouring under a very great misapprehension. As a matter of fact the present pensions advocates are reappointed to office, under subsection (4). We may have brought in a unanimous report, but we were not unanimous in the beginning; personally I shared the view which has been expressed by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough, that the pension commission should have power to appoint its own men. My reason for so thinking was that in every case these pension advocates are returned soldiers and they are and have been men acceptable to the leaders of the returned men. We desired to continue that state of affairs, but the representatives of the legion said they were quite willing to have this clause inserted if that was thought advisable because in every case the preference will be given to returned soldiers. Not only that, but in the past they have been asked to sit in with regard to the appointment of these men. These vacancies will only occur from time to time, from death or other causes or when it may be necessary to add an additional member to the staff. I think there can be no question that even in the view of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have expressed very pronounced opinions in the last few days with regard to certain matters, it was the part of wisdom to make all future appointments subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission of Canada.

Mr. DUFF: The chairman of the special committee which was appointed to investigate this matter has not answered my question at all. The fact that these advocates are returned soldiers has nothing to do with the matter. The pension commission or this newly appointed board certainly can select advocates for the returned soldiers, and in that way we will get rid of a lot of red tape in these appointments. Surely the gentlemen who will form this body will have sufficient interest in the returned men to appoint returned men as pensions advocates, without reference to the Civil Service Commission. I say that this clause is not necessary at all. I believe it will clog the machinery of this act and will keep the returned soldier waiting anywhere from three to nine months until the Civil Service Commission, which is not composed of returned soldiers and which may appoint other than a returned man, gets around to making an appointment. So far as I am concerned, in the interests of the returned soldiers and in spite of the fact that this matter was investigated by such a wonderful committee, composed of gentlemen who have all the necessary knowledge to decide on these questions, I am opposed to having these advocates so appointed. I say it should be left in the hands of the minister, the governor in council or the pensions commission. I would prefer

to have the appointments made by the governor in council, because after all in this country, where we have responsible government, appointments should be made in that way rather than by a body which has no responsibility at all.

Mr. ARTHURS: If the hon. gentleman will turn to clause 10H he will find a similar provision with regard to commission counsel, in exactly the same terms. I do not think for a moment that the soldier organizations in Canada would be in favour of having the men who appear against them appointed by the court that is going to try them. By this measure we are taking over the men now engaged in this work and future appointments will be made by the Civil Service Commission. I do not think there should be any question about that at all.

Mr. DUFF: I do not want to take up too much of the time of the committee, but surely my hon. friend is not serious when he insinuates that the Civil Service Commission should appoint these advocates instead of the minister or the governor in council because, in the latter case, the returned soldier might not get a square deal. Let me tell my hon. friend that in my experience during the last seventeen years, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred appointments have been made by the Civil Service Commission on the recommendation of either the minister, his deputy or someone else in the department. It is all nonsense for my hon. friend to say that if these appointments are not made by the Civil Service Commission the returned men will not get a square deal from the minister or the governor in council. I say this clause should be struck out; it is absolutely unnecessary and is not in the best interests of the returned men.

Subsection agreed to.

Subsection 10H agreed to.

On subsection 10I—Reviewing officer.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Though this is one of the two or three really important clauses in the bill I shall delay the committee for only a moment. This section is intended to meet the unfortunate situation in regard to which many complaints have arisen respecting the abuse of the appeal system. There is one important change of principle embodied in the new act. Speaking the other day on another subject, I suggested that, in the meticulous care which the department had taken to divorce all pension matters from political considerations, we had perhaps in some instances gone too far and removed from parliament and the governor in council that authority and responsibility which should be theirs, and our objection was perhaps commendable. In this act, in the appointment of a reviewing officer and in the appointment of a board, we have deliberately restored to the governor in council itself and, through the government, to the department, responsibility in respect of two causes of complaint—congestion, where we now place the responsibility on the government itself to see that adequate means are taken for the hearing of cases by the quorum, and secondly, in the case of the reviewing officer, the provision that the governor in council shall become responsible for the appeals that shall be made. It is perhaps an experiment, but I think it is a wise one; and having brought these two important matters more completely under the control of parliament, we shall probably, I think, be able to obviate many of the troubles which we have experienced.

Mr. DUFF: I would direct the attention of the minister and of the chairman of the special committee to this particular section. The chairman of the committee gave satisfaction but he rather opposed my view which I expressed in connection with the appointment of the advocates, because he was of the opinion that the pension advocates should not be appointed by the commission. The present clause reads:

> Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, or any other statute, the governor in council may appoint an officer, called a "reviewing officer," and may fix the salary that shall be paid to him.

In other words, in one case this very able committee compels the pensioners, before they can get their cases heard, to submit to the delay of having the advocate appear before the Civil Service Commission, while in the case of the reviewing officer the appointment can be made by the governor in council. I wish the chairman of the special committee would explain why he was Dr. Jekyll in one case and Mr. Hyde in the other.

Mr. ARTHURS: There is this difference between the two cases. Under this bill, which if carried will change the operation of the Pension Act, the most important, the most essential officer so far as the men are concerned is the reviewing officer. He is the channel through which all cases must pass. It was contended by some that this officer should be under the control of the present board of pension commissioners or its successor, while others took the view that he should be under the control of the Department of Justice. Others, again, including General Ross, who

submitted a very elaborate report last year, suggested that the reviewing officer should be under the control of the pensions appeal board. Personally I was inclined to favour the latter course, but after we considered the matter, this being a very important office, we decided to leave this man directly responsible to parliament through the minister, having the appointment made by the governor in council, thereby being under our direct control, so that we could demand an accounting at each session. This is a most important office, and I trust that the government will select a man of great ability, a man with a sense of fair play, because he stands between the pensioner and the public purse. If he makes no decision to appeal within thirty-five days of judgment, the applicant receives his pension irrevocably; if, on the other hand, he decides that an appeal is necessary, the applicant has ninety days in which to prepare. I would point out to my hon. friend that this official is in an entirely different class from the advocates.

Mr. DUFF: I admit with the hon. member that the reviewing officer under this bill is in an entirely different class from the advocates who are to be appointed to represent the returned soldier. And that is the great trouble in this country; there is too much class. In my opinion the pensioner is the man who should be looked after. He should be given the easiest way to get his pension reviewed.

Mr. ARTHURS: That is what we are doing.

Mr. DUFF: Instead of that the chairman of the committee now says that the reviewing officer, who is going to get a big salary and occupy an important position, should be appointed by the governor in council. The advocate, who really represents the poor returned soldier in the country districts, must go before the Civil Service Commission for approval. The soldier must wait until the advocate has been appointed by that body. I do not know whether the Civil Service Commission is any good or whether its members are earning their salaries; that is a debatable question so far as I am concerned. But this government as well as previous governments have retained the Civil Service Commission, and I say that if that commission is necessary in the case of the advocates, it is equally necessary with respect to the reviewing officer. I submit that the reviewing officer as well as the advocate should be appointed by the Civil Service Commission; indeed, the necessity is more apparent in the former case. I can see what my hon. friend means; I can see what the minister means in the contention that the reviewing officer should be appointed by the government. It is a good fat job for someone. The advocate may appear before the board only once in a year or in five years and he will be paid a certain fee, five dollars or ten dollars. The returned soldier has to wait three or six months until this august body in the Hunter building appoints the advocate. But with regard to the reviewing officer, receiving a salary of five, six or seven thousand a year, the chairman of the special committee stands up and says that this official is in an entirely different class. I know it; surely he is in a different class—likely in the Tory class. He will be appointed by the Tory party.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am anxious to know whether by setting up a new commission we are short-circuiting in any way the hearings of applicants. Will cases still pass through the commissioners to the appeal court and then to the reviewing officer? In other words, what is the mode of procedure? I ask that question because of the difficulty men have experienced in having their cases settled.

Mr. MacLAREN: The provisions of this legislation are in very large measure a simplification of what was a complicated organization. Simplification and expedition are I think two of the prominent features of the bill. There will be two adjudicating bodies instead of three as at present, one, the pension commission and, two, the appeal court. I do not agree exactly with what my hon. friend the chairman of the committee says as to the duties of this reviewing officer. His duties will be important but they will not be preeminently important. He will have nothing to do with the awarding of pensions, he will simply review cases which have been heard by the travelling boards.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That would be the commissioners?

Mr. MacLAREN: Two members of the pension board who will go out to hear evidence. These men will have the power of making a definite decision. During the last few months there has been an erroneous impression throughout the country that this legislation was going to do away with the personal contact with the men. That is not the case because such contact has been provided for. There will be two adjudicating bodies instead of three which will simplify

the procedure and save time. Where a man has been granted a pension by the travelling board the question will then arise as to whether that finding should be accepted or an appeal taken, and this point must be decided by some individual or organization. This will be the duty of the reviewing officer. He will review the evidence and if he is satisfied that the pension has been granted on proper grounds, that will be the end of it. If he thinks the evidence is insufficient and that there should be an appeal taken, he will so report. He will have no authority over the awarding of pensions, he simply decides the proper cases for appeal. I believe this provision will go a long way to meeting the complaints which have been made that too many references have been made to the appeal court.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Assume that two commissioners hear an applicant and decide to make an award. That award will be reviewed by this reviewing officer and if he thinks it is too generous, he will refer it—

Mr. MacLAREN: I did not say he reviews it, he looks over the evidence and decides whether or not an appeal should be taken.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am simply trying to get clarity. This reviewing will be done in the interests of the government because he will be their officer. If he decides that the case should go to appeal, it will go to the appeal court which is now set up.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is the only court to go to.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Their decision will be final.

Mr. MacLAREN: Absolutely.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): In the event of an applicant being dissatisfied has he the right to take his case to the appeal court?

Mr. MacLAREN: In all instances. That is the point I was trying to make clear, that the reviewing officer will have nothing to do with such cases. A man who has been unsuccessful has a right to take his case before the appeal court.

Mr. DUFF: With all due deference to the minister, I cannot agree with him when he says there will be only two bodies under this bill. First, there will be the body known as the Canadian pension commission; second, there will be the reviewing officer and, third, there will be the appeal court. Under this legislation there will be three bodies to which the soldier can appeal. He will appeal first to the pension commissioners and if he is not satisfied with their decision, he can appeal to this reviewing officer.

Mr. MacLAREN: No.

Mr. DUFF: What is the reviewing officer for if he is not there to be appealed to? He certainly must review the evidence.

Mr. MacLAREN: May I explain? There will not be three bodies. There will be only two adjudicating bodies, one the pension commission and the other the appeal court. At the present time where a pension has been granted, the case is considered as to whether or not an appeal should be taken. It is the same in principle to-day as I trust it will be under this bill. But that body is the pension board and objections were taken to the procedure under which this board would first express their views as to the granting of a pension and then decide whether or not there should be an appeal. That procedure was not considered to be logical. This reviewing officer will perform the same function now being performed by the pension board but he will be independent of the board. He will not have expressed an opinion and will be under the governor in council so far as jurisdiction is concerned. He simply determines whether or not it is reasonable to appeal and will be responsible for the cutting down of unnecessary appeals.

Mr. DUFF: The reviewing officer will be entirely separate from the commission or the appeal court?

Mr. MacLAREN: Quite so.

Mr. DUFF: After reviewing the evidence he will either decide in favour of or rule against the soldier. For the sake of argument I will assume that the minister is right when he says there are only two bodies, the new pension commission and the appeal court. If the minister is going to appoint eight commissioners instead of the present three, then in my opinion there will be no necessity for an appeal court. The reviewing officer can review the evidence and pass his finding back to the pension commissioners. I have no hesitation in saying that since it has been operating, the appeal court has been responsible for an unnecessary expenditure of at least $10,000,000.

Mr. LAVERGNE: The reviewing officer.

Mr. DUFF: I am talking about the appeal court to which the soldier appealed against the decision of the pension commissioners.

I cannot remember whether this court was set up by the late government or the present government, but from information I have received I know it has been responsible for a waste of at least $10,000,000. I could give a dozen instances, but I will give only one at the present time. A jeweller in a certain city was asked by the government of the day to raise a regiment in which he was given the rank of colonel. He had in his employ a clerk who did certain clerical work in connection with the raising of the regiment. This clerk never put on a uniform or went overseas, he simply carried out the orders of the colonel who was boss of the jewellery store. But a few years after the war, the appeal court having been formed, the pension board received an application from this man, it was turned down and it was appealed to the appeal board. The appeal board awarded this man, who was never in khaki, who was never overseas, $7,000 back pension and gave him a pension during his lifetime. He had tuberculosis and later on died and at the present time his family are receiving about $100 a month from the pension board although he was never entitled to anything. Nevertheless the appeal board, against the decision of the pension commissioners who investigated the case and who knew that this man had no claim, gave him about $7,000 back pension and put him on the pension list, with the result that until he died he received a large pension and now his family are receiving a very large amount of money from this country. The minister cannot deny that the incident to which I have referred did happen and that this country has been mulcted to the extent of a large sum of money and is still paying out large sums to the family of this man who was a jeweller's assistant in a jewellery store, who never saw the war, never put on khaki, never served as a soldier. I can give a dozen similar instances.

Mr. LAVERGNE: As a matter of fact this is an extraordinary case, because at the present time the tribunals are giving about 40 per cent of their decisions in favour of the returned men, while about 80 per cent of the cases have been appealed by the reviewing officer.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): There is no reviewing officer. The chief commission counsel.

Mr. LAVERGNE: What is in a name?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The procedure is entirely different.

Mr. LAVERGNE: In many cases which are appealed, instead of the men having the doubt in their favour, their claims are thrown out.

Under this new machinery we have really four bodies instead of three. The returned man puts in his claim to the board of pension commissioners. If it is approved, well and good; if not, the pension commission refers the matter to two of its members to hear the evidence and give a decision. If the decision is in favour of the returned man, it goes before a reviewing officer and he will then send it to appeal just the same as was done before by the commission counsel; it will be the same procedure. So far the delay has been caused by too many appeals being brought by the pension counsel before the appeal board. After the tribunal, which had heard the witnesses, heard and seen the men and knew the cases, had given its decision, at least 75 per cent of those decisions were appealed and only about 40 per cent of the appeals were decided in favour of the men. I never was a very strong partisan of the war, but I think we are not playing the game with the returned man. Instead of his being given the benefit of the doubt, every time the decision has been against him, that of the first court being reversed by the appeal court, and the man who went to the front and lost his health or came back wounded, has seen his claim rejected by the appeal court. In my opinion we should take the position that men who have been at the front should at least get the benefit of the doubt. I am afraid we are putting this reviewing officer into the same position as that of the pension commission counsel; we shall have the same result and the law will not work any better than did the previous act.

Mr. MARCIL: I think the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne) should explain what this pension law means. The references that have been made to this body, that body and the other body reminds me of the old song:

> Gin a body meet a body
> Coming through the rye;
> Gin a body kiss a body,
> Need a body cry?

I have the case of a poor widow in St. Godfroy in the county of Bonaventure which I have brought to the attention of the board of pension commissioners about eight or ten years. Although her son was killed in action at the front, I have never been able to get a dollar for her, a poor woman who has been living on charity from the parish of St. Godfroy and from the parish priest. Every

six months or year I get an encouraging letter that her case will be looked into. Then Mr. Chasse writes me stating that her case does not come within the purview of the conditions under which a pension can be granted. This case has been kicked around amongst Tom, Dick and Harry for the past ten years. She cannot get anything and I cannot get anything for her. There was a travelling board appointed in Matapedia last fall. This woman lives forty or fifty miles away; she did not meet the body; she was not given a hearing; she was not called at all. I cannot give her name at the moment. Her son, a young man of eighteen years, was, as I say, killed in action. If he had been living to-day, he would be looking after his mother.

I want to bring forward another case. There is in my county a man whom I will not mention who receives a total disability pension and who has a large number of children. I think he receives so much for his wife, so much for himself and so much for each child. The story was that, while he was not totally disabled he received about $180 a month, because he was the organizer of my opponent in the election of 1925 and took a very active part in the county at that time. Questions are put to me by my electors: On what basis or principle of justice are such pensions awarded? I am unable to answer them. We are paying $55,000,000 out of the treasury in pensions, but if there is anyone in the house who can explain why a pension is given or refused, it is more than I have been able to do. Of course we know what happened in the United States. After the recent revulsion of public feeling there, they made a clean sweep of many of those pensions, I think $500,000,000 at one sweep.

A soldier who has gone to the front and who has been disabled or who, by reason of his service to his country, has lost health, should be compensated, but there should be some basis of justice in the way in which his claim is treated. The system is so complicated it is impossible for a poor man to understand the difference between a pension board, an appeal board, a reviewing officer and this, that and the other thing; we are entirely at sea in the matter. I wish to call the attention of the minister to this particular case of the poor woman at St. Godfroy whose son was killed in action, and I ask him in all decency to do something for her.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think the matter can be made simple if it is dealt with by the means at our command. Any man who wishes to be advised and assisted goes to the nearest pensions advocate of his area. The government pays that official his salary and it is his duty to do all he can to assist the men, as I believe he does. All that is necessary in any of the cases to which my hon. friend has referred, is to tell them to see the pensions advocate in their district.

Mr. MARCIL: What about the case of the mother of this soldier who was killed in action?

Mr. MacLAREN: I am referring to all those who think they are entitled to pension.

Mr. MARCIL: The official is in Quebec, about 400 or 500 miles away.

Mr. MacLAREN: If necessary, I shall send him to the woman's house.

Mr. MARCIL: Can the minister tell me who acts in Bonaventure county?

Mr. MacLAREN: Just let me finish; I think I can save the hon. member a number of questions.

Mr. MARCIL: I wish the minister would.

Mr. MacLAREN: First of all as to the procedure. A man does not understand these matters until they are explained to him and the course is to appeal to the nearest pensions advocate.

Mr. MARCIL: Supposing he is in Quebec, 400 or 500 miles away?

Mr. MacLAREN: He will be instructed. The case to which my hon. friend from Bonaventure has referred and similar cases are pitiable and distressing but one cannot do anything until one knows the whole of the facts. It must be connected with war service. Is that the case? These cases require full investigation by those trained in the work. I know nothing about the particular case in question and I could not offer any opinion until all the facts are placed before me. If my hon. friend will be good enough to have the name and address I promise to let him know the grounds on which it was refused and the reasons connected with it. Simply to relate the case here does not effect much beyond drawing my attention to it, but if my hon. friend will give me the name and address I promise to give a prompt reply.

Mr. MARCIL: From what I understood from the correspondence with this woman the boy enlisted at the age of eighteen and he was not then contributing to the assistance of his mother, perhaps because he was not old enough to work. He was killed at the front and now a pension is denied the poor

mother because he did not support her when she did not need his support. If she has not a case in equity, I do not know who has. I know the minister's kind heart and that is the reason I am bringing the case to his attention.

Mr. MacLAREN: Please give me the facts.

Mr. CHEVRIER: There seems to be a lot of misapprehension about this reviewing officer. At the start I was not in favour of it because nowhere in the judicial system of Canada was there such an officer of the crown as a reviewing officer under this act. When the quorum goes about the country and hears applications for pension, if the decision of the quorum is unfavourable to the applicant, the board there and then decides against the applicant, and the applicant at once knows that he may appeal. If the decision is to be in favour of the applicant no decision is given in the field, but those who heard the application, either a quorum of two or, what sounds rather peculiar, a quorum of one, or whoever hears the application reports the case to Ottawa and the decision is placed before the reviewing officer without the applicant knowing what the result will be, although of course he infers from the decision not having been given in the field that it will be in his favour. The reviewing officer then takes the case as it comes before him and looks over the evidence and if he feels that the decision in favour of the applicant ought to be appealed by the crown he simply turns the case over to the appeal board and says in his opinion that there ought to be an appeal. An appeal may or may not be taken. The reviewing officer simply reviews the evidence, places the facts before the proper officers and says in his opinion that an appeal ought to be had. It might be construed, and this is where I disagree with the majority, that the reviewing officer was already deciding the appeal, but I can well see the difference. He does not decide the appeal; he is rather in the position of counsel. In an ordinary civil or criminal action when judgment is rendered, the dissatisfied party secures the advice of counsel on the chances of success in appeal. Counsel may say: In my opinion you would be well advised to appeal. That does not mean that the client should or should not appeal. It simply means that in the opinion of counsel, or as in this case in the opinion of the reviewing officer, an appeal ought to be taken. It does not by any means follow that if an appeal is taken it will be successful.

Mr. LAVERGNE: But this is an appeal.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Just as a counsel learned in the law who is called in to give advice advises an appeal. But that does not mean that the appeal is well taken or that it will be successful.

Mr. LAVERGNE: In this case the reviewing officer decides that there will be an appeal, and then the man has to go and have his case appealed before the court. In the ordinary courts the lawyer advises an appeal, but here the reviewing officer decides that there should be an appeal.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The reviewing officer says in his opinion the evidence is such as would warrant the taking of an appeal. I can well see now that I have gone through the reports how this operates. Under the old system the crown, being limited as to the time in which they could take an appeal, appealed cases holus-bolus, if I may use the word, appealed en masse, without knowing whether the case was good or bad. They simply appealed every decision in favour of the applicant, and as a result of these appeals being taken promiscuously, purely to save time, without looking into the merits of the case at all, the court became congested. In the meantime the applicant who had received a favourable decision in the field kept on hoping for months and months that he would get his pension after a decision had been given in his favour.

I said at the outset that I did not favour this reviewing officer because nowhere in the judicial system of Canada is there such an officer. I thought we could devise a system that would simplify matters, but again I say, in order to prevent the clogging up of the higher tribunals with appeals taken by the crown without due consideration of the evidence, it was necessary that some kind of a check should be imposed. It would have been much better if the crown counsel who had heard the case in the first instance there and then decided there would or would not be an appeal. But I am not responsible for that situation. As it is now, no appeal is to be taken by the crown unless the reviewing officer expresses the opinion that an appeal should be taken. The returned man has always the right to appeal the moment that an adverse decision is given. When the reviewing officer gives his decision that the crown ought to appeal, the applicant is advised, and then he has time to have his case prepared by the veterans' bureau and all the other machinery placed at his disposal under the act. I do not like this fifth wheel to a cart. But under the conditions I think it is the only system that could have

been devised in order to prevent the clogging up of the courts and at the same time do justice to the applicant and deal with the case with the shortest delay possible.

Mr. LAVERGNE: But we come to the very same result as before. This reviewing officer will appeal all the decisions in favour of the men.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not prepared to accept that. If he does, he is not worthy of his position.

Mr. LAVERGNE: That was the experience of the past. The chief commission counsel appealed in almost every case that was decided in favour of the men. I do not think the exceptions numbered five per cent. After a decision had been given in favour of the man, then on the ipse dixit of the commission counsel the case was appealed, and it would be months before it would be decided. I think that under the system proposed here we shall have the very same result. I suppose it is an improvement, but to my mind it is not an ideal system, and while we are at it we may as well do the whole thing.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Will my hon. friend suggest a way out?

Mr. LAVERGNE: I do not know if my suggestion will be any better than that of the committee. But a man makes a claim; the commission delegates its work to two members to hear the case. They give a decision in his favour—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It may be turned down.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Yes, if so that is the end. But suppose they grant a pension, then that record, without the man knowing, goes back to the pension board and the reviewing officer takes it; he looks at the record, he has not heard the case, he has not seen the claimant, but he decides by looking over the file that this case should be appealed, and it is sent to the appeal court. It is practically the same procedure as that which takes place with the chief commission counsel. We will be falling into the same rut. I understand the pension board cannot say: we will appeal this case or we will not appeal. They should be entitled to a counsel who would advise them—give them an opinion about the case. Either the registrar of the court or the advocate who has fought the case for the crown before the quorum of the commission should report to the commission: This case in my opinion is not proven, the quorum has erred in its decision. Then the commission should take the advice of counsel, or of the lawyer who represented the commission in the quorum. But why should there be a man there with sort of juristic powers who will be allowed to say: I advise the commission to appeal, in spite of the case having been won by the man, without the opinion of the lawyer who represented the commission before the court? To my mind we shall be back in the same rut from which we are trying to escape. Why not take the opinion of the man who conducted the case before the quorum? Then the commission might have a sort of advisory counsel to check the opinion of that lawyer. This is going to defeat the purpose of the committee, and the men will be in the same position. After all the promises made by both parties in this house since the war broke out, in my opinion, we are not playing the game with the returned men. I have this satisfaction that I was not one of those who made these promises, but they certainly got many promises that are not being fulfilled to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): One word only. There was a very well-organized committee and they investigated last year the entire question of pension administration. That committee did represent the organized veterans of Canada, and the various tribunals functioning in regard to the administration of pensions. The unanimous effect of the three subreports was all in favour of establishing two courts, a court of first instance and a court of final instance. The bill as submitted had some very objectionable features, especially in regard to the reviewing officer who was to be under the jurisdiction of the president of the appeal court. The committee changed that and he is now an independent officer. The pension counsel who are to make the appeal in case they think it necessary are also appointed by the Civil Service Commission under the Civil Service Act. So the control that the old board of pension commissioners had over the commission counsel is gone. These amendments, arrived at by the committee after careful consideration, were endorsed by those who represented, after years of experience, the considered viewpoint of the organized ex-servicemen of the Dominion of Canada. So although I agree largely with the fears and proper apprehensions of my hon. friend, I suggest that this is the very best thing that we can do. We all agreed on it, we took the advice of the ex-servicemen, of the department officials and this is the best we could arrive at. I suggest that we give it a trial.

Mr. LAVERGNE: So much the better.

Mr. ROSS: Although it does not properly belong to the discussion of this bill, I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the case reported by the hon. member for Bonaventure. There the difficulty is again demonstrated which I pleaded against this morning, that these notices are sent out just with the titles, chief pension advocate, chief commission counsel, and the poor unfortunate applicant living hundreds of miles away has no idea where to write or to apply. I appeal to the minister and the incoming board to simplify this, give more details and get rid of this difficulty.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The case mentioned by my hon. friend from Bonaventure was a case of dependents, and entirely different from the ordinary case. Such a case must not be confused with the ordinary application for pension.

Mr. ROSS: But the fact remains that this poor woman does not know the next step. I am not talking about whether it is a dependent or a first application.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I may say again what I have said from 1930, that while I agree with this appointment of the reviewing officer as being the best method by which appeals by the crown can be dealt with, personally I have always felt and always stated that I think finality in such cases should lie with the court best qualified to hear the case, that court being the body which meets the man in the field, goes into the circumstances thoroughly, and knows the applicant. If I had my own way I would have no crown appeal, I would have the case settled by the court that sees the man, but as long as we have an appeal I think the best way is as we have it now.

Mr. COOTE: I insist on taking this only opportunity I have of protesting against there being any reviewing officer at all to appeal against a decision given by the judges who have actually seen the applicant and heard his story. I have met with many instances of what seemed to me injustice, where a case which seemed to me just and humane and in keeping with the act, particularly that clause under which the man is to be given the benefit of the doubt, has been appealed from the decision of the tribunal. In cases that have come to my own notice where appeal is taken from the decision of the tribunal, I have not seen one in which the man was given the benefit of the doubt by the appeal board. If I had my own way I would do away with the reviewing officer altogether.

Section agreed to.

Sections 7 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

On section 18—Repeal.

Mr. MacLAREN: The committee will remember that some days ago the Minister of Finance referred to an agreement which had been reached with the associated veterans to the effect that no further additions should be made to the list of pensioners by way of marriages and births after May 1. As a result I am asking the Minister of Trade and Commerce to move that the bill be amended, and I may say to hon. gentlemen that this amendment has been submitted by the Minister of Finance to representatives of the associated veterans, and they have expressed their satisfaction with it. The amendment is as follows:

That the bill be amended by inserting the following section therein immediately after section 18:

"18A. Notwithstanding anything contained in this or any other act, no pension, or additional pension, awardable or payable under the provisions of this act, shall be awarded or paid:

(1) under schedule A or schedule B or section 33 of this act, to or in respect of,

(a) any child of a member of the forces or pensioner, if such child shall have been born on or after the first day of May, 1933;

(b) the daughter, or other person, who, on the death of the wife of a pensioner or on the death of a widow of a member of the forces who has been in receipt of a pension, shall have assumed the household duties, and care of the minor child or children of the pensioner or the widow, as the case may be, on or after the date aforementioned.

(2) Under schedule A of this act, to or in respect of the wife of a member of the forces or pensioner, if she shall have been married to him on or after the date aforementioned."

Mr. RHODES: Perhaps I might confirm the statement made by the minister to the effect that this is the amendment which was submitted to and accepted by the representatives of the associated veterans whom I saw, headed by the president of the legion, Major Roper.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I have no particular objection to this amendment, because of what the minister stated, but I do think this very important amendment might

have been submitted to the committee which devoted several laborious days to the consideration of the other clauses. I am scarcely in a position to comprehend at once the significance of the amendment.

Mr. RHODES: It was purely a question of procedure; this had not been referred to the committee and it would have required a fresh reference from this house. Otherwise that would have been done.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Section 19 agreed to.

On the title.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): May I inform the committee that in addition to the formal report made by the chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Parry Sound, several other recommendations were made which it was not thought advisable to embody in the formal report to the house. I think three or four recommendations were agreed upon in connection with specific cases brought to the attention of the committee. I believe they have been directed to the department, and I hope the minister will pay particular attention to them.

Mr. MacLAREN: They are being sent to the Prime Minister, and I know they will reach me ultimately.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I should like to know what was done with one particular recommendation, which does not appear in the bill because it did not have application, but which was brought before the committee by the heads of one of the veterans' organizations. It was to the effect that section 73, which is commonly termed the benefit of the doubt clause, should be amended by the addition of certain words.

Mr. ARTHURS: At the request of the various parties presenting these claims—which, of course, I said we could not bring to the house—these recommendations were carefully copied out and forwarded as informal recommendations of the committee to the Prime Minister. They included the particular recommendation to which the hon. gentleman has just referred.

Title agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, read the third time and passed.

[Mr. I. A. Mackenzie.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): With the consent of the house, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we revert to the order of presenting reports of standing and select committees.

Mr. SPEAKER: By consent of the house we will revert to the order of presenting reports of standing and select committees.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Fifth report of the select standing committee on agriculture and colonization—Mr. Senn.

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale) presented the sixth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills.

He moved:

That the private bills reported upon to-day in the sixth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills, viz:

Bill No. 101 (Letter DI of the Senate), an act for the relief of Angelo Stavrow;

Bill No. 102, an act respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company; be placed upon the order paper of the house for consideration this day in committee of the whole house and for third reading.

Motion agreed to.

GENTER THICKENER COMPANY

Mr. DAVID SPENCE (Parkdale) moved:

That the recommendation contained in the sixth report of the select standing committee on miscellaneous private bills, respecting refund of charges on Bill No. 102, an act respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company, be concurred in.

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): I must take exception to this motion which, I understand, calls for concurrence in the report of the committee in connection with Bill No. 102. This will have the effect of refunding to the parties interested in the bill the fee of $400 which they are called upon to pay under the rules. I may be mistaken, but the practice, I understand, has been to make the refund in the case of private bills where the applicant is an individual, but not in the case of an incorporated company to whom we give the powers they seek in the bill before the house. I would ask that the motion stand at least until such time as we have ascertained whether or not it is in conformity with the practice that has heretofore obtained.

Mr. SPENCE: This was the recommendation of the private bills committee, and as the

session is drawing to a close the company would like to have the matter dealt with to-night. I cannot see any difference, so far as this motion is concerned, between a private individual and a corporation. Sometimes the corporation is worse off. I am not making any particular fight, but I think the request should be granted.

Mr. RHODES: I am not so much concerned about the return of the $400, although that is not to be lightly overlooked, but I should not care to have a motion of this kind passed hastily, thereby establishing a precedent by widening the practice of returning fees which, under the rules, ought to be paid.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion stands.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): May I for a moment speak to a question of privilege. With regard to the presentation of the report of the committee on agriculture, I notice that it was not read in the house, and I wondered whether it might be printed in Hansard.

Mr. STEVENS: It will appear fully in votes and proceedings.

Mr. COOTE: When a report of a committee is read does it not appear in Hansard?

Mr. STEVENS: Not always.

Mr. COOTE: I think there are many who would be interested in it.

CANADA-FRANCE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State): I ask leave to lay on the table of the house a certain trade agreement between Canada and France which was signed this day, and to lay on the table also a certain convention between Canada and France concerning the rights of nationals, and commercial and shipping matters, which was signed this day.

TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 107, respecting a certain trade agreement between Canada and France.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I suggest to the Secretary of State that he give to the house as full a statement as he can of what is embraced in the agreement so that we may have it before us in its essential features?

Mr. CAHAN: I should be very glad to do that, but I suggest to the right hon. gentleman that I be allowed to introduce the bill now so that in its printed form it may be distributed to-night. When it comes up again on Monday morning all hon. members will have copies of it before them and that will very much facilitate my explanation.

Mr. STEVENS: With the schedules.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish in any way to prevent my hon. friend from introducing the measure at once. With his customary courtesy he has given me a copy in advance, and, judging from the size of it, I think it would help us if, at the outset, he gave us an explanation, indicating the essential features. It is a considerable document as it stands.

Mr. CAHAN: It would be more convenient for me to deal with the schedules as printed and distributed, because the explanation will be rather lengthy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Very well.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CONVENTION CONCERNING RIGHTS OF NATIONALS AND COMMERCIAL AND SHIPPING MATTERS

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 108 respecting a certain convention between Canada and France concerning the rights of nationals, and commercial and shipping matters.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I assume that my hon. friend has considered the question whether this measure should have been preceded by a resolution.

Mr. CAHAN: Inasmuch as there is no increase in customs duty and there is no provision respecting which any expenditure of public money is involved, we were advised by the law officers that a previous resolution was not necessary.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SENATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 104, respecting the Canadian and British Insurance Companies.—Mr. Rhodes.

Bill No. 105, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.—Mr. Bennett.

Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Duranleau.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall said bills be read the second time?

Mr. RHODES: Later this day.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house again in committee of supply, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Post Office—outside service—salaries and allowances, $15,381,845.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $14,161,500.

Miscellaneous, including $5,000 to provide for payment of compassionate allowance to employees injured while in the performance of their duties or to other persons injured while performing duties in any way connected with the postal service or in protecting His Majesty's mails, or to the dependents of such employees or other persons who may be killed while so engaged, payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, and payment of $205 to S. R. Kirk, $1,076,030.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Mr. Chairman, I shall keep the committee only a few moments while I direct attention to a case of the appointment of a postmaster, which has been placed in my hands by the national organization of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League. This concerns the appointment of Mr. A. C. Belle Isle as postmaster at Campbellton, New Brunswick. I would like to give a few details in connection with this appointment. I am informed that the vacancy occurred in January, 1932, and that several returned soldiers applied for the position, among them being Messrs. Wetmore, Jardine, Duncan, Leblanc and Boucher. The appointment was actually made in January, 1932, when it was given to the present incumbent, Mr. Belle Isle. I understand that before the appointment was actually made the position was advertised as a bilingual position, and Mr. Belle Isle was appointed as temporary postmaster, I believe in August, 1932. About six weeks later in September, 1932, a second notice was posted. The second notice was in the usual form with the exception that it contained the following:

Applicants must have a sufficient knowledge of both French and English to satisfactorily discharge the duties of the office.

According to the evidence of one of the civil service examiners which appears on the file, this recommendation, which I am not criticizing, was made by the Post Office Department. This matter is referred to in a letter of January 30, 1933, addressed to the Postmaster General, reading in part as follows:

It appears that, at the examination conducted by the Civil Service Commission, the outstanding candidate for this office was Mr. J. S. Wetmore, a returned soldier. There were also other returned soldiers declared qualified. It appears, however, that the English speaking candidates were eliminated because it was declared that they had not a sufficient knowledge of the French language.

There are two grounds for complaint in connection with this competition. The first is the manner in which the bilingual qualification was advertised. We are informed that this qualification was eliminated but was later inserted in the advertisement in a very misleading form. Whatever the influences may be which caused the last advertisement to be posted in the manner it appeared, the impression was created in the minds of a large number of people and certainly in the minds of the English speaking returned soldier applicants that bilingualism would not be a deciding factor.

The second ground for complaint has reference to the standing of the appointee—Mr. Belle Isle. Whatever his personal qualifications are, our information indicates that his business qualifications and relationships are most unsatisfactory and should be investigated. Something in regard to his past history and standing was reported by the Civil Service Commission examiner but, for some reason, neither the Civil Service Commission nor your department conducted any further investigation, notwithstanding the examiner's recommendation that this should be done. That this candidate, whose business reputation is well known locally, should have been accepted without further investigation while qualified returned soldier applicants of unquestioned character and standing were eliminated is surprising and is the cause of great indignation.

The last paragraph reads:

In view of all the circumstances, the Canadian Legion requests that you permit this appointment to be made without reference to the bilingual qualification, as was apparently originally intended. This may entail the elimination of Mr. Belle Isle but our Campbellton branch believes this to be justified in view of his poor business standing in the community.

According to a return which was made in this house earlier in the session, the Civil Service Commission examiner recommended a further investigation into Belle Isle's character. Inquiries were made of several citizens in the community who were familiar with the appointee, including Mr. F. C. Mortimer of Saint John and Mr. H. A. Carr of Campbellton. Included in this return is a financial statement furnished by the appointee in June, 1930, for the purpose of securing credit from the Dominion Rubber Company, Limited. This purports to be an accurate and true statement of the appointee's financial position and shows a net surplus of $21,614. The appointee was examined under oath in October, 1931, under the provisions of the Debtors Act, and according to the evidence it is shown that the surplus which was alleged to have existed in 1930 never existed at all. The evidence which was taken under oath showed the appointee to be insolvent. There

is also on the file an affidavit by Dr. L. Erle German to the effect that the applicant is not physically reliable for his present duty because of his addiction to certain habits which render him entirely incompetent. The Civil Service Commission examiner made a further investigation into Belle Isle's character on December 15, 1932. On January 30, 1933, the Canadian Legion wrote to the Postmaster General protesting against this appointment. This letter also appears on the file. On February 10, 1933, the Postmaster General was interviewed by a delegation which was introduced by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). This delegation consisted of Mr. J. C. Herwig and E. B. MacLatchy of the Canadian Legion. On February 10, 1933, a further letter was written by the legion pointing out its position in regard to this appointee. On February 21, 1933, the executive of the Campbellton branch of the legion wrote to the Postmaster General to ask that further inquiries be made with regard to the fitness of this applicant. Under date of March 6, 1933, a letter was addressed to the Postmaster General asking for an interview, which took place on March 7. A petition addressed to the Postmaster General and to the Prime Minister was circulated through the community. This petition reads:

To the
Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, P.C., K.C., M.P.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
and
The Hon. Arthur Sauvé, M.P.,
Postmaster General.

We, the undersigned, hereby strongly protest against the appointment of Mr. A. C. Belle Isle as postmaster at Campbellton, New Brunswick, and do respectfully but emphatically request that a returned soldier be appointed to this position.

The petition was signed in the course of a few days by 1,286 adults including the present mayor, four former mayors, four town councillors, the police magistrate, four lawyers, eight doctors, twenty-six merchants, twenty superintendents and firm managers, sixty semi-professional men, accountants, and so forth, and one hundred and one of the community outside the actual city of Campbellton.

The Prime Minister was interviewed with regard to the whole situation on March 31, 1933, and I understand he wrote a letter on that date to the Postmaster General asking him to look into the entire situation surrounding this appointment. I wish to make it very clear in bringing this matter to the attention of the minister, that if in his opinion bilingual qualifications were necessary for that appointment, I am not criticizing that in the slightest degree, but the information that has been sent through the legion is to the contrary effect, namely, that bilingual qualifications were not required for the appointment in question. It would seem that the soldier preference was entirely ignored on this occasion. The present incumbent beyond question, if the sworn testimony on the file brought down in the house previously this session is worth while, has not the qualifications to render him a fit and competent person for this office. I am suggesting to the Postmaster General that he take into consideration the undoubted public opinion in that community with regard to this appointment and that he have this position vacated on account of the evidence existing against the present incumbent, have it readvertised and, if he is of the opinion that bilingual qualifications are absolutely necessary for it; then of course I cannot quarrel with that, but I have done my duty in bringing before my hon. friend and the committee a case submitted to me by the headquarters of the Canadian Legion.

Mr. SAUVE: My hon. friend will admit that this was a case involving the Civil Service Commission and Mr. Belle Isle was appointed by the commission after an examination—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): May I interrupt my hon. friend? There is in the file in regard to that a letter from the Civil Service Commission examiner stating that when the temporary appointment was vacated in September, 1932, and when the actual notice in connection with the bilingual qualification, which I read, was inserted, that was done by some of the officials of the Post Office Department.

Mr. SAUVE: The position was advertised as bilingual because it was assumed the population in Campbellton was about fifty-fifty French Canadians and English and it was requested that the appointee be bilingual, because the former postmaster was bilingual. Mr. Belle Isle, like other candidates, was examined; he was rated by both inspectors, one of my department and the other of the Civil Service Commission and he was rated first. I have on file many testimonials from high personages of Campbellton, for instance, Monseigneur Melançon and other French and English Canadians, stating that Mr. Belle Isle was very well qualified to be appointed as postmaster. Following that, the Civil Service Commission appointed him. After hearing the remarks of my hon. friend, I assure him that I am disposed to consider the case very fairly.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Thank you.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear that the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Sauvé) wishes to be fair towards those who have cause to complain. That is why I shall inquire from him whether he is also equitably disposed towards the bilingual municipalities of the other provinces.

In the parish of Pré-Sainte-Marie, in Saskatchewan, it appears that a person named Snider was appointed postmaster on the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir); the parish is almost entirely French Canadian. I request the hon. Postmaster General to be fair towards these people.

Will the hon. Postmaster General allow me to read a copy of a letter sent to him on February 22, 1933:

Dear Sir,—

Since November last, we have been in correspondence with the Postmaster General in connection with the transfer of our post office. Would you be kind enough to bring to bear your influence for justice's sake, on our behalf, and request the department to see that we get fair play.

This letter is in no way tainted by party prejudice; it is written solely in a spirit of fairness and without bias of any sort.

We, Canadian pioneers of Pré-Sainte-Marie, who settled this parish in 1912, a parish 100 per cent French, until 1920, having our own Church, where the Fathers of Sainte-Marie officiate, also a French Canadian school and, moreover, having had a French Canadian postmistress from 1912 to 1932, were given the mule's kick last autumn.

I trust it is not the Postmaster General's kick.

Our postmistress, having resigned, was replaced by a person speaking only one language and a complete stranger to our parish and what is still more grievous, one whose family resides in Pré-Sainte-Marie since only 4 years, and is of Dutch descent, the father being one of the leading socialists. Such are the premises where was located the post office, in charge of Mr. Garnet Snider, junior.

Now, we, French Canadians of Pré-Sainte-Marie, have no more post office, since the latter is located in the district of Forest V—and cannot request our mail or postal money orders in French, because Mr. Snider does not understand a word of French. As we have settled close to our Church, our post office is 3½ miles distant from our centre. Is it not shameful for a department or government which contends that it is anti-socialist, and when we French Canadians are the only ones to combat such false doctrine, that department forces us to call on these people each time we wish to post a letter.

This appointment was made on the recommendation of Doctor MacKay, of Tisdale—we have the written proof—and approved by a kind of committee whose members are mostly K.K.K., that is, anti-French and, especially, anti-Catholic. You can readily understand that a French Canadian had no chance of being appointed postmaster at Pré-Sainte-Marie.

These same gentlemen boasted in 1928 and 1929, that with the help of Mr. Anderson, Buckle and K.K.K. & company not a French Canadian would be left at Pré-Sainte-Marie. Allow me to state, sir, that they succeeded fairly well; in 1932, notwithstanding our protests they despoiled us of part of our school district. Now, they rob us of our post office —they rejoice over their triumph—for, as they state, it is from Ottawa that justice has come and from a French Canadian minister.

We can hardly realize that such a painful humiliation has been inflicted on our people, we French Canadians from Saskatchewan. If this humiliation had come from an English speaking minister or one of those night-caps of Long Lake, we would have felt wounded, but from a French Canadian minister it is doubly painful.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Brasset) allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am fully aware of the Pré-Ste-Marie case to which the hon. member refers.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): May I request the hon. Postmaster General to allow me to complete the reading of this letter.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member will note that my intentions are of the very best. By my explanation, if he will only accept it, he will discover that I am not against those he wishes to defend. We are looking into this matter, and I think the occasion is not well chosen, under the circumstances—the hon. member knows my feelings —to read this correspondence to the house for insertion in Hansard; that is, if he wishes to help in settling this difficult case, in a spirit of fairness.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): At the request of the hon. Postmaster General, I shall dispense reading this letter.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Thank you.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Pass it over to me, if you please; I shall read it.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): However, under the circumstances, I would request the hon. Postmaster General to look into this case of flagrant injustice. Whether it is in Saskatchewan or any other part of Canada, the French Canadians, when in majority and especially in parishes almost entirely French Canadian, are entitled to have one of their own race as postmaster, especially, when a French Canadian has occupied that post for

a long time. I would, therefore, request the hon. Postmaster General to exert his authority, as head of the Post Office Department, so that justice be done to the people of Pré-Ste-Marie.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): That is what I am endeavouring to do; we must avoid making matters worse.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat familiar with the Pré-Ste-Marie affair to which the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Brasset) referred, and I wish to add a few words previous to taking up some other matter. The hon. Postmaster General has known of this Pré-Ste-Marie case for a long time past, and yet it has not been settled. The post office was taken away from that locality and placed 3 or 4 miles further. The municipality of Pré-Ste-Marie is at least 80 per cent French Canadian.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, 49 per cent. The post office is situated at 2 miles from the Catholic church and school. That is far enough.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): Their church, school and municipal institutions were all grouped in French Canadian style. The post office was located close to the church and school before it was transferred to the home of the gentleman mentioned by the hon. member for Gaspé. The post office was taken away from this municipality and located three or four miles away. These facts were known to the hon. Postmaster General months and months ago and yet the question was never settled.

We made representations to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) who represents the constituency in which is situated the parish of Pré-Ste-Marie. I received an answer from the hon. Minister of Agriculture —unfortunately I have not got it with me— however, this is what he stated: I do not meddle in your affairs, please do not meddle in mine.

I do not doubt the good intentions of the hon. Postmaster General, however, I would request him to see that this case is settled, as soon as possible, in a fair-minded way— so as to prove satisfactory to the people of Pré-Ste-Marie.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the letter read by the hon. member for Gaspé, is dated February, 22, 1933 and continues as follows:

The last paragraph he read is the following:

We can hardly believe this shameful humiliation inflicted on our people. we French Canadians from Saskatchewan. If this humiliation had come from an English speaking minister or one of the night-caps of Long Lake, we would have felt wounded, but from a French Canadian minister, it is doubly painful. I do not know what intervened, however, they realize the injustice done, they are aware that we are protesting, they are now uneasy; they wish to bring into Pré-Sainte-Marie one of their conspirators, a returned soldier, and they state that "no Frenchman ever will have the post office" because, owing to the ignorance of these fanatics, they do not want any more French Canadians as postmasters.

We, French Canadians, cannot understand why our post office was transferred to Mr. Garnet Snider, our new postmaster. He is not a Conservative, having never voted, or is he a returned soldier, moreover, does not speak a word of French; yet, his appointment was approved—as they say—by a French Canadian minister. Furthermore, to crown matters, an anti-socialist government places our post office in the home of one of the leaders of this shameful movement.

However, sir, after taking cognizance of all the correspondence forwarded in connection with the Pré-Sainte-Marie post office and which must be on file in the Post Office Department, you will find that some French Canadians had sought the position of postmaster at Pré-Sainté-Marie. You will also note that the Post Office Department inspectors visited Pré-Sainté-Marie on November 7 and 8; but—a mystery —not a French Canadian knew what the inspector was doing there. The same automobile bearing the letters O.H.M.S. returned shortly after but—another mystery— . . . "How did you know I was here," said the inspector. Not a French Canadian came in touch with this important personage. Do not be shocked, sir, if, in the near future, the honoured name of Pré-Sainte-Marie disappears and is replaced by Forest V. . . . Then their triumph will be complete and they may then laugh because such a victory will only be possible through the help of a French Canadian.

Now, sir, we wish to know whether among our Quebec clan, there are still some with red blood in their veins, who are men of the type of our forebears or whether they are what the English call "mechanical robots" with a rubber stamp.

If you belong to the first category, we request your help. Could you make it a point to see that the Post Office Department acts fairly towards us without offending the gentlemen above mentioned. But if, on the contrary, you are mechanical robots, we shall pray God that he may enlighten your souls and we shall look to the press which is free and independent from political affiliation to inform our brothers in the east of Canada of the insult received, perhaps, indirectly but nevertheless with the full knowledge of the Post Office Department.

We are forwarding a copy of this letter to all worthy men who we believe equal to the task confided to them by their constituents.

Trusting to receive an answer so as to convey it to every French Canadian in Pré-Sainte-Marie.

(Signed) Henri Mahussier.

Pré-Sainte-Marie,
Saskatchewan.

This letter, sir, is dated February 22, 1933. I am the more pleased to inform the com-

mittee, because you, yourself, sir, forwarded a copy to the hon. Postmaster General.

What is the use, sir, of discussing, here, in the house, the rights of our compatriots, when the Postmaster General is concocting a deal with some one, since February last, and that this case has been dragging since October? Is it a fact that the Minister of Agriculture is a S. M.—Sealed Member—of the Ku-Klux-Klan, and when some one calls out "Sanbag" he pricks his ears. That simply means, strangers are near, be on the watch. Moreover, we have members of the Ku-Klux-Klan, in the house; there is one who has not been seen for a few days, we also have the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull)—

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): The discussion must refer to the item under consideration.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, that is what I am discussing. In this letter a complaint is lodged against the Ku Klux Klan which influenced the Postmaster General to appoint Snider.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member is fully aware that no personal attack against a colleague is permitted, whatever may be his feelings towards him.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): If it is not wrong to be a member of the Ku Klux Klan, it is neither wrong to tell them that they belong to that organization and explain the under-currents which influence certain appointments made here, in Ottawa. The time has come to throw light on the subject. The Postmaster General comes along with a smile and says: "I am settling this matter, do not read the letter, say nothing about it, you will harm their cause." It is more than time that the people in Canada he enlightened on what goes on at Ottawa and the disgraceful way French Canadians are treated by a French Canadian minister, who is so unfair to his race. It is more than time that the country should be made aware of the injustice committed.

When one stops to think that the post office in charge of a French Canadian was close to the church, that it was removed to a place 3 miles away, that it was given to a young man, son of a socialist, who never had voted, does not speak a word of French and, that these people are obliged to go to the next parish to mail their correspondence, one cannot help being shocked to note that the Postmaster General took the advice of fanatics rather than look after French Canadian interests. That is what took place. Then, we have outbursts of patriotism on the part of the Postmaster General who makes the round of clubs in Quebec proclaiming equal rights for French Canadians, and stating that we show ourselves tolerant and a lot of such phrases. Let him act like a man, a man with a big heart, a real patriot! The minister has created more than 300 or 400 post offices. If he wished to give Snider a post office, he was perfectly free to do so; however, why did he not leave a French Canadian to serve French Canadians at the post office, close to the church, in Pré-Ste-Marie? Why did he not do so? Quite the contrary, he deprives French Canadians of their post office near the church in Pré-Ste-Marie, he transfers it 3½ miles away, he appoints a young man who has never voted, a fanatic, son of a socialist. And that is called respect for the rights of French Canadians by the Postmaster General!

I have nothing further to add on the subject. All I can express is my deep indignation, and I feel certain that all who read the returns which were just tabled in the house, and from which a letter was read this afternoon, will share my indignation and will not expect any act of justice from the Postmaster General.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The day before yesterday, the hon. Postmaster General gave to the house figures tending to prove that under his administration, there had been much less dismissals than under others. To that effect, he stated that, from 1896 to 1911, there had been 1,788 dismissals and from 1922 to 1930, 1,148, while during the two years under his administration, there had only been 770 dismissals. According to his method of reckoning, the figures seem to show that, under the present regime, we have had less dismissals than under previous governments. The only way of calculating these figures would be to keep track of the years also. From 1896 to 1911, 15 years elapsed, and in the course of these 15 years, 118 postmasters were dismissed per year; from 1922 to 1930, 140 postmasters were dismissed per year, while during the two years that the hon. Postmaster General has had charge of the department, there were 380 dismissals per year. The figures are the same only shown under a different light. This proves that, under the present regime, we have had many more dismissals than under previous administrations.

A little further on, the hon. Postmaster General stated:

The dismissals are carried out on complaints made, not by myself, but by fellow citizens of the postmaster or by members, as it was practiced in the past; and when these complaints

were found to be facts by a commissioner, after an inquiry, they are dismissed.

I have before me, sir, a return in connection with the station of the parish of Cap-St-Ignace. There is no need to go further back and quote all the correspondence which took place. At the request of Messrs. Dechène and Choquette, advocates, Mrs. Métivier, the postmistress, was granted the right or privilege —if it is one—to have an inquiry. The report of the inquiry which I do not want to entirely read, ends as follows:

I consider that she—Mrs. Métivier—does not come under the provisions of article 55 of the Civil Service Act, chapter 22—revised statutes of Canada, 1927, and, therefore, I find no ground for the complaint of political partisanship lodged against said Mrs. Amarilda Métivier, of Cap-St-Ignace station.

(Signed) Fanning Gosselin,
Commissioner.

This does not seem to agree with the statement of the hon. Postmaster General, because the report of the inquiry states that Mrs. Métivier is not guilty of political partizanship.

Not only have we the findings of the commissioner who held the inquiry, but we have moreover a letter from the deputy minister which partly reads as follows—addressing himself to Mr. Choquette:

It is unnecessary to continue the inquiry as nothing has been proved against the postmistress, your client. I feel convinced that the hon. Mr. Sauvé will drop the case, as I mentioned when you last called at the department.

(Signed) L. J. Gaboury,
Deputy Minister.

There seems to be no ambiguity, the case of Mrs. Métivier seems definitely settled. On January 12 of that year, the Postmaster General writes to the member for Montmagny:

In reply I must inform you that the commissioner who held the inquiry found no ground for the complaint lodged against that postmistress, and, under the circumstances, the matter has been left in abeyance.

You will recall, no doubt, that I first had recommended the dismissal of this postmistress, pursuant to your statement to the effect that you had personal knowledge of her active political partisanship. However, previous to arrangements being made for the transfer of the post office, there was a request for an inquiry by Mr. Fernand Choquette, a request which I could hardly refuse and to which, moreover, you had no objection.

This letter is signed by the Postmaster General. After all this correspondence, a memo was prepared and addressed to the hon. Postmaster General, in which the Deputy Postmaster General inquires whether he will follow the suggestion of the member for Montmagny or else do what is right. On February 3, 1933, the hon. Postmaster General wrote to the member for Montmagny as follows:

The council has decided that the rules must be followed in this case as in others and that the findings of the commissioner holding the inquiry could not be set aside.

The hon. Mr. Meighen believes that this decision is in accordance with the rules established in 1923 and accepted by both parties.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Arthur Sauvé,
Postmaster General.

There is also a letter from the hon. member for Montmagny to the hon. Postmaster General which is rather harsh in its tone. On February 15, 1933, the hon. Postmaster General stated himself that nothing was found against Mrs. Métivier at the inquiry held, following the complaints lodged by the hon. member for Montmagny. The latter had stated that to his personal knowledge Mrs. Métivier had taken an active part in politics. The member for Montmagny did not appear at the inquiry; he was not even a witness of what took place. I was never in court but I have been present at trials in the course of which persons were warned: to avoid hearsay evidence and only testify to what they themselves had heard or seen.

Something incredible happened. On February 15, 1933, the hon. Postmaster General, although he had stated that the privy council would not sanction the dismissal of Mrs. Métivier, that Mr. Meighen had given his views on the subject, notwithstanding all this, decided to dismiss Mrs. Métivier. Mrs. Métivier is entitled to our sympathy, and must earn a livelihood. I know that the hon. Postmaster General is usually gallant to ladies. In saying so I have no afterthought.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Not in matters connected with administration.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Not in matters connected with administration, do you say? Nevertheless, it is a young lady that he appointed as postmistress at L'Islet.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I did not recommend her.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): That reminds me that a returned soldier had applied for the position of postmaster at Cap-St-Ignace station. I do not know why the hon. Postmaster General did not appoint him. Had he shown some backbone—he was asked just now to prove that he had some in connection with the Pré-Ste-Marie case—if he was firm in his own province, why did he not grant the request of the hon. member for Montmagny, with whom he is so friendly. I have here a

copy of a telegram recommending the returned soldier Roméo Bernier:

Re post office Cap-St-Ignace station would draw your attention to the request of returned soldier Romeo Bernier qualified—pursuant to act should be appointed immediately.
(Signed) Armand LaVergne.

The hon. Postmaster General has no excuse for not appointing him.

On September 7, 1932, the hon. member for Montmagny wrote to the hon. Postmaster General the following letter:

I enclose the form duly signed, recommending Mr. Romeo Bernier, returned soldier, for the position of postmaster at Cap-St-Ignace.
However, if there is to be a temporary appointment, I wish to recommend Mr. Jules Caron, from the same locality.
(Signed) Armand LaVergne.

That is Mr. Jules Caron not being conversant with the act, he is to be appointed temporarily, then it will be stated that the position comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and Mr. Roméo Bernier will get the appointment. I state that, in this case, the hon. Postmaster General was justified in appointing Mr. Roméo Bernier, he was a returned soldier. May I inquire why the hon. Postmaster General did not heed the inquiry?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Mr. Chairmain, before the hon. Postmaster General replies, as my name has been mentioned, I should like to give my version of the affair. Does the hon. member for L'Islet know the facts? He was probably informed by Messrs. Dechêne and Choquette who often correspond with him in connection with Montmagny affairs. First, let us see how matters stood: Mrs. Métivier had replaced a widow, Mrs. Bergeron, who had 10 children and was dismissed without an inquiry, in 1926, by the then Postmaster General. I am not aware that the hon. member for L'Islet rose in the house, at that time, to protest. When the election took place, the postmistress for the time being slandered public men in general and in particular the member for Montmagny. I requested her dismissal. If the thing happened again, I would act likewise. She denied having used the words which were attributed to her and came to call on me. I told her: Madam if you deny having used these words, we shall hold an inquiry. If you did not use them, evidently, nothing will be found against you. The inquiry was held and it was proved by two witnesses and her own evidence that she had slandered public men and, in particular, the member for Montmagny. The commissioner who held the inquiry declared that her case did not come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

That was not the aim of the inquiry; the aim was to find out whether she had said the words complained of. The evidence having clearly shown that they had been uttered, I requested her dismissal, with a view to ensuring that public men, be entitled to some consideration on the part of the public, and not be subject to slanderous attacks, especially, coming from those who are in the public service.

Those are the facts. That is all what took place. The hon. member for L'Islet states that the commissioner, Mr. Fanning Gosselin, found that Mrs. Métivier was not guilty. That is not the case. He found, on the contrary, that she made use of the words reproached to her, but that, according to him, the provisions of the Civil Service Act were not applicable to her. However, the facts remain. Mrs. Métivier paid no attention to the evidence brought against her and carried on her gossip, in the post office. I again insisted that she be dismissed, because it was only just that she should be.

I recommended Mr. Bernier. Moreover, the act obliged me to do so. He had the first right to be appointed providing he fulfilled the requirements of the Civil Service Act. Not being able to fulfil them, he was not appointed. It was Mr. Caron who was appointed. He is an excellent postmaster, everybody is satisfied. Moreover, he generously made up for the unfair way Mrs. Bergeron was treated in the past, by renting her house, this helps Mrs. Bergeron and her ten children to earn a livelihood.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that on September 19, 1930, the hon. member for Montmagny had recommended Mrs. Bergeron.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The charges made by the hon. member were denied under oath. There is no need of reading them, he knows them.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): They were proved to be true by two witnesses and corroborated by Mrs. Métivier, herself.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The charges were not as serious as all that. There is one here, the third. Mrs. Métivier is supposed to have stated, referring to the member for Montmagny: "He is no better than the others, he has given his support to every political party." One cannot contend that what this person said on the threshold of the post office was very insulting. She stated that the hon. member belonged to all parties. He himself boasts of it.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is not what I complain of. That was not her only statement.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I can read them:

1. I am acquainted with Mrs. Métivier, widow and postmistress of Cap-St-Ignace station;
2. She is known for her Liberal views and her opposition to the Conservative party;
3. Last spring and on two or three different occasions since then, in the presence of five or six persons, strangers to her family, Mrs. Métivier disapproved of the Conservative party's policy and even made personal attacks against Mr. Armand LaVergne, the present member for the county of Montmagny, stating: He is no better than others; he belonged to all political parties; he got elected so as to fill his pockets, as all others do, or other words of such nature.

And I have signed,

Onésiphore Frégeau.

On the other hand, according to the charges of Mr. Frégeau against the postmistress of Cap St. Ignace station, she is supposed to have made that statement in the presence of five or six persons. He evidently shows bad faith because these charges are entirely denied by Mrs. Noël Ouellet, Mr. William Bernier and Miss Aline Guimont. I have the documents here. These documents were not invented by me, they were furnished by the hon. Postmaster General.

Mr. LAVERGNE: (Translation): These people made no denial, they simply said that they did not hear the statement.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Did the hon. member for Montmagny hear the statement made by Mrs. Métivier.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): No, I did not hear it, however, I was given sufficient proof to request her dismissal. I requested it, and under the same circumstances, I would act likewise, because I consider that a post office is not a place in which to slander public men. If the hon. member for L'Islet thinks it is the right thing to state that a member gets elected to fill his pockets, well, it is up to him. That may not affect him but it does affect me.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I think the member for l'Islet is just as honourable as the member for Montmagny.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is what I thought.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): At the moment, his pockets are as full as mine.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I wish to give the hon. member for l'Islet some explanation with reference to Mrs. Métivier. Mr. Gosselin, who held the inquiry, in fact, sent in a report, as the hon. member for Montmagny stated, that he did not think that the charges made against this postmistress did not come within the four corners of the Civil Service Act, and on the representations made by the hon. member for Montmagny, who is best able to judge in this case, we wrote to Mr. Gosselin, the commissioner, to find out what he meant when he stated that the charge made against Mrs. Métivier was not a matter coming under the purview of the Civil Service Act. The commissioner replied that he had the proofs that these words had been said before the warrants were issued, that it was not in the course of the election. It has been an established rule long before to-day, long before I was put in charge of the Post Office Department, that a postmaster or postmistress has no right to take an active part in politics not only during election time, but from the moment he or she is appointed to that position.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I regret that the hon. postmaster did not think proper to forward me this letter from Mr. Fanning Gosselin, the commissioner who held the inquiry, because I requested all correspondence and this letter never reached me.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall give the hon. member another explanation which he will understand as he did the last. I communicated by telephone with Mr. Gosselin, in Quebec, to find out what he meant, since the hon. member for Montmagny persisted in maintaining his point and that we wished to be fair towards him. The hon. member for l'Islet will recognize that I took the necessary time to think over the matter and that in no way was I ill-disposed towards Mrs. Métivier, however, when a minister is given new proofs or new representations are made of a nature to change his views, he is forced to do so, if he has a conscience.

Mr. MARCIL: In my constituency I have the honour to represent a large number of people who speak the English language; nearly one-third of my constituents are English speaking, and the case I wish to submit to the minister and the committee concerns a post office in an English speaking centre Therefore I shall speak in English; otherwise I should have spoken in French. The minister is something of a countryman of mine, having been born in the parish adjoining my own, and I am going to submit this case to the hon. gentleman and ask him, as a fair-minded man, whether the action taken is in the interests of the postal service and of the dominion.

The town of Port Daniel Centre in the county of Bonaventure is largely English speaking. The postmaster who has been dismissed, Mr. E. E. Sweetman, had been in office twenty-five or thirty years and to the best of my knowledge no report had ever been made against him either by the department or by the patrons of the office. In 1917 or 1918, if I remember rightly, an attempt was made to have him removed but he appealed to Sir Robert Borden himself and was maintained in office.

The patronage in my county is in the hands of the Hon. Dr. Paquet, a former member of this house and of the Meighen administration. I have no objection to the minister receiving advice from him, but it is strange that my last opponent has apparently given up Bonaventure entirely and has taken no part in making recommendations to the Post Office Department. It must have been decided by the Conservatives of the district to have a change of postmasters made in that office, for there was no complaint of any kind against Mr. Sweetman. The following is the document recommending the appointment of John George Assels:

We, the undersigned officers of the Port Daniel West Conservative Committee, strongly recommend John George Assels, of Port Daniel Centre, for the positon of postmaster, replacing Mr. Edward Sweetman, at Port Daniel Centre, Que.

Arthur Lawrence, President.
Thos. B. Bisson, Asst. Sec'y.
J. Langlois, Tresorier.
William Ahern, Secretary.
Edgar Lawrence, Poll Representative.

To support this application, Dr. Paquet got into communication with the department and strongly urged the change in office. As it was a civil service appointment an investigation had to be held, and Mr. Gerard Simard of Rimouski was appointed investigator. This gentleman, who has made considerable money out of the department, making these investigations, was sent down to take the evidence. I will not read his report because I do not think it is very important, but I will quote from the testimony of Mr. Sweetman, who was under oath. Having been sworn, he said:

After the federal election, a few days after, M. Lawrence came at home and I told him that Mr. Bennett was a very clever man and he would not be a Prime Minister if he was not clever. At the last federal election, I think that a petition to get voters in favour of Mr. Marcil was put at the post office, in order to be signed by citizens, but I asked nobody to sign it. The petition was in the part of the house where we live. I don't remember to ask anybody to sign it; and to my knowledge, Mrs. Sweetman has not asked anybody to sign it. This petition remained at our house a very short time. I did not see any whiskey or liquors on my premises. Mrs. Sweetman is assistant postmaster since thirty-six years. As to the car of my son, Edwin, this one is the only owner that I know. My wife may have help him to pay, but I don't know.

[Mr. Marcil.]

The Post Office Department had no complaints against this man. Joseph Jones, who had carried the mail for four years, said that he had never heard any complaint against this post office, and Mr. Robert Sullivan swore:

In my opinion, the post office has always been well kept, since they had it, and never had any complaint against them.

During the past thirty-six years there has never been any reason whatever for a change. The postmaster appealed from the decision that was given. He is an Anglican, and I will read one testimonial given this man, which I think should weigh with the minister. It is a testimonial that would certainly weigh in any other part of the empire, a letter from the Lord Bishop of Quebec:

Bishopthorpe, Quebec,
August 30, 1932.

Postmaster General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—

I take the liberty of writing to you about the post office at Port Daniel Centre, Bonaventure county, the Gaspe peninsula.

The postmaster, Mr. Edward Sweetman, has held the position for over thirty years. He is an invalid but his wife and daughter discharge the work of the office. They are people of irreproachable character and I understand from the office of the inspector at Quebec, as well as from two clergymen who have lived at Port Daniel, that the duties of the post office are carried on quite efficiently.

It is rumoured that the office is to be taken away from the Sweetmans and given to some other person.

Personally, I am and always have been a Conservative but I feel strongly that to take the office away from these worthy people would be a grave injustice. I express the hope that you will take the necessary steps in order that Mr. Edward Sweetman may be left in charge of the post office at Port Daniel Centre.

I remain,

Yours sincerely,
Lennox Quebec,
Lord Bishop of Quebec.

Now what do we find in this case? We find three applicants clamouring for the position, backed up by Dr. Paquet, and on the other hand we have the Lord Bishop of Quebec giving the evidence he does in this letter, backed up by the Anglican clergymen who had been in the district. Moreover, there was evidence in the possession of the department to prove that no charge had ever been made against the conduct of this post office. A returned soldier applied for the position but he was thrown aside on the ground that

he had not the qualifications, being subject to fits. Mr. Ahern also applied but he too was rejected. Mr. Assels, however, was so insistent that he succeeded in getting Dr. Paquet into motion. Dr. Paquet first applied for the dismissal of Mr. Sweetman and was informed that an investigation would have to be held. The report of the investigator is of no significance, and it is contradicted by the postmaster himself.

I should like it to be clearly understood by the committee that the administration of the Post Office Department has become a matter of pure party patronage. In this district the postmaster had given long and efficient service, and he was highly recommended by the Bishop of Quebec. I would ask the minister also to read the evidence of Mr. Simard, and see whether the investigator was warranted in violating the act in the way he did. A petition was left at the residence of Mr. Sweetman but it was never presented to anyone; no one was ever asked to sign it either by the postmaster or by his wife. The son, who is a grown up man, owns an automobile, and as he had nothing to do with the post office he was free to come and go as he liked. No evidence was submitted against this postmaster except that Mrs. Sweetman, it is said, made the remark on one occasion that Mr. Houde of Montreal was a tramp. That, however, is contradicted. As regards Mr. Bennett, she eulogized him, saying that if he were not clever he would not be Prime Minister.

The Postmaster General is a man of high standing in his party and enjoys a high reputation in Quebec as an honest man. I should like him to read over the evidence and say whether, in the light of the testimonial that has been given this man Sweetman and in view of the standing of these people in the community, their respectability and their long and faithful service to the department for thirty-six years, the department was justified in dismissing him simply in order to appoint a party hack who was not a returned soldier and who I am sure could not have rallied in any sense the majority of the patrons of the office. The fact of the matter is that the change was made purely for party purposes. I must leave the matter in the hands of the minister; I can do nothing now. I do hope, however, that when he has a moment of leisure the minister will look over the file and convince himself that I have made out a fair case.

Mr. SAUVE: I thank the hon. member for Bonaventure for his remark. I have always honoured him as a gentleman and my opinion has not been changed to-day. With regard to the case he mentioned, it is quite true that Mr. Sweetman was dismissed upon the complaint of Mr. Paquet. The charge was denied by Mr. Sweetman but the commissioner, after holding an investigation on August 23, 1932, found the postmaster guilty on two counts. A witness Lawrence stated that Mr. Sweetman while discussing politics at his own home had declared that Mr. King was the best man and no one could be better. This same witness stated that Mr. Sweetman had stated to him that during the provincial elections of 1931, Liberal liquor had been left at his place for distribution. According to this same witness, Mr. Sweetman admitted that at the last federal elections a petition to be signed by the electors in favour of Mr. Marcil had been left at his home by his brother. The hon. member for Bonaventure knows that I have the highest respect for the bishop and the religious authorities, but this was not a matter of morals, it was one of fact. Certain regulations were enacted before my regime, and when the postmaster had been declared guilty of political partisanship, I could not do other than follow the regulations.

Mr. MARCIL: Did the minister take into consideration the thirty-six years of service which had been given without an adverse report being made by any officer of the department? Did the minister act merely on the opinion of a man from Rimouski who said that a petition had been left at the postmaster's house but that no one had been asked to sign? They could have left a similar petition at the home of the minister.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): I wish to inquire from the hon. Postmaster General what decision he has reached with reference to the appointment of a postmaster for the town of Iberville?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am aware that the hon. member for St. John's-Iberville (Mr. Rhéaume) is well informed as regards this matter. A number of representations were made, as I wrote to Mr. Denicourt, one of the candidates chosen by the Civil Service Commission, and we are considering the matter. We shall have to conform to the regulations and make the appointment accordingly. It is true that it is a case which comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. The hon. member is well acquainted with the facts. We have to proceed with great caution, listen to representations, and when they have all been heard we shall act accordingly, conforming to the act or the public interest.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): Will the hon. Postmaster General allow me to point out to him that if he wishes to conform himself to the Civil Service Act and amendments introduced by his party last year—if my memory serves me right—I cannot see why he hesitates to appoint Mr. Denicourt?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The matter is not entirely under my jurisdiction. The revenue of the post office at Iberville is more than $3,000. It is true that my approval must be sought finally.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): I understand. That is why he should not have any hesitation; the Civil Service Commission has recommended the appointment of Denicourt and he has his appointment in his pocket since April 3. On April 19, 1933, I wrote the following letter to the hon. Postmaster General:

Hon. Arthur Sauvé,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—

I have been informed that the Civil Service Commission had chosen Mr. Wilfrid Denicourt as postmaster of Iberville, over fifteen days ago, but his appointment had not yet been approved by the Post Office Department.

I have no doubt that the department will approve the appointment of Mr. Denicourt because he is a returned soldier and qualified for the position.

I am aware that influences were brought to bear to appoint another person, however, I trust that nothing will come of it, because it would be very unfair to Mr. Denicourt and, furthermore, your department cannot disregard the Civil Service Commission's choice. I am in no way interested in this appointment. All that I request is that the act should take its course.

The following is the answer received from the Postmaster General, on April 20, 1933:

Dear Mr. Rhéaume,—

I am in receipt of your letter dated April 19 with reference to Mr. Wilfrid Denicourt who, as you stated was chosen to be postmaster at Iberville.

In reply, I wish to state that my department is awaiting the inspector's report to settle the appointment permanently.

If, my memory serves me right, there are two returned soldiers who have applied for the position.

As you are also aware, the new Civil Service Commission is not complete.

According to the examination list Mr. Denicourt came first with 84 points and Mr. de Beaujour is fifth out of six candidates, with 71 points. I trust that the hon. Postmaster General will approve the choice of the Commission. The latter when advertising the vacant position stated:

The secretary of the commission will receive applications up to February 17, 1933.

[Mr. Sauvé.]

According to the report, before me, from the commission, five candidates out of six complied to that order of the commission; the only one who did not comply was Mr. de Beaujour, who forwarded his application on March 10. I cannot see why one should hesitate in appointing Mr. Denicourt who is a returned soldier, has five children and has had no work for over a year, while Mr. de Beaujour has been employed over 3 years at the locks in St. John; he earns $450 to $500 per year and draws a pension of $175 from the State. Moreover, he owns a lot where he has a garden. He therefore, is fairly well-to-do. Denicourt is a returned soldier, a brave lad who joined the 22nd Battallon, passed the Civil Service test and came out first. Mr. de Beaujour came out 5th; however, I am aware that he has been pulling strings and the hon. Postmaster is aware of that fact. When Mr. Goyette died, last autumn, Mr. Ernest Thuot, a good conservative, probably the most Conservative partizan in the county of St. John's-Iberville—

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): There are not many in St. John's-Iberville?

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation) —who has been head clerk at the Liquor Commission, ever since the store was open in Iberville, gave up his position to become temporary postmaster, if I am well informed, Thuot wants de Beaujour to be appointed on condition that he is kept on and that the salary and pension be split in two. I consider that Thuot's appointment was not regular and did not comply with the act. I can assure you that if ever the Liberal party returns to power the first dismissal will be that of the postmaster at Iberville. I shall request it myself as an act of justice. Mr. Thuot had no business to give up his position at the Liquor Commission. He had been employed there for the last five or six years. He took an active part in politics, in 1931, he went to the county of Rouville—when employed at the Quebec Liquor Commission to carry on conservative propaganda from door to door. The Quebec government did not even hold an inquiry about it. After the death of Mr. Goyette he gave up his position and deprived Miss Goyette of the position she had held at the post office for over twenty years, and threw her on the street. To-day, if Denicourt is not appointed, it is because influence was brought to hear to have de Beaujour appointed in his place, so as to keep Thuot there and divide the salary. If Thuot lost his position he has but himself to blame and I do not think that he can get that position back at the Quebec Liquor Commission.

I trust that, notwithstanding all the recrimination I have heard, the Postmaster General will comply with the act as regards this appointment. I wish to inquire from him after these explanations—he knows the facts as well as I do—whether he will accept the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission in connection with this appointment.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I think the hon. member will be satisfied when the case is definitely settled.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): I hope so. Now, sir, I do not wish to hold up the estimates, but I would request the hon. Postmaster General to state why, in the parish of St. Georges-d'Henriville, county of Iberville, two tenders were called in connection with the rural mail contract, when a third contract was awarded without calling for tenders.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): May I request the hon. member to kindly postpone his inquiry as I have not the information with me. It is a question of contracts and there are many of them.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): There are but two.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I mean throughout Canada. St. John's-Iberville is but one county and there are many others. I shall be pleased to give him all the explanations and details he desires. I do not wish to conceal anything, he has a right to receive the information, and he shall have it.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): Thanks. However, I would not like to have these details after the contract has been awarded.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, no.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): May I inquire from the hon. Postmaster General why a contract was awarded without tenders being called and why tenders are necessary in the other case?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): At present, I cannot answer. Had I this information I would willingly give it.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): When does the hon. minister expect to furnish this information.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall be able to give it on Monday morning.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): This will be quite satisfactory. Now, sir, a contract held by Mr. Barrière, in St. Gregoire, was transferred. Can the hon. postmaster inform me to whom this contract was transferred?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I have not the name of the person here. The hon. member should have notified me that he desired this information; he could, in the course of the session, have secured that information either by putting a question on the order paper or otherwise. He would have been given a reply in the house, and, thereby, had it inserted in Hansard. I would have been pleased to have given the information as that is one of the aims of the session. We cannot furnish all information without knowing what hon. members require. I shall make a point to bring such information with me, on Monday morning.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): I would like to know to whom the contract of Mr. Barrière of St-Gregoire-le-Grand has been transferred. I would also like to know why, in the same parish, two calls for tenders were posted, from March 27 to April 22, and why one of these posters was taken down. I think that one of these contracts was awarded to Mrs. Bessette of St-Gregoire-le-Grand.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): There was correspondence exchanged recently in this connection.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): Will the hon. Postmaster General furnish me with this information Monday morning?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): Mr. Chairman, western Canada is not the only place where English speaking postmasters were appointed in parishes entirely French Canadian. In my own county, adjacent to Ottawa, the thing was done a little over a year ago. In January, 1931, the postmaster of Val-des-Bois was dismissed because of political partisanship.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): What parish?

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): Val-des-Bois, Hull county. On January 22, four applications were made to the Civil Service Commission by Messrs. Archie Larocque, Théodore Thibeault, Hermas Morin and Isidore Larocque. Some time later, after the position had been advertised, three candidates were given a test and Mr. Peck was appointed. He was the least qualified candidate, according to the report of the inspector who had charge of the test.

Representations were made to the Postmaster General. In the file which I have here, there is a memo from the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Gaboury:

The Postmaster General has received further representations concerning the above postmaster-

ship. Provided the assistant postmaster can take care of the bilingual requirements of the office, the appointment of Mr. Peck will be satisfactory.

However the examiner or inspector who had charge of the test refused to recommend the appointment of Mr. Peck because at Val-des-Bois, there is only one English speaking citizen and that is Mr. Peck; the entire population with this exception speak French. On April 23, Mr. Underwood wrote to the district superintendent:

Representations have been received by the Postmaster General concerning applicant Peck who, it is noted, is not considered by the investigating officer as having the necessary bilingual qualifications.

This matter has been examined and the department considers that, provided the assistant postmaster can fully take care of the bilingual requirements of the office, there would appear to be no objection to Mr. Peck's appointment if he is otherwise a recommendable applicant.

Mr. Peck does not speak a word of French. There is not an English family at Val-des-Bois. The commission requested on more than one occasion. . . . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order! It is six o'clock.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): I shall be through in a minute. On more than one occasion the commission requested a report from the district superintendent. It took four months to obtain that report, and, finally, Mr. Peck was appointed. I take this opportunity to point out this affair to the house. I think, sir, that in the county of Hull, where there are few English speaking citizens, and at Val-des-Bois, in particular, where there are none, the department should have appointed a French speaking postmaster.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

Mr. R. S. WHITE (Mount Royal) moved:

That the following bills be placed upon the order paper for consideration in committee of the whole, this day:—

Bill No. 101 intituled: "An Act for the relief of Angelo Stavrow."

Bill No. 102, "An act respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company."

Mr. SPEAKER: This can only be moved by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

[M. Fournier.]

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 68, for the relief of Birdie Glickman Steinberg.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 69, for the relief of Harry Prupas.—Mr. Vallance.

Bill No. 75, for the relief of Olga Shidlowskaya Lowrey.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 76, respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Casgrain.

Bill No. 85, for the relief of Emily Florence Lawrence Knight.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 86, for the relief of Marjorie Bertha Willcox.—Mr. Bothwell.

Bill No. 87, for the relief of George Andrew Carruthers.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 88, for the relief of Lilias Torrance Newton.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 89, for the relief of Hilda Mary Falkenberg Gilmour.—Mr. Bell (St. Antoine).

Bill No. 90, for the relief of Eva Amy Falle Jordan.—Mr. White (Mount Royal).

Bill No. 91, for the relief of Joseph Claremont Carroll.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 92, for the relief of Venita Angeline Scotten Kendall.—Mr. Heaps.

Bill No. 101, for the relief of Angelo Stavrow.—Mr. White (Mount Royal).

GENTER THICKENER COMPANY

The house in committee on Bill No. 102, respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company, Mr. Stirling in the chair.

On section 1—Extension of time for application to revive patent.

Mr. BENNETT: I think this bill should stand. It is a very serious matter, a patent of this character, and I have strong views as to what the duty of parliament is. The Secretary of State is not here. The bill has been placed on the order paper by consent of the house and if it stands there will be no inconvenience and there will be an opportunity of looking into it.

Progress reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

APPEAL TO PRIVY COUNCIL IN CRIMINAL CASES—LEGISLATIVE POWER UNDER STATUTE OF WESTMINSTER

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East) moved:

That the order of the house for the second reading of Bill No. 57, an act respecting the criminal code (appeals to privy council) be discharged.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object sought by this bill has been attained by the amend-

ment of the criminal code which passed the house last week.

Motion agreed to and order discharged.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SATURDAY SITTING

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the motion standing in my name in the notices of motion be allowed to stand.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Is that the one with relation to the possibility of sitting to-morrow?

Mr. BENNETT: We will not sit to-morrow.

Motion stands.

SUPPLY

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The house in committee of supply, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Post Office—outside service—salaries and allowances, $15,381,845.

Mail service, including mail service by air, $14,161,500.

Miscellaneous, including $5,000 to provide for payment of compassionate allowance to employees injured while in the performance of their duties or to other persons injured while performing duties in any way connected with the postal service or in protecting His Majesty's mails, or to the dependents of such employees or other persons who may be killed while so engaged, payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, and payment of $205 to S. R. Kirk, $1,076,030.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, there was a postal station on St. John street in Quebec which was closed recently, and I have received many letters and resolutions protesting against the closing. Would the hon. gentleman say what were the reasons which induced him to make that change?

Hon. ARTHUR SAUVE (Postmaster General): The reason is that the closing of that postal station on May 1 will result in an immediate saving of about $1,800 per annum. The ultimate saving through the withdrawal of the staff and subsequent adjustments will amount to about $5,000 per annum. At the same time we are improving the service by two suboffices.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I must tell my hon. friend that the people of that section of the city do not seem to agree with him as to the improvement resulting from this change, because I am receiving many protests about it. This post office is situated in one of the most important sections of the city of Quebec. The citizens of both Quebec South and Quebec East were taking advantage of the facilities there. However, I hope if the result is not what my hon. friend expects, it will be possible to persuade him to revert to the former situation.

Mr. SAUVE: We will see at the end of this year. I myself received several protests, but I sent letters to the Quebec papers explaining our purpose, and after the explanation given I think my hon. friend from Quebec East will accept our action. I did not receive any further protests since.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have much good will for the minister.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): I have a complaint from Dease Lake and Telegraph Creek post offices in British Columbia. A notice has been posted in those post offices that from now on the parcel post rate will be 12 cents a pound. They are the only places in British Columbia where that change has been made. I have inquired as to the reason. I realize it is probably for the sake of economy, but I would like to ask the Postmaster General how much he anticipated will be saved by depriving those two post offices of that service. It is 5 cents a pound in other post offices in British Columbia, but it is raised to a flat rate of 12 cents for those two post offices. I have taken it up with the deputy minister but he could not give me any other answer than that it is done for the sake of economy. I can see no warrant for depriving those people of that convenience for the few dollars that may be saved; for I presume the mail has to go there anyway, whether there are few parcels or many, and I cannot see what saving can be accomplished.

Mr. SAUVE: We tried to do our best; if we have not satisfied the people there we will seek to do so. But my hon. friend will understand the situation that faces us on account of the depression of business. We are trying to do our best to serve the public and at the same time to serve the interests of the country. If your people are not satisfied we will seek to satisfy them.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): May I also ask the Postmaster General this: in the same district the towns of Anyox and Alice Arm up to last spring had three mail services a week. Last spring they were cut to two, which was naturally a hardship on those communities. The latest report that I have received informs me that it is anticipated that the service will be put to once a week.

I have several letters containing these complaints, but I do not think it is necessary to put them on record. I just want to register these complaints and I should like the minister to look into the matter very carefully before reducing the services from three to one a week. The population is the same as it was before, so I do not see why they should be deprived of that service.

Mr. SAUVE: We have asked for a better price for a weekly service. I suppose we will receive tenders, and we shall do our best.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Can the hon. Postmaster General recall the facts in connection with the postoffice of Missanabie, county of Algoma, Ontario, which were the subject of quite a considerable correspondence between the Rev. Father Maynard, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) and the hon. Postmaster General? The hon. Postmaster General, I presume, recalls this post office and can reply to the questions which I desire to put to him?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Will the hon. Postmaster inform the house who is, at present, in charge of this post office?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Missanabie? Mr. Stuart.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): It is the same Mr. Stuart who was the subject of the correspondence referred to?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I think so.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Evidently, the Postmaster considers that Mr. Stuart has the qualifications necessary to fill this important post? .....Silence is consent.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I beg your pardon! I was waiting for the hon. member to resume his seat before replying. I am still working on that case. We have done our utmost to settle it, endeavouring at the same time to protect the interest of the department and meet the wishes of people of Missanabie, in Algoma West. There are naturally two sides to this question of a postmaster. Charges were lodged against him because of his personal views and behaviour towards certain citizens. The charges were absolutely denied by the postmaster. We notified the district superintendent to look into this matter and hold an inquiry. The superintendent sent in a report stating that the charges against this postmaster were not substantiated. Moreover, I requested one of the higher officials of the department Mr. Underwood, who is General Superintendent of Postal Services, to make a thorough examination of this case and continue the inquiry in this respect. Mr. Underwood's report is as follows—

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Would the hon. minister give the date?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): September 16, 1932.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Was there a report made after that date?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I do not think so. The report is as follows:

The undersigned discussed this question with the district superintendent, at North Bay. The Inspector Gagné who made the latest report on the case, was not at the office, I could not question him personally on the matter.

The district superintendent is of the opinion that there is no justification to take any definite action against that postmaster, considering the complaints lodged up to date. He added that there were no doubt people around Missanabie who are inimical to the postmaster and who are making every effort to have him dismissed.

On the other hand, the district superintendent considers that the efficient services rendered by the postmaster and the satisfactory way he manages the post office from the financial viewpoint, etc., justifies his maintenance in office. So far as we are specially concerned, namely, that an assistant postmistress unsealed a letter, it is clear that she did not do so with premeditation or malice. Had she acted thus, she could no doubt have destroyed this letter, while it has been clearly established that the moment she noticed that she had unsealed this letter, by mistake, thinking it was addressed to the postmaster, she immediately handed the letter to the son of the person to whom the letter was addressed, so that he might deliver it, explaining what had happened; moreover, the letter was never taken out of the envelope.

It was stated that the postmaster was hostile to French Canadians. This statement is denied by the postmaster who says that he gets along very well with the majority of the people but that there are some who spread trouble and discord and endeavour to bring charges against him. The present case is an instance of a case where it is difficult to get to the bottom of the affair; however, after discussing the subject with the district superintendent, who has personal knowledge of the facts, and considering how far the affair has gone, I think that we are not justified in taking immediate action by dismissing this postmaster.

(Signed) E. J. Underwood,
General Superintendent of
Postal Services.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): The hon. Postmaster, I think, stated that this report was dated May 16, 1932?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): September.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): September 1932?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): If I understood the wording of this report, it is stated that action cannot be taken immediately? We are now in May, 1933; it is evident that no action was taken immediately. When does the hon. Postmaster General expect to take energetic action, in keeping with the actual situation as represented to the hon. Postmaster General?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Energetic action? I do not wish people to think that I lack energy; however, I should like to be given credit for sound judgment. It is not a matter of energy only but of sound judgment.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): It is an excellent thing to have both.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes, one must have both. Since that date there has been some correspondence exchanged with Father Maynard, who seems quite unfriendly towards the postmaster. I inquired from the local member, who should be consulted in such matters, and he informed me that the postmaster enjoyed the confidence of the great majority of the citizens of that locality.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Who is the member for that constituency?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): It is Mr. Simpson, member for Algoma West. The hon. member for Quebec East must be acquainted with him.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): There is nothing wrong in asking his name.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, on the contrary. If some one inquired who was the member for Quebec East, everybody would know that it is the Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): The hon. member for Quebec East robbed me of my powder!

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I wish to state to the hon. senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) that, ever since then, we have received no request from any group of persons belonging to the constituency, protesting against his conduct and asking for his resignation.

As to the administration of this post office by Mr. Stuart—the report speaks for itself—there are no complaints. Mention was made of a letter unsealed by an assistant. She gave an explanation, which is, moreover, that given by many postmasters. Furthermore, even under the preceding regime, I have knowledge of similar cases happening, and the then Postmaster General did not consider it sufficient, after listening to explanations given, to demand the resignation of the postmaster.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General is not quite consequent. Perhaps, he wishes, in his argument, to resort to the premises which he laid down just now, when he stated that not energy but sound judgment was needed.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, both energy and sound judgment.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): I always thought that, first, sound judgment was needed and, then, energy. At all events, the hon. Postmaster General states that no complaints have been received for a year past. It is unnecessary to have received complaints within a year; positive complaints were lodged and the correspondence is there to prove it. The Rev. Father Maynard openly complained of the administration of that post office in bitter terms, perhaps, not without cause. The Hudson Bay's representative also complained. An inquiry was held. The hon. Postmaster states that it is all over, that a report was made in September, 1932, and immediate action was to be taken. It is unnecessary to sift the whole affair again and to hear further complaints. It behooves the Postmaster General to act so as to arrive at some conclusion. This place, sir, is situated in the county of Algoma which is worthily represented in the house by the chief whip of the party on your right, sir, that is, perhaps, an explanation. However, faced with these specific charges which were lodged by the Rev. Father Maynard and others, I think that the Postmaster General shows much indolence and a great lack of energy. Perhaps, there is some sound judgment mingled with it, however, as the matter stands, it does not show very much.

On May 16, 1932, Mr. Ross—the latter cannot be charged with partizanship, as he does not know French and is the district administrator of North Bay—states:

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Is he a post office employee?

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Quite so, he is an inspector. It is the official report of the district superintendent of North Bay, to the general superintendent of Postal services. He states:

> There is no doubt that the postmaster has some prejudice against French Canadians; if he has not against every one; he has, at all events, against the French element of his locality and has shown very little tact in his dealings with these people.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Shame! shame!

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Is that the report of an official of the Post Office Department?

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Quite so. It is the report of Mr. John C. Ross, district superintendent to the general superintendent of postal services.

It is then unnecessary to search for a mare's nest and await charges to follow. Moreover, the hon. Postmaster General has the complete file before him and he can ascertain the wording of the complaints. On April 8, 1932, the Rev. Father Maynard wrote to the Postmaster General. I do not wish to insert in Hansard the whole letter, which is very long, however, the Rev. Father expresses himself in the following terms:

Often, complaints were lodged with the Post Office Department in connection with the post office of Missanabie. We have received promises that there would be improvement—

They are, perhaps, in the nature of the promises that the distinguished leader of the hon. minister made previous to the 1930 election. They are always promises of improvement but nothing coming out of them.

—but we have had, up to now, no satisfactory results.

The cause of the faulty service at the post office of Missanabie dates from when Mr. Stuart was appointed postmaster. Mr. Stuart has only been residing in Missanabie a few years. Up to last autumn he was the Hudson Bay's factor. From the day he arrived in Missanabie, Mr. Stuart, carried on an unrelenting war against Mr. Arthur Coté to rob him of his store customers.

Things were so unpleasant for Mr. Coté, that he left the place.

Since Mr. Stuart has become postmaster he has ostensibly renewed his antipathy for French Canadians. Last month he roughly handled a young man—

The hon. Postmaster General knows to what I am alluding to.

—a crippled young man, a French Canadian, who presented himself at the post office to claim his mail. . . .

The following is another complaint. Mr. Arthur Godon, of Missanabie, had requested from the chief of police a letter of recommendation on his good standing. . . .

It is exactly the letter to which the hon. Postmaster General alluded just now. One may doubt the report of the inspector, to the effect that the letter in question had been unsealed but that the one who had opened it, Mrs. Stuart, had not read it. The hon. Postmaster General does not expect that we are going to gulp down that story. It was a most important letter concerning Mr. Stuart himself as regards complaints made against him. Mrs. Stuart was well aware that the magistrate would forward this letter to the person it was addressed, and I am quite convinced that she did it knowingly, willingly and with the purpose of finding out what it contained. I shall continue the letter of the Rev. Father Maynard:

With this information you may realize, sir, that a change is necessary. French Canadians have a right to be treated with respect and justice.

With such a letter it is unnecessary to bring further complaints, so as to have an avalanche of them, to stir the sound judgment but, especially the energy of the hon. Postmaster General and to continue the inquiry. The inquiry had been started it should have continued.

Some time later—as the file shows—on May 26, 1932, the hon. Postmaster General wrote to the Rev. Father Maynard as follows:

I wish to refer to your letter of April 8, in connection with the administration of the Missanabie post office.

An inspector of the superintendent's office, at North Bay, recently visited your locality, and I understand he had an interview with you. The postmaster was warned about the complaints to which his attitude gave rise among his French Canadian post office clients. . . .

Naturally, the Postmaster General, notwithstanding all these complaints, will admonish him a little. He makes promises to the Rev. Father Maynard and imagines that the Canadians will rest content with admonitions and promises.

The postmaster was warned about the complaints to which his attitude gave rise among his French Canadian post office clients and I trust that this warning will have a beneficial and lasting effect.

It is rather a weak explanation.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to point out another fact to him.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I forgot to state, just now, that Mr. Stuart was granted leave to go to England to visit his sick mother. He returned a month ago.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): He seems to be ill himself.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Before the postmaster left for England much water had run under the bridge. The Postmaster General showed little backbone; however, I trust that when the report is complete, he will give proof of a little more backbone. On May 25, the Rev. Father Maynard wrote to the Postmaster General the following letter. However, the

Postmaster General took great pains not to include it in the returns tabled in the house. This letter does not appear on the file which was asked and tabled in the house. Father Maynard thus expresses himself:

I have just received your answer to my letter of April 8, last, complaining of the postmaster at Missanabie and strongly requesting his dismissal—

The Rev. Father Maynard had requested his dismissal.

—on unimpeachable evidence. May I state that the settlement of this question—such as you state in your letter—does not satisfy those concerned, and with cause.

Yet, the hon. Postmaster General maintains that his judgment is sound and that he is particularly well provided with backbone. He has never done anything. Let us return to the letter. The Rev. Father mentions two grievances, and he has unimpeachable evidence.

And with this unimpeachable evidence you, the Postmaster General, are satisfied with a simple admonition against this enemy of the French Canadians, this strange brazen-faced person, while all wish that he be deprived of the management of the post office.

It is most unfortunate that one of our race, who could protect so easily the interest of our people, sacrifice them. We are moreover sufficiently scoffed at by the English element in all our dealings, not to do justice, at least, to our people in such a flagrant case.

The Rev. Father Maynard, who is a member of the eminent society of Jesuits, does not mince his words; he, perhaps, remembers that he is a soldier. Moreover, sir, he uses a very strong and appropriate term which, unfortunately is not parliamentary. I therefore do not wish to confide it to Hansard, in order that I may not be requested to withdraw it.

We shall remember—

Let us say here that there is a very energetic term which describes admirably the situation.

—this lack of energy on your part when the occasion offers.

I think, sir, if the hon. Postmaster General wished to prove that he had backbone and had been willing, he could have settled this case to the satisfaction of all who lodged complaints. Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Stuart went over to Europe to visit his sick mother, the inquiry could have been continued, even before his departure, but, especially, it could be continued now. I trust that the Postmaster General, with the complete returns he has, containing such scathing reprimands, will first give proof of his sound judgment and energy or energy and judgment or both together and that he will remedy the intolerable situation existing at Missanabie, so that those of our people who guide public opinion and enjoy the confidence of the people may continue to do so.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Will my hon. friend allow me to put a question? Has he any statistics as regards the proportion of French speaking people in that locality?

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): I have not the figures with me. The French population of that district is quite large, it is quite a large proportion. I could not state exactly what it is, however, the French influence in that district is considerable.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of the minister to a situation which exists no doubt throughout Canada, but which does exist in that part of Canada west of the great lakes. The transportation companies are practising economies by the cutting down of train services, especially on the branch lines throughout western Canada. Because of this reduction in railway service we are receiving a rather limited postal service. The branch line upon which I happen to live was built some twenty years ago. Originally we had a passenger train and a mixed train daily with a daily mail delivery both east and west. This service has since been reduced to tri-weekly. There are other instances where the service has been reduced to bi-weekly. Because of these reductions in service the business men of the communities find themselves without the necessary postal accommodation, and I was wondering if it would be possible for the Post Office Department to consider the possibility of putting on a truck or automobile service in order to provide the necessary postal accommodation. Will the minister and his officials give consideration to this question?

Mr. SAUVE: The Post Office Department is not responsible for the situation which has been created by the railways. In some cases where the railway service has been cut we have put on a special service and I hope that within a few months the situation of which my hon. friend complains will be remedied.

Mr. VALLANCE: I appreciate and admit the argument advanced by the minister that the Post Office Department is not responsible for the economies being practised by the railway companies but it seems to me that this department of government which always boasts of the manner in which its business is carried on will be jeopardizing its efficiency if it does not take cognizance of these conditions. I suggest in my humblest way that the minister and the officials of his department

give consideration to this question because it is working a hardship upon the business men located on these branch lines who are receiving only three mails a week and sometimes only two, whereas the previous service was daily. They find it impossible to carry on business under these conditions. I leave the matter with the minister for his consideration.

Mr. SAUVE: We are considering it.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Now that Mr. Stuart has returned to this country, the hon. Postmaster General would be very gracious if he would inform the house when he has the intention to continue the inquiry and when he expects to receive a report.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): My hon. friend will recognize—he has had much public experience—that it is not always an easy matter to act quickly. Certain difficulties arise in a country composed of various elements like ours. The hon. member also knows that in the course of my few years in public life, I have never missed the opportunity to champion the cause of my compatriots, and this to the utmost. It is neither at my age nor at this phase of my public life that I will become a traitor to their interests; however, conscious of my responsibility in the administration of the country, I think I am justified in taking all possible means—I am not referring to violent means, my character is not such nor am I an extremist—to reach a settlement of this question, as I have done in the past without making a display of patriotism, and to work on behalf of my compatriots in Ontario, and, my own people know it. My character has not changed and the hon. member may rest assured of one thing, that, before long, he may, perhaps, have to reconsider the remarks he made this evening, when he again refers to the part I played in the final settlement of the question raised to-day.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): I have never doubted the sincerity of the hon. Postmaster General. I have a great respect for his long and fruitful career. Only deeds speak louder than words.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): If the hon. Postmaster will state that he has really the intention to settle as soon as possible this affair I shall be quite satisfied. If the hon. Postmaster will state that he has really the intention to settle this affair, I shall take his word for it. Only let him remember that deeds speak louder than words.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): I expected that the hon. Postmaster General would give some explanation—

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): I would very much like that the minister be given an opportunity to reply to my question.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): If members opposite would give me an opportunity and especially time. I cannot reply to everybody in the same breath.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Quite so.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I would not like the hon. member for Ottawa to think that I do not wish to reply because through courtesy I allowed the hon. member for Hull to address the house.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Quite so. But it was perhaps very much to the point.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member is clever, he has that reputation. He is also moderate in his views. That is how he has acquired some prestige in the house.

I know what I intended to convey; I can promise him one thing: I shall continue to look after this case with all the discernment possible, and I trust—I repeat it—that the hon. member will not have cause to reproach me next session.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): I wish to thank the hon. Postmaster General.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): When the house adjourned, I was explaining to the hon. Postmaster General the appointment of Mr. William Peck of Val-des-Bois, in Hull county. When the examination for this position was announced, the examiner came to Val-des-Bois. Three candidates presented themselves for the test. They were given marks on their test and classified by the examiner. The candidate who received the least marks, Mr. William Peck, was given the position. In a letter which the general superintendent of postal services wrote to the district superintendent, he pointed out to him that:

> Representations have been received by the Postmaster General concerning applicant Peck, who, it is noted, is not considered by the investigating officer as having the necessary bilingual qualifications.
>
> This matter has been examined and the department considers that, provided the assistant postmaster can fully take care of the bilingual requirements of the office, there would appear to be no objection to Mr. Peck's appointment if he is otherwise a recommendable applicant.

Under the circumstances—

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member speak louder?

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation):

—the district superintendent is requested to look into the situation further and if in the light of the above remarks his report can be amended, he will please make the necessary alteration and return it to the department.

This report was made following a request of the Civil Service Commission to the Post Office Department in connection with the result of the examination. I do not know whether the examiner altered his report after the remarks of the superintendent, but I do know that a few days later, the commission announced the appointment of Mr. Peck, in the following terms:

This is to certify that the person named hereon has been selected to fill the position named above, after examination in conformity with the provision of the Civil Service Act and of the rules and regulations made thereunder; is qualified to be appointed on probation at the salary shown above.

If the hon. Postmaster General will refer to the file, he will note that the two other candidates had a higher rating and were better classified than Mr. Peck. I wish to inquire from the Postmaster General why the department appointed to this position the least qualified candidate? He is an English-speaking person who does not know a word of French, who resides in an exclusively French Canadian parish, 50 miles distant from Ottawa. There are a few German families but the majority are French Canadians. Mr. Morin and Mr. Larocque were better qualified. Mr. Larocque was even recommended by the parish priest. Mr. Peck who does not speak a word of French was appointed. I think the hon. Postmaster General might explain the reason of this appointment.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Another question awaiting settlement.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): To my regret the remarks of the hon. member did not all reach my ear; however, I can furnish him with the following information: Mr. Peck replaced Mr. Morin as postmaster. The latter was dismissed at the request of Mr. Noél Beauchamp, who charged him with political partizanship. It was proved that Mr. Morin had meddled in politics. Mr. Peck therefore replaced him. The hon. member contends that Mr. Peck does not speak or understand a word of French. I must say that I am rather surprised at that statement and, immediately after the session, I shall make a personal inquiry in this connection. I may state that, if an injustice has been done, if it was a case of partizanship in the appointment of Mr. Peck, and if he cannot speak French in the midst of a French Canadian population, I shall see that the case is settled.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General can look over the report of the examiner. I got my information from the returns furnished by the department and, this report states that Peck does not speak or understand French.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall quickly settle the matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): It should never have happened. It has already lasted too long.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): There are precedents.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Not so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): I would like to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to another matter. A few days ago I received a letter from the hon. postmaster General in connection with mail transportation from l'Anse-à-Beaufils to Val-d'Espoir, in the county of Gaspé. The hon. Postmaster General informed me that the post office at Val-d'Espoir only brought in a revenue of $96 per year and that, consequently, he could not establish a daily mail service between l'Anse-à-Beaufils and Val-d'Espoir.

I received, to-day, a letter from the parish priest who requests me to insist with the Postmaster General to have a daily mail service. If the hon. Postmaster General will permit me, I shall read the letter received this morning:

Sir,—

In reply to your letter of the 2nd instant, I must express my thanks for your entreaties with the Postmaster General. The report which the Postmaster General gave you is that of March 31, 1930, to March 31, 1931; the revenue was $96.45. That year there were 60 families at Val-d'Espoir. Last year, namely, from March 31, 1931, to March 31, 1932, the revenue was $104. There were that year 68 families.

This year, there are 151 families. It seems to me that this should be sufficient to permit our having our mail every day.

He adds that there are postal money orders at l'Anse-à-Beaufils but not at Val-d'Espoir. He further requests a regular post office at Val-d'Espoir where there are at present 160 families. They are families that have settled here and they always look forward, as a pastime, to the mail. I would request the hon. Postmaster General, owing to the earnest entreaties of the local parish priest and other persons, to take the matter into serious consideration and see if he could not establish

a daily mail service between l'Anse-à-Beaufils and Val-d'Espoir also a regular post office in the latter place.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Would the hon. member have any objection in sending me over a copy of the letter he has just read so as to have it on file?

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): I shall hand over this letter to the hon. Postmaster General.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I shall consider the suggestions of the hon. member in the best disposition possible.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to say a few words that may not be strictly in order on this vote but I think I can say them in a shorter time than might be spent wrangling over a point of order. I wish to call the attention of the house to the indefensible waste of public money in having two fully equipped independent post offices in this building, within ten feet of each other. I wonder where anywhere in the whole world you could find a parallel condition. The most easterly one has a clientele at the most of ninety-six, and very often, as the records show, of not more than fifty, with perhaps a dozen officials as well. We have in our post office sufficient men who are competent to do the whole thing. The saving may not amount to more than $10,000, and $10,000 out of $345,000,000 is not a very big item, but it is the look of the thing. In these days of low incomes and high taxation people look at that sort of thing and they do not like it. It is the sort of thing that might suddenly sweep the country. Suppose some of the C.C.F. went about the country saying: "These two old parties have been perpetrating a thing like that for the last thirty years." A British government was defeated on a snap vote on a question of cordite. It was a trivial thing, there was no war on at the time, but there was a sudden flare-up and the government was defeated. It is the appearance of the thing I want to get at. If we allow these things to go on right under our nose, it will be argued, what will we do in bigger things. I am not saying anything against any official; I am simply saying that one post office would be ample for both houses.

Mr. BENNETT: Just one word in respect to that matter. For fifteen years that subject has been engaging the attention of successive governments. When the estimates were being prepared two years ago I had a report made on it. Not only has an effort been made with respect to that but also with respect to the accountant's office. It has been urged that there should not be two accountants' offices for the Senate and the House of Commons; with the retirement of one of the officials an effort will be made to merge them into one, and with the retirement of one postmaster an effort will be made to bring about the reform to which the hon. gentleman has referred. But there are great difficulties in the way. I think my predecessor made some effort in the same direction, but the Senate is a body that has a mind of its own when it comes to the question of dispensing with its post office. That I think is a short way of putting it.

Mr. NEILL: We hold the purse strings.

Mr. BENNETT: I know, but they also claim the right to a post office.

Mr. GIROUARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to a request just received. I could not better put my request than by reading a resolution of the parish council of Ste. Anne du Sault, county of Arthabaska. This resolution is as follows:

At a general and regular meeting of the municipal council of the parish of Ste-Anne-du-Sault, held in the ordinary place and at the regular hour of the council's meetings, Monday, May 1, 1933, at 7 p.m., those present being his worship, the mayor Alphonse Boissonnault and Messrs. the councillors Oscar Gentès, Pierre Sicard, Felix Nil Soucy, Joseph Morin, Alfred Loranger and Emile Beaudet, forming a quorum under the chairmanship of the mayor.

Whereas there is at present a refreshifying movement taking place in the province of Quebec and, that it would be well-timed to change the name of Bulstrode station for a French name, it is moved by councillor Oscar Gentés, seconded by councillor Pierre Sicard, that a request be made by the council to the management of the Canadian National Railways, also to the Postmaster General, at Ottawa, to change the name of the station and that of the post office, at present Bulstrode Station, to that of DeFoy.

Carried.

(Signed) Alphonse Boissonnault,
Mayor.

(Signed) Maurice Plourde,
Sec,-Treas.

True copy.
Maurice Plourde,
Sec.-Treas.

It is simply a question of changing the name of the post office to that of De Foy. I must inform the Postmaster General that it is an entirely French Canadian parish, and I trust that he will be gracious enough to make the change.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): For some time past we have been making changes and we shall continue.

Mr. BOUCHARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to apologize to the committee

for drawing the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to an old or stale question. However, I always wonder whether the power of dismissal of the Postmaster General, which is quite extensive, is not out-weighed by his power of reinstatement of those whe were dismissed. At present, I do not wish to dwell, at length, on the absolutely unfair dismissal of the postmaster of Kamouraska, Mr. Edouard Guy. Much of the evidence is contradicted by affidavits, however, I do not intend to refer again to that particular phase. When the hon. Postmaster General appointed Mr. Louis Langlois, as postmaster of Kamouraska—naturally, he is one of his good supporters—I wondered whether he took the trouble to go through the entire file and whether he discovered that Mr. Langlois had been dismissed after an inquiry, not for political partizanship, as shown here, but because he had despatched by mail, free of postage, defamatory literature to the address of my predecessor in the house, the hon. Justice Stein. Therefore, he disregarded the regulations of the Post Office department in mailing these circulars without affixing any postage stamps. The literature was of a political nature. Consequently it was a political offence. I am given to understand that in this connection the hon. Postmaster General is very lenient—especially when they affect the Conservative party—there was, however, a flagrant disregard of the postal regulations. If I make such an inquiry, it is not that I wish to criticize the hon. Postmaster General's actions, but I wonder whether he took the trouble to thoroughly examine the file.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): When was he reinstated? In what year?

Mr. BOUCHARD (Translation): He was dismissed about 1924, after a thorough inquiry.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): In what year was he reinstated?

Mr. BOUCHARD (Translation): He was reinstated in 1931. If I ask this question, it is because I am aware that the hon. Postmaster General has a very generous disposition and that if any document in the file escaped his eye, he may have an opportunity to verify the facts and act accordingly.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Had the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Bouchard) drawn my attention to this matter in 1931, I would have sifted the case thoroughly and given him an answer. I promise him to thoroughly examine this case and shall give him an answer next time.

Mr. TOTZKE: I wish to ask the Postmaster General a question or two in connection with the dismissal of a postmaster which I brought to the minister's attention last year. Before putting my question I wish to quote what the minister said in reply last year.

Mr. SAUVE: What case?

Mr. TOTZKE: The Jansen case. It took me about half an hour to present the case and I think I successfully proved that the dismissal had been very unjust. The minister replied to me in two sentences, but his remarks were very much to the point and I did expect as a result of his remarks to get some action. His remarks will be found at page 3163 of Hansard of May 20, 1932:

> Mr. Sauve: In answer to the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke), all I can say is that my remarks in Montreal explained my feeling at that time and at the present time. I am sorry if a misunderstanding has arisen in the case mentioned by my hon. friend, and I shall be very glad to go further into the matter.

In view of all the circumstances I think it was justifiable that the minister should go further into that matter and see if anything could be done to rectify the injustice. I would like to ask the minister if he took any steps to find out whether anything could be done to restore that post office to that man.

Mr. SAUVE: I will review the case and give an explanation on Monday.

Mr. TOTZKE: I have another case that I would like to bring to the attention of the minister. This is in connection with the post office at Alvena, Saskatchewan. The postmaster at this office was charged with political partisanship by the defeated Conservative candidate on October 8, 1930. The postmaster denied the charge and furnished declarations to that effect, but he was later dismissed in spite of this and in spite of the report of the district superintendent in which he says:

> I circulated the patrons of the Alvena office on November 14, asking for an expression of opinion as to service rendered and whether or not the charges made were correct. To date sixty replies have been received, and of the patrons responding forty-six have expressed satisfaction with Mr. Slusar and his conduct of the office. The remaining fourteen claim that Mr. Slusar is not capable of handling the business since the post office has assumed new importance. He is said to be very slow in the sorting of mail and writing of money orders, owing to his lack of education, and to be, at times, disobliging and impolite. Complaint has also been made as to the present location of the office, which is across the railway tracks from the rest of the village.

The inspector was sent out, and the report further states:

> In several replies to my circular—

The superintendent had sent out circulars to the various patrons of the office.

—it was intimated that the complainants were making an effort to have Mr. Slusar removed from his position so that they, or some one of them, might obtain charge of the office, and that Mr. Peter Drabinasty, garage man, was the leader of this agitation. This seems borne out by the fact that several replies to my circular are in this man's handwriting although signed by different parties. The same implication was made to Mr. Cumming,—

That is the inspector.

—and it was suggested by Mr. Dmetro Andrunyk, general merchant, and Mr. J. Gray, agent of the Searle Elevator Company (both considered to be men of dependable judgment) that it would be doubtful if a change for the better could be made at the present time on account of the general character of the persons available for the position. Experience has shown that the postmaster in a community of this kind is particularly the target for criticism.

Further on in his report the superintendent says:

I am doubtful if the present postmaster will prove able to rise to the responsibilities of this office and provide satisfactory service for the business of the growing village, but I think that no action should be taken against him at the present time.

That is the report of the district superintendent. I may say from my own personal knowledge of this particular office and the community that the report is quite correct. I know that when they did appoint a successor to this postmaster he was not as well able to carry on the business of the office as the previous postmaster. But in spite of this report of the superintendent an investigation was ordered into the charges of political partisanship, and the commissioner who held the investigation was again in this case, as in the case of the Jansen post office, the brother of the defeated Conservative candidate. Evidence was taken by this commissioner, and two witnesses were called. One mentioned that when he heard the remarks of the postmaster which were the basis of the charge of partisanship there were two men present whose names he mentioned, and who had heard the remarks at the same time. After the evidence was taken the postmaster secured declarations from these two men who were supposed to have heard him make the remarks, and forwarded them to the Post Office Department, and both men in their declarations say that the evidence given was incorrect. They both say:

I was at no political meeting at any time in Alvena during 1930 and at no time did the said Slusar talk politics to me or in my presence.

[Mr. Totzke.]

This, as I have said, was sent to the Postmaster General, and he was asked by the commissioner for advice as to whether further investigation should be made. On May 12 a letter was sent to the commissioner, and there was no reply to that, but in spite of the production of new evidence and the desire of the postmaster to have it considered the order was issued that the postmaster should be dismissed and another man appointed in his place. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he did give consideration to those declarations, which practically nullify all the evidence that was taken before the commissioner, and if he did after consideration of those declarations decide that there should be no further investigation?

Mr. SAUVE: Mr. Slusar was dismissed on the charge of political partisanship. The charge was denied by the postmaster and was investigated by Commissioner Wilson on the 29th of April, 1931. He was found guilty on four counts: that the postmaster made partisan remarks among a number of persons at a meeting held in Alvena in the interests of the Conservative candidate for the purpose of inducing them to support the Liberal candidate; that the postmaster tried to induce persons to support the Liberal candidate; that the postmaster in the winter of 1930-31 at his store premises in the presence of at least three persons attacked the present administration with the intent of affecting the political views of persons present; and that during the provincial election campaign in 1929, on the store and post office premises the postmaster pointed out to an elector the advisability of voting for the Liberal party. He consequently was found guilty by the commissioner, and I followed the rule established by my predecessors. As to the new postmaster, I must say that the question raised by the hon. member is occupying the attention of the department, and we will continue to give attention to and review the case.

Mr. TOTZKE: The hon. minister has not got my point at all. Perhaps in trying to be brief I have not put it very clearly. The minister just gave a review of the charges and the evidence heard and the finding of the commissioner. I was asking if the minister did consider the declarations that were sent in by the two men who had been stated by one witness as having been present and heard these remarks alleged to have been made by the postmaster. They denied that they had been present at the meeting, which to my mind absolutely nullifies the evidence given by the

one witness. Did the Postmaster General give any consideration to that fact?

Mr. SAUVE: Yes, I understand that is what happened, and I understand that the former postmaster has made a complaint against the acting postmaster. The case of the former postmaster is settled; he has been replaced. However, in view of what has been said with regard to the administration of the new postmaster, we are disposed to review the case to see if we cannot satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. TOTZKE: I know the former postmaster was dismissed; I did not need to be told that. I am trying to find out why he was dismissed. I say that after the report of the inspector had been received by the department fresh evidence was brought in by means of these declarations, and I want to know if the minister considered that fresh evidence or if he just went on the report of the commissioner, who said:

> You will note the witness George Zadvorny mentions two parties in his evidence named Michael Hrytzak and Bronko Zahretsky. These names do not correspond with the names mentioned in the declarations but the names are somewhat similar.
>
> It is my belief that the reopening of the investigation would not result in a different finding than that I have already made notwithstanding the contents of the declarations. I shall not do anything further unless you instruct me otherwise.

In other words, the commissioner says that there would be no use in reopening the case, in spite of the fact that the evidence of one witness has been entirely nullified by the evidence contained in these declarations; he is determined to dismiss the postmaster on the evidence of one witness, despite the fact that the postmaster denied all the charges. Did the Postmaster General give consideration to the new evidence that was brought in?

Mr. SAUVE: We will proceed to review both cases.

Mr. TOTZKE: I hope I will get some word in connection with this case before the year is up. In another case I waited for more than a year for a reply. My next case does not involve any question of political partisanship; the charge here is tampering with the mail, which I admit is a very serious charge. It appears that a number of samples of merchandise were sent to the post office at Lac Vert, in Saskatchewan. The postmaster there also conducts a general store, and has as a competitor another general merchant in the same village. The agent for the Kellogg food people had been through the village and had taken a list of names from the other merchant in connection with the distribution of samples of goods. When the samples arrived in the office the postmaster's wife inadvertently, according to her claim, wrote the name of their own store on the packages in addition to the name of the other store which had been stencilled there. This lady claims that she did not notice the other name and said they had been expecting similar samples for distribution in connection with their own store. In this connection I should like to read the report of the district superintendent. After reviewing the whole situation this is what the superintendent says:

> Mr. McRae has been postmaster at Lac Vert since June 6, 1921, and generally speaking, his services have been fairly satisfactory. My understanding is that he bears a good reputation in the district. He maintains that he had no knowledge whatever of what had been done by his wife in connection with the articles addressed to Mr. Rose, until advised by the addressee.
>
> I am of the opinion that it would be hardly fair to the postmaster to carry out the drastic action demanded by Mr. Rose.
>
> I would respectfully suggest that the postmaster be permitted to continue in charge of the office on the definite understanding that all duties pertaining to same must be performed in a fit and proper way and that should any further mistreatment of mail matter occur in the office, the question of declaring the postmastership vacant will be given immediate consideration.

Then the question arose as to whether the wife of the postmaster was correct in her contention that similar samples were expected for distribution from their store; that matter was investigated and it was found on inquiry of the Kellogg people that this was quite true. There is nothing on the file after that, no report, no suggestion, no request of any kind on the part of anyone that the postmaster be dismissed, until December 9, 1932. Then I find a memorandum from the Postmaster General to the deputy postmaster general which reads as follows:

> Referring to reports submitted by the district superintendent of postal service at Saskatoon, concerning complaints made in regard to the mistreatment of mail matter at the Lac Vert post office, will the deputy postmaster general please take steps to remove the present incumbent from office.

After the superintendent had written to the department advising that the postmaster be kept in charge of that office and given another chance the Postmaster General, without apparent reason, issued an order that the postmaster should be dismissed. I should like to ask the Postmaster General what his reasons were for overruling the recommendation of his district superintendent.

Mr. SAUVE: The inspector claims that the postmaster's wife was at fault. We will consider the report and see what it is possible to do.

Mr. TOTZKE: Does the Postmaster General say that the man has not been permanently removed?

Mr. SAUVE: I understand that the man was dismissed because the matter was considered sufficiently serious to justify that action.

Mr. TOTZKE: I understand that it was considered sufficiently serious to justify dismissal but I should like to know why the Postmaster General undertook to dismiss the man contrary to the recommendation of his inspector that this man should be retained in the office. What reasons had the department for dismissing this postmaster after the superintendent had recommended that he be retained?

Mr. SAUVE: The department is not always bound to follow the recommendations of the superintendent.

Mr. TOTZKE: I realize that. But as a rule does not the department take into consideration the report of the superintendent after he has sent out an inspector to the office to interview the patrons, and after he has given his best judgment to the various conditions that exist on the strength of which he makes his report? I know very well the superintendent in the Saskatoon district and he is one of the fairest men whom I have met in the service. He makes excellent reports with regard to everything that happens, and I am convinced that if the superintendent, fair and unbiased as he is, had considered this a very serious breach of the postal regulations, he would not have recommended the retention of the man. I want to know what prompted the minister in spite of all this to dismiss this postmaster.

Mr. SAUVE: He had committed a serious breach of the regulations and in any event we are not bound to accept the report of the superintendent. It is a matter of departmental judgment.

Mr. TOTZKE: I am free to admit that perhaps the reports of the superintendent are not always followed; but what request or report prompted the minister to dismiss this man after the superintendent had recommended that he be retained? I can scarcely conceive that for his more or less trivial offence he should have been dismissed. It was only one complaint. The only complaint that had been made was in connection with the writing of the name of the postmaster's store on these samples, and I am informed that only three or four of them got out that way, and as soon it was drawn to his attention the error was rectified. Moreover, the mistake was not made by the postmaster himself but by the assistant postmaster. I should like to know what the minister based the dismissal on.

Mr. SAUVE: The department does not consider the error trivial.

Mr. TOTZKE: In that event, there are certain regulations that must be followed. I take it that the superintendent at Saskatoon would follow those regulations, and if there was not any room for the exercise of discretion on the part of the Postmaster General there certainly would not have been a report like this from the district superintendent at Saskatoon. The action of the Postmaster General leads me to believe that there must have been something, some report from someone, which does not appear on the file.

Mr. SAUVE: I will review the facts and I hope to give my hon. friend an explanation that will satisfy him.

Mr. TOTZKE: I thank the minister, and again I trust it will not be until next year that I shall have to wait.

Sir EUGENE FISET (Translation): Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Postmaster General be so kind, as to inform me whether he has received the letter forwarded to him the other day, requesting certain information in connection with the transportation of mail between St-Fabien station and the post office and, if so, may I expect a reply in the near future.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I certainly received the letter of the hon. member and transmitted it to Mr. Anderson's branch who is making inquiries on the subject.

Mr. YOUNG: I have here the auditor general's report for the year ended March 31, 1932, and I notice that the revenue from stamps and post cards amounted to $27,000,000 odd. How much of that was derived from stamps for other than postal purposes?

Mr. SAUVE: We cannot segregate the amount. They were excise stamps.

Mr. YOUNG: Can the minister tell us, then, whether the department operated at a profit or at a loss last year?

Mr. SAUVE: We expect a surplus.

Mr. YOUNG: The previous year there was a deficit of over $2,000,000. Does the minister expect a surplus this year?

Mr. SAUVE: Yes.

Mr. YOUNG: For the year ended March 31 past?

Mr. SAUVE: About $600,000.

Mr. YOUNG: How much money is invested in post office buildings throughout the country?

Mr. SAUVE: It depends upon the policy of the Public Works department.

Mr. YOUNG: Can the minister tell me in dollars and cents?

Mr. SAUVE: No.

Mr. YOUNG: Has any other department spent money in connection with post office work and if so how much?

Mr. SAUVE: I cannot answer that question.

Mr. YOUNG: I have the estimates for this year and I notice on page 32 under the Department of Public Works, item 113, six sub-items. One is for public buildings outside Ottawa: heating, light, power, rents, salaries of caretakers, engineers, firemen and so forth, supplies for caretakers, engineers, firemen and so on, amounting to $5,000,000 odd. How much of that is for post office buildings?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think that is relevant to the discussion; that would come up under public works.

Mr. YOUNG: I understood that there was one item reserved under each department in connection with which we might ask any question.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may ask the question if there is no objection from the committee.

Mr. SAUVE: Those accounts are not charged to the department.

Mr. YOUNG: I shall have to ask for a return next session.

Mr. VALLANCE: Has the department of the Postmaster General ever figured out at what cost it has carried other departments of government in connection with postal services to those departments?

Mr. SAUVE: About $1,000,000.

Mr. VALLANCE: Would that $1,000,000 cover what is expended by the Public Works department in the interests of the Post Office department?

Mr. SAUVE: I cannot say.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): Would the hon. Postmaster General inform the house as to how many employees over 65 years old are still retained in the department and what is the total amount of salary they draw?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member will readily recognize that it is preferable to put such questions, regularly, in the course of the session. Had he done so, we could have made inquiries and given him the information now asked for. He will admit that it is impossible to answer on the spur of the moment a question of that nature without having previously made some inquiries.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General is usually well informed. He has on the tip of his fingers all the details of the administration of his department. No doubt, without giving exact figures, he could possibly state approximately the number of employees in his department who are over 65 years old and also give approximately the amount they draw.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): We are at present making a complete census and I am not so conceited enough as to think that I can inform the House on every detail of my department which comprises more than 40,000 employees.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): I understand that, according to the Civil Service Act, when an employee has reached the age of 65, he can be superannuated.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): However, his superannuation is left to the discretion of the Minister in charge of the department.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): At 70, he is obliged to retire. But at the age of 65, it is a question for the department to decide according to the administration's interests involved.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): With your kind permission, sir, I wish to point out to the house the case of the retirement of an employee of the Post Office department. I think that in the present case, the hon. Postmaster General used his discretion as head of a department to get rid of an excellent employee, fulfilling his duty well, enjoying all his faculties both physically and mentally, because there was no cause to retire him. It is unnecessary to state that this employee was guilty of being a Liberal. He took no active part in politics as he was of a too scrupulous and conscientious temperament; he could not be got rid of on the usual pretence of political partisanship.

However, as soon as he reached the age of 65, the hon. Postmaster General invited him to retire. The employee referred to is Robert Carrier, a brother of an ex-member in this house for the county of Levis. Mr. Robert

Carrier was postmaster at Levis. The retirement of Mr. Carrier was very unfair owing to the circumstances connected with it. He was postmaster at Levis during 26 or 27 years. Up to two years or three years ago, the Levis postmaster was not considered in the civil service and therefore not entitled to a pension. However, two or three years ago, the Levis post office was classified among the city post-offices, thereafter Mr. Carrier was called upon to contribute to the civil service pension fund, he was therefore obliged to contribute, yearly, 5 per cent of his salary.

This year, the hon. Postmaster notified him that, for economical reasons, he was retiring him. Mr. Carrier replied that he would retire providing a pension was given him. The hon. Postmaster wrote to him that it was impossible to grant him a pension, notwithstanding his contribution to the pension fund, because, to be entitled to a pension a civil servant must have contributed to the pension fund during 10 years and that he had only contributed to the fund for a few years.

Mr. Carrier requested to be left in charge of the post office until he had completed the ten years which the act stipulates in order to be entitled to a pension.

I think that, owing to the excellent services of Carrier, and the fact that no fault could be found against him both from the viewpoint of his work and political activity, the hon. Postmaster General should have allowed him to complete the ten years stipulated by the Act, in order to enable this good servant to draw a pension. The hon. Postmaster General may reply: we have granted him a gratuity. That is so, a gratuity of ten or eleven months of salary was granted to him. That is all he received, a lump or fixed sum, once for all. He was granted ten or eleven months' salary as a gratuity. One must bear in mind that, in truth, this gratuity is nothing else than the money Mr. Carrier contributed to the superannuation fund. It is his own money which was returned to him. It strikes me, that as there was nothing against the character or services of Mr. Carrier, who is still in excellent health and could have given ten or fifteen years more of service to this country, the hon. Postmaster should have allowed him to complete his ten years so as to entitle him to a pension.

The reason given for retiring him from the service was the saving this change would effect. I frankly admit that I cannot see what saving the minister can effect by retiring Mr. Carrier. First, a gratuity is granted to him, then the person who replaces him must be paid about the same salary. The same reasons were given when the deputy ministers of National Defence and Agriculture were superannuated. It is a very queer economy to practise. Dr. Grisdale, deputy minister of Agriculture is superannuated with a pension of $6,000 or $7,000, and a successor is appointed to whom a large salary is paid. The outcome of it all is that the government instead of making one disbursement makes two disbursements. That is called economy! The case of the national defence is still more flagrant, since, beside paying a pension to the retiring deputy minister, Col. Laflèche is paid a salary and a pension as a disabled veteran of the Great War. In the latter department the government makes three disbursements, while only one was made when Mr. Desbarats was deputy minister.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am not responsible for that.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): In these three cases, those of Mr. Carrier, Mr. Desbarats and Dr. Grisdale, civil servants with long experience were superannuated, they were eminently qualified to carry on their duties, enjoying all their faculties and were still able to render great services to the government. I wish to again protest against the unfair way Mr. Carrier was treated, and I trust that in the future the hon. postmaster will show more consideration for these old employees. It is not because a few among them are liberals—there are still in the Post Office Department a few liberals—that the hon. Postmaster General should take advantage of this discretional power to retire employees at the age of 65, and thus worry them, when he cannot find other reasons to do so.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am greatly surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger) in connection with the retirement of Mr. Carrier, postmaster at Levis. Why state in this house that Mr. Carrier was retired because of his political leanings?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Why was he retired?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Because such are the regulations. The opposition appeals to the government to economize, economize, economize! The Postmaster General, for three years, and especially this year, has been practising the strictest economy, with a will, but not pleasurably. Consequently, we have wiped out deficits, considerably decreased expenditure—close to $7,000,000—which corresponds to the policy advocated by the opposition, and resulting, this year, in a surplus of more than $500,000. Does this not please members of the opposition?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Instead of boasting of its deeds...

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Just a minute. The ex-Minister of Justice knows better. There are regulations at the Post Office Department and I assert—I am amazed that the hon. member for Bellechasse ignores it—that in no case of the superannuation of an employee is there displayed the least intention of condemning his political views. Mr. Carrier is one among others, Conservatives, Liberals and many others who, at the age of 65, are obliged to retire pursuant to the regulations adopted in the interest of the administration.

What is the hon. member for Bellechasse saying?

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): I was speaking to the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Is the hon. member for Bellechasse prompting the hon. member for Quebec East?

At times, representations were made to the department, specially by postal employee's unions, to have the superannuation act amended—at the time Mr. Carrier was an employee of the Post office department—in order that employees who had not 10 years service, when leaving the service, for one reason or another, might be reimbursed of the amount of their contribution, pursuant to the act.

At present, the only means—the hon. member will note that the system followed in the administration of the department deserves his approval—by which we can reimburse these contributions is by having the amount included in the estimates, and all employees are aware of this. I am astonished that Mr. Carrier who placed his case in the hands of the hon. member for Bellechasse was not better informed. It is a usual practice between the Department of Finance and the councils or representatives of the various civil service associations. I repeat it, sir, with the thousands of employees in the service and the regulations adopted at the request of civil servants for better protection, we are obliged to-day, to observe these regulations, as we do the act. And in the best interests of the administration of the department, I wish to inform hon. members of the opposition that from the economic viewpoint we conform to the regulation, but we are not unfair to employees and such protests would not come from the Postal Employees Association neither from their council.

Again, I state, I am astonished that the hon. member for Bellechasse should think that the Postmaster General shows bad faith when he takes an interest in the welfare of his department.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Oh! oh!

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): There was just as much solicitude shown to the ex-postmaster Carrier as to others. Conservatives received the same notice. All were on the same footing. Why endeavour, to-day, to reproach me for doing my duty, when it is well known that the aim we are pursuing in acting thus—

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General will readily admit that he has an absolute discretional power as to retiring from the service an employee who is not over 70 years old. When a civil servant has reached the age of 65, the minister may superannuate him but it is optional. When a civil servant is over 70 years, the minister is obliged to superannuate him or request a special vote in the house. However, between 65 and 70 years the minister has an absolute discretional power, he may retire him but it is an optional matter. Such is the case of Mr. Carrier. That is why I contend that the retirement of Mr. Carrier is unfair because he was not allowed to complete the period of 10 years which would have entitled him to a pension. The hon. Postmaster General is well aware that there are in his department perhaps hundreds of employees who are over 65 years old and have not been superannuated. According to a report made recently to the house, there are in the government service, at present, 815 civil servants who are over 65 years old, and who draw, in salaries, almost $2,000,000. Out of this number there must be one third in the Post Office Department. Again, whatever may be said to the contrary, I am convinced that Mr. Carrier was retired because there was a desire to replace a Liberal by a Conservative and no fault could be found with him.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The appointment was made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General informed us that he wished to practise strict economy; he rejoices in the result he is obtaining. Will he state in what consists the saving he realized by retiring Mr. Carrier? He has not informed the house.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I wish to be more serious in my reply than the ex-Minister of Justice has been in his question.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): It behooves the Postmaster General to leave jokes aside, it does not suit him.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I wonder who is the joker of the two?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): I am not, I have put a serious question.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No, it is not a serious one.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Is that so?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): No.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): We can treat you as you deserve, if you so desire, I am asking a simple question and I would appreciate a polite reply.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member for Quebec East will readily admit that it is impossible to state that the dismissal of Mr. Carrier, at the age of 65, will result in a definite revenue. No. However the number of such cases will permit the department to replace them by other employees, at present in the postal service, and this will dispense us from taking on new employees. That is what happened at Levis. It is not an outsider that replaced Mr. Carrier, but a postal employee appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Moreover, the hon. member for Bellechasse will admit that when he states there are so many employees who are over 65 years old and still in the service of the department, he forgets one thing —I do not wish to impute that he shows bad faith—that we are making at present, a census in this respect. A number of them have been notified that their services will end six months hence, others in four months, and the result will be apparent at the end of the year.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Could the hon. Postmaster General state whether there are in his department employees who are more than 75 years old?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): There is but one and, because of the special service he renders to the members of this house and the department he is kept on.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General has given a reply to suit his purpose, however, the gentleman referred to draws a salary of $5,220 per year. He has never rendered me a service, neither have I ever asked him for one nor do I intend to do so. There must be another reason for retaining the services of this gentleman after he has reached the age of 75. Not only are there some in the Post Office Department, but they are to be found in other departments. The employee referred to would be well advised to retire from the service. Can the postmaster deny that, in the course of this year, a number of postal employees who earned much less than $5,220, were superannuated? Some of them draw but very small pensions, others do not even draw any, as in the case of Mr. Carrier; while the gentleman referred to, who is far from being poor, could retire from the service with quite a nice pension and, thereby, permit others to be promoted by the Civil Service Commission. Instead of praising so highly his department and rather than dismissing employees with small salaries and granting them petty pensions or none, why does the hon. Postmaster General not exert himself to superannuate employees who have passed the age of 75 and should be retired, so as to permit other civil servants to be rewarded for their services? The hon. postmaster would be very gracious if he could explain this anomaly otherwise than by the reply he has just given now and which is not a reply.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member will readily recognize that the civil servant he refers to has had a long experience and is at the head of an extremely complicated service which we are almost entirely reorganizing, owing to the situation created by the suppression of a large number of trains or railway lines. The rural mail service is being reorganized. This extremely difficult organization needs much experience and even if the hon. member has not come in touch with this official, all members opposite, especially those who have been here any length of time, have had the opportunity of judging of his judicious qualities and his remarkable efficiency due, not only to his ability but especially to his experience.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Would the hon. Postmaster General find himself in a difficult situation, if Providence, unfortunately, decreed that he should be deprived of the services of this remarkable official! What difference would there be if he were superannuated?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): We would find ourselves in the same situation as the people of Ottawa, if, to-morrow, they were deprived of their member.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): There is an enormous difference between the two cases.

Mr. BRADETTE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, as I have already stated, I think that the hon. Postmaster General does his utmost to help the vast region that I have the honour

of representing in the house. I have but one case to submit to the hon. Postmaster General; it is not a question of politics but one of the site of a post office. I refer to Val-Gagné. About 10 months ago, Mrs. Sigouin, the postmistress, died. The people of this beautiful rural village expected that the post office would not be removed, as it was the most central place of this locality. The position was given to a person who has all the qualifications required for a postmaster; however, the choice of the new locality for the post office is not rational, if the aim is an efficient service to the population. I have no criticism to make as regards the person appointed; however, the village of Val-Gagné is located to the south of the T. N. & O railway, while the church is located on this side, as well as all stores, public places, hotels, etc., and though nine-tenths of the population reside in this part of the village.

To-day, owing to the post office having been transferred across the railway, these good people must cross the double track. The hon. Postmaster General can realize the danger threatening these people and the poor service which will result. The son of Mrs. Sigouin, who resided at Ste-Agathe when his mother died, has taken up residence at Val-Gagné and manages the hotel that Mrs. Sigouin owned. This young man is a veteran of the great war. If I am not mistaken, he was even wounded at the front. He was a candidate for the position of postmaster. As I stated, at the outset of my remarks, I am aware that the department, in every possible way, has endeavoured to give the pioneer population of our region a most efficient service. However, to-day, in Val-Gagné, there is an anomaly which inflicts on the population a serious handicap and exposes them, in some measure of risk when they cross the tracks to get their mail, owing to the location of the post office. If the department could possibly, without clashing with the interests of anyone, restore the post office to its original site of two years ago or so, I think that such a step would please at least nine-tenths of the population of this fine new centre.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am pleased to state that I have noted the valuable suggestions made by the hon. member for Temiskaming North (Mr. Bradette) and shall make it a point to see that the population of that region are given satisfaction.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I have a very pleasant duty to perform in offering my respects and warmest congratulations to all my colleagues, on this side of the house, who have laid before the hon. Postmaster General, their grievances, and, especially, to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) who so ably set forth the Missanabie case. I also have another agreeable duty to fulfil, namely, to publicly thank my distinguished colleague and friend, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) for the help he extended to me in the matter of getting all the returns which the house had ordered, in connection with the Missanabie post office. The trouble we were put to in order to obtain these returns, is unbelievable! Repeatedly, I had recourse to every possible means, I wrote to the minister's secretary and also complained to the house. Once even, the hon. Minister of Finance will recall, on a motion for the house to resolve itself into committee of supply, I broached this subject, by courtesy for the hon. Minister of Finance, I interrupted my remarks. Later I returned to the attack. I then was seconded by the hon. member for Quebec East; no doubt, the right hon. Prime Minister himself was stirred by the arguments we submitted to the house, to the effect that, when a vote is taken in the house ordering certain returns these must be brought down conscientiously and without reserve by the minister interested. I would not be surprised if the right hon. Prime Minister himself had intervened to remind his colleague that it was his duty to table all the documents belonging to the file referred to, without restriction or concealment, and in their entirety. Finally, that is what happened. I am thankful to the Postmaster General and have given him credit for it.

How does it happen that members are obliged to fight to obtain documents when their return is ordered by the House of Commons itself?

One thing struck me in reading over the Hansard, page 3960. When the Postmaster General stated, when I requested the tabling of these documents:

(Text):

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I cannot say more to-day.

(Translation):

He went no further. However, I note in Hansard:

(Text):

I know the rule.

(Translation):

These words were added, as an after thought, and the following day, when the question again came before the house, the member for Témiscouata spoke as follows:

(Text):

The Postmaster General is reported as having said, "I know the rule." He did not say it.

(Translation):

I said: "He is dumb"—and it is not reported in Hansard.

This is what happened. Hansard twice was tampered with. I gave the Postmaster General the benefit of the doubt, I thought that he was ignorant of the rule, that this was his justification; notwithstanding that ignorance is no excuse before the law, I thought it could be an excuse in politics; I imagined that the Postmaster General was not aware of the rule. Was he boasting when he said he knew the rule? I quoted the case of Sully; why did the Postmaster General have so much trouble with the Sully case? He has himself to blame, for not conforming to the act, as the act obliged him to submit this case to the Civil Service Commission and he failed to do so; he proceeded by delays, decrees of all kinds and in an entirely different way than the one he should have adopted had he wished to do his duty.

He failed in his duty, he endeavoured to free himself from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, he resorted to all kinds of delays to prevent the Civil Service Commission from deciding who should be postmaster of that locality. And it was because the hon. Postmaster General refused to conform himself to the Act, in this case, that he met with difficulties. They are not yet ended, because, as he stated yesterday, he is in no way certain that the Privy Council will approve his proposal to pay Jean $100 so as to indemnify him for all the trouble he had to undergo owing to the fault, negligence, ill-doing of the Postmaster General himself.

That is not all. I requested the tabling of certain documents, or, in other words, I put a question which was changed into an order of the house for returns, on April 19, 1933. What was this question?

1. How many postmasters have been dismissed since the month of August, 1930?
2. How many postmasters have been appointed (a) temporarily; (b) permanently since the month of August, 1930?

At the beginning of the sitting, to-day, I inquired from the Postmaster General when he would reply to these questions. He answered: "As soon as possible." What a clever answer. I waited all day, until 10.15 this evening, to receive this anwer to this motion ordered by the house on April 19—

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me? These answers were sent to Mr. Mulvey, to-day.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): So much the better. Thanks. Better late than never. I wish to thank the Postmaster General for having at last, answered this question just as his estimates are about to be adopted. I have the answer here.

How many postmasters have been dismissed since the month of August, 1930?
788.

On the other hand note this:

How many postmasters have been appointed (a) temporarily
1,153.
(b) permanently since the month of August, 1930?
3,035.

If the Postmaster General has dismissed 788 employees, if he has only created 300 or 400 new post offices, how has he been able to appoint 1,153 temporary employees and 3,035 permanent employees? He shoved three pegs in each hole. Will the hon. Postmaster General answer this question?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I beg your pardon?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am asking the hon. Postmaster General how it happens that if he only dismissed 788 employees, he was able to appoint 1,153 temporary employees and 3,035 permanent employees, making a total of 4,188 appointments?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): We dismissed more than 700 postmasters, it is true, however, the hon. member must not confuse the temporary and permanent employees. The temporary employees are appointed for two or three months, they are then replaced. We are obliged to reply to questions exactly as they are put to us.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Let us discuss the permanent employees and leave out the 1,153 temporary ones. How can the hon. Postmaster General explain that he dismissed only 788 postmasters, that he created only 300 or 400 new post offices and that he was able to appoint 3,035 permanent postmasters? That is a puzzle!

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): The hon. member should know that these figures refer to the service all over Canada, the changes—

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The dismissals refer also to all Canada.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): —deceases, changes not connected with dismissals for political reasons.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Well, sir, if there are so many postmasters that die, I shall be forced to conclude that all the Liberals are poisoned. I think, sir, that the hon. Postmaster General's reply is not satisfactory and is unworthy of a cabinet minister. I shall let those who heard the explanation given by the Postmaster General judge of their worth and shall not insist any further on the subject, because I do not wish to unduly delay the adoption of the estimates.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Is the item carried?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): No, no! I have still further questions to ask. I wish to inquire from the hon. Postmaster General whether he was acquainted with a person named Emile Bourré, an ex-employee of the post office, in Montreal, but superannuated in 1931, and to whom leave of absence, with full salary, was granted, before being superannuated.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I am not personally acquainted with Mr. Bourré and I cannot answer this question the way it is put, I have not the details with me.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I regret very much that the hon. Postmaster General has not the details with him because I am informed that Mr. Bourré had a leave of absence for 720 days, with full salary, on the recommendation of the Deputy Postmaster General. I cannot vouch for the fact, I received the information through the mail. I cannot vouch for it as a fact. A letter received informs me that this chap was given 720 days leave of absence. He must be some kind of friend.

I have been requesting, sir, since April 19, from the hon. Postmaster General, the information which he gave me just now, be made a statement with reference to the dismissal of postmasters under various governments, he quietly passed over Louis Philippe Pelletier's mournful reign at the Post Office Department, when the guillotine was in constant motion.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member will have to restrict his remarks to the item under discussion.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I am discussing it. I am asking the hon. Postmaster General to furnish me with certain information; it was the minister who set the example by quoting the number of dismissals since 1896.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I would request the hon. member to set the example.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Certainly, I am endeavouring, however, to nail the hon. Postmaster General to the discussion of the estimates such as they should be carried on. And when I inquired as to the dismissals of postmasters since August, 1930—the house having ordered the tabling of this information—his duty was to give the full information and there was no need of going back to 1896, while at the same time leaving a wide gap between 1911 and 1921. I have remained faithful to the great leader of the Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and I recall how he reprimanded the then Postmaster General in 1911.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): We cannot discuss this evening, under item 272, the post office administration of Mr. Pelletier.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Certainly, and this is why: The Postmaster General made a statement—

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I wonder why the chairman did not call the Postmaster General to order when he referred to the dismissals of 1896 to 1911?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I am not responsible for my actions to the hon. member.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): You are not responsible for your actions to me, sir; however, I think I am in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): I would request the hon. member to adhere to the item under discussion.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I shall not further insist. I am not going to start a boxing match in the house.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): This in no way unnerves me.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): No. I regret that there seems at times to be two weights and two measures.

I am not going to discuss what has already been debated in the house. I found quite an interesting document in the patent records. It is the description of the letter box, the famous box, a marvel of Amédée Lesieur, patented under another name. Amédée Lesieur, I stated the other day, was a wine merchant of Montreal, who had carried on a profitable business when the Scott Act was in force in Quebec; now he is a manufacturing agent, an agent of applicants for patents. The following is what is found in the Canadian

Patent Office Record of February 9, 1932, p. 338—

You are aware, sir, that pure water is called in pharmaceutics aqua pura and that under that term a druggist always asks a higher price for a bottle of aqua pura than for an ordinary glass of water. I also am aware that chemists designate it as H^2O; it is a chemical formula which means water—pure water as obtained from a tap just like the water the Prime Minister sent, at the expense of the state, to Washington for the use of the Kiwanis club. That is called, sir, diplomatic water, it is a special water. However, the following is the description of the famous box of which you have a photograph under your eyes, that stove pipe which is described as if it were the eighth marvel of the world.

When the description of this stove pipe is read to you, sir, you will imagine it is made of platinum, with gold supports, covered with rubies and similar to the ancient jewels found in Tut-Ank-Ahmon's tomb. Allow me to read to you the marvellous description of Amédée Lesieur's box:

No. 319,598. Mail Box. Boîte postale.
Alfred Edmund Guy Madley, Westmount, Quebec, Canada, 9th February, 1932. Filed 3rd December, 1931. Serial No. 384,322.

1. A rural mail box comprising a cylindrical casing closed at one end—

It is no longer a stovepipe closed at one end; it has become a cylindrical casing.

—and open at the other end—

As all stove pipes are.

—a hingedly mounted door for the open end, combined reinforcing and spring actuated supporting means for the box.

Is that not marvellous?

2. A rural mail box comprising a cylindrical casing with a pivotally mounted door—

One is a hingedly mounted door and is a pivotally mounted door.

—at one end and closed at the other end, a bendable metallic band adapted to envelop and reinforce the box—

Apparently the box is reinforced at both ends.

—and having one end suitably bent, a standard provided with a cap having an opening therein, a retaining bolt spring pressed for engagement with the band and with the standard and a tensioning nut for said bolt.

So there is a nut for the bolt. This is very important, very difficult and very highly technical.

3. In a rural mail box and in combination, a cylindrical casing closed at one end and provided with a gravity-operable door—

[Mr. Pouliot.]

So we have three doors, the hingedly mounted door, the pivotally mounted door and now the gravity operable door.

—at the other end, a standard, a combined reinforcing and supporting member for the casing and pivotal spring pressed means connecting said member with the standard.

Is that not marvellous? Is it not a grand thing for which to grant $28,000 to this fellow? Mark you, sir, that the report of the Postmaster General is dated November 5, 1931. He speaks of the scarcity of rural mail boxes in the maritime provinces and in Quebec, and he goes on to say:

This box is a greatly improved one, is patented and cannot be purchased elsewhere, and is particularly adapted to use in the postal service. The minister states that the price of $2.75 is fair and reasonable.

I am sure the minister has never seen the box; he has only seen the description. The descriptions of the three doors are worth a dollar each; this man was a marvel to make such a wonderful thing for 25 cents less than the $3.

An hon. MEMBER: How many did they buy?

Mr. POULIOT: The department bought ten thousands boxes, and on each box this wine merchant made a profit of $2. I wonder if he could not have used those boxes for wine containers. Evidently he thought it was just as well to sell them to the Postmaster General empty, so that they could be used as rural mail boxes. This shows how money is wasted while the salaries of the poor postmasters are cut ten per cent. Here is a fellow to whom the country owes nothing but who receives a grant of $20,000 from the Postmaster General. The hon. gentleman submitted his report to council on November 5 but the application for a patent was not filed until December 3, long afterwards. Yet the minister speaks highly of the economies he has made in his department.

I have tried to sum up what I have to say in the most concise way possible, but there is still another case I wish to submit to the committee. It is next to the last and I shall try to make it as short as possible. If I have gone into details in connection with these mail boxes it is only to show the house and the country how the Postmaster General is wasting his time in connection with such petty matters. He would do better to abide by the law instead of wasting time evading it.

Now, sir, let us discuss the Notre-Dame-du-Lac case. On July 15, 1931, we find a

memo of the Postmaster General to the Governor in Council with reference to the dismissal of Antoine Landry, postmaster, for political partizanship.

On August 18, 1931, order in council P.C. 1994 dismissing Antoine Landry. August 31, 1931, application for the position by the returned soldier Dominique Côté to the Postmaster General.

September 5, 1931, Mr. Gaboury, deputy Postmaster General, writes to Dominique Côté:

I have noted your application, however, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the appointment in this case is under the control of the Civil Service Commission which will give public notice of the vacancy in the locality. You may then put in your application in the regular way on the form which can be obtained at the post office itself or at the office of the Quebec District Superintendent of Postal Services.

On September, 1931, another letter from the returned soldier Dominique Côté, addressed to the Postmaster General.

On September 24, 1931, reply of Mr. Gaboury to Mr. Côté:

I have noted what you state, however, as I pointed out in my letter of September 5, the appointment in this case is a matter which comes under the purview of the Civil Service Commission.

On September 26, 1931, Mr. C. E. Dubé wrote to Mr. Gaboury that the returned soldier Côté was in no way qualified, having no education:

I recommend that Mr. J. Thomas Voisine be appointed temporarily and when the time comes to appoint a permanent postmaster, through the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Côté will have the full right of applying, and the commission will be able to judge whether he is qualified, which I doubt.

What Mr. Dubé wrote to the deputy Postmaster General is quite right. However, when he recommended such a person to fill the vacancy temporarily, that is not as right. The returned soldier should have been appointed, however, one must be broad-minded in this connection and not blame him.

On September 28, 1931, Mr. Underwood notifies Mr. Green, superintendent at Quebec, that the appointment of Mr. Voisine, as temporary postmaster is an accomplished fact. On October 28, 1931, the post office is transferred to Voisine.

On November 27, 1931, the returned soldier Côté forwards to the Postmaster General a petition bearing sixty-three signatures.

On December 4, 1931, the Deputy Postmaster General wrote to Mr. Côté that the appointment in this case is under the control of the Civil Service Commission.

53719—315½

On December 5, 1931, the Deputy Postmaster General writes to the Civil Service Commission and requests a temporary certificate for Voisine. On January 5, 1932, Mr. Underwood writes to Mr. Green instructing him to advertise the position. The notices are posted for the period between January 9 and 24, 1932. The qualifications required are: a sufficient education to keep ordinary accounts, carry on a limited correspondence and serve the public in a proper way.

On January 21, 1932, the Deputy Postmaster General notifies the Civil Service Commission that the Postmaster General is not in a position to send in the report with reference to the applications. On February 24, matters have not changed. A temporary certificate is requested rather than to conform with the Act and allow the Civil Service Commission to make the appointment.

On March 24, 1932, Mr. Underwood writes to Mr. Green, then follows a report from Mr. Green with reference to those who have applied for the position of postmaster at Notre-Dame-du-Lac.

Copy

Ottawa, March 24, 1932

S, Tanner Green, Esq.,
District Superintendent of
Postal Service,
Quebec, P.Q.

Dear Sir,—

Re: Notre Dame du Lac

I am returning herewith your report on the applicants for this position.

In reference to the application of Mr. Dominique Cote, returned soldier, the Inspector rates the applicants 85 per cent but it is stated that the location and accommodation offered are poor.

The point is, is the location and accommodation poor to the extent of rendering it an undesirable situation for the Post Office? if so, then in reply to question 20 your answer should be "No" and the reason should be "Unsatisfactory accommodation and location."

As a matter of fact, the rating given to the candidate covers all factors. It covers the educational qualifications of the candidate, his ability to fill the position, his habits, standing in the community and also the accommodation and location which he offers.

If the accommodation is barely satisfactory but you are of the opinion that a satisfactory service could be given, then your rating should be slightly more than 60 to indicate that notwithstanding the fact that the accommodation is poor it is sufficiently good to justify the placing of the Post Office at that point.

Will you please be good enough to give this matter further consideration and return the report with any amendments which you feel are necessary, at the earliest possible moment.

Yours very truly,

E. J. UNDERWOOD,
Chief Superintendent of
Post Office Service.

S.P. No. 218, (p. 59)
Ref. No. 80,
January 25, 1933.

(Translation):

The same question was put to each of the candidates, to Voisine and Côté: Will you change the site of the post office, if you are appointed? Reply of Mr. Côté: "No." Reply of Mr. Voisine: "No." That is, the site was to be the same, in both cases. Yet, it was contended that the site suggested by Mr. Côté was unsuitable while the one suggested by Mr. Voisine was a suitable one. And an official, so important as Mr. Underwood wrote to Mr. Green, of Quebec, to request him to change the rating of Côté because he had offered an unsuitable site, when this site was exactly the same as the one offered by Voisine. What what was the rating of Voisine? Ninety per cent. Dominique Côté, 85 per cent. However, note, sir, that it was said then that Voisine was offering a suitable site while Côté was offering a rather unsuitable one. For Voisine, it was said: "Private residence, very good accommodation." For Côté: "Private residence, poor accommodation."

This was evidently the reason for which the rating of Voisine was 90 per cent while that of Côté was 85 per cent.

Now, sir, what was the second report sent? I had all the trouble in the world to lay my hand on the first report of Mr. Green. I was obliged to have motion after motion adopted, and I had to write many a time to the Postmaster General and his officials, so as to obtain this report. Why is this information, which is requested by members who have a right to it, not given with good grace by the hon. Postmaster General? I have here the second report referring to Voisine and Côté:

Thomas Voisine: Class C, married, age 52; residence in "the" district 12; service overseas, no; education, primary; speaks, reads and writes French, but no English; has the candidate himself the required qualifications to perform efficiently the duties of this position, yes; character, very good; habits, very good; reputation, very good; what experience has the candidate had which may enable him to fill this position? None, except as temporary postmaster; other experience, secretary to the municipality of Ste-Rose.

Dominique Côté:

Class B, bachelor, age 35; residence in the district 35; service overseas, yes; education, primary; speaks, reads and writes French, but not English; has the candidate himself the required qualifications to perform efficiently the duties of that position? yes; character, very good; habits, very good; reputation, very good; what experience has the candidate had which may enable him to fill this position? none; other experience, always been a labourer.

The two candidates were questioned.

Rating: Thomas Voisine, 90 per cent; Dominique Côté, 75 per cent.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

That is, in the second report it was no more stated that Côté offered an unsuitable site, which was untrue, the first time. The qualifications of the two candidates were the same with this difference that one, Côté, was a returned soldier, and that the other, Voisine, was not, and the rating of Voisine is left at 90 per cent, while the rating of Côté is reduced from 85 per cent to 75 per cent. That is, according to Mr. Underwood, when the Postmaster General stated that Côté had offered an unsuitable site, he had 85 per cent; when he offers a suitable site, he is reduced to 75 per cent. The report continues:

The post office is no more in a public building, but in a separate one and a very good site. Even if there is no change.

Each candidate is willing to devote all his time to the duties which the post office necessitates. Voisine intends to obtain the help of his son and daughter and Côté the help of Miss Blanche Landry, who has had six years of postal experience.

Moreover, that is how post offices are kept in rural sections.

Do you consider this candidate sufficiently qualified as regards education, experience, personal qualifications, character, honesty, also do the premises and site answer the requirements of the post office in question?

Answer: yes, in both cases.

Signed by Jos. Lallier, Inspector of Postal Service, and countersigned by S. Tanner Green.

On March 23, 1932, Mr. Foran wrote to Mr. Gaboury:

(Text) Re Notre-Dame du Lac. I am to draw your attention to the fact that the time limit for receiving applications in this case was January 2, 1932, and to inquire whether the Department is yet in a position to submit the report on the qualifications of the candidates.

On April 1, 1932, Mr. Coolican writes to Mr. Foran:

(Text) I may say that the department is not yet in a position to furnish that report.

On April 15, 1932, temporary certificate from the Civil Service Commission, not to exceed two months from February 28, 1932.

On April 25, 1932, Mr. Foran to Mr. Gaboury:

(Text) As three months have now elapsed since the closing date for receiving public applications, will you kindly co-operate with the Commission in expediting the matter.

On May 11, 1932, temporary certificate from the Civil Service Commission, for a month, from April 28, 1932. Foran to Gaboury:

(Text) I am also directed to say that no further extension will be granted until the report has been received.

On May 17, 1932, another letter from the returned soldier Dominique Côté to the minister:

On May 18, reply of Gaboury to Côté:

I may state that the decision in this case entirely rests with the Civil Service Commission.

On May 19, 1932, Mr. C-E. Dubé writes to Mr. Sauvé:

I would suggest that Mr. Dominique Côté be examined as to—

In " au point de vue," the last word is wrongly spelt "vu."

In "son instruction" the first word is wrongly spelt "sont."

Instead of "qu'on commence," he writes "qu'en" commence, etc.

On May 23, 1932, reply of the Postmaster General to Mr. Dubé:

I noted your suggestions and I shall refer to them later.

On May 30, 1932, Mr. Grondin writes to the member for Témiscouata:

The report with reference to the candidates has not been forwarded to the Civil Service Commission and as the revenue of this post office last year was only $1,782, the permanent appointment will be made by the Post Office Department. This affair will receive the necessary attention, as soon as possible.

On May 30, 1932, three practically similar letters from Joseph Dubé, harness merchant; from Georges Voisine, councillor of Notre-Dame-du-Lac and brother of the other Voisine—a letter without date—and from Philippe Morin, June 3, 1932, on behalf of Thomas Voisine and against Dominique Coté, to the Postmaster General.

This is what happened. Instead of submitting the case to the Civil Service Commission, the Postmaster General listened to the recommendations or gossip which came from three unqualified individuals of Notre-Dame-du-Lac.

The hon. Postmaster General wrote to me as follows, on July 13, 1932:

The superintendent has forwarded together with his report a letter from Mr. Côté, a photographed copy of which I am sending you, it gives a good idea of the education of this candidate. You will no doubt, be of my opinion, that the Postmaster General cannot entrust the postal administration, especially when it is a matter of such importance as the post office of Notre-Dame-du-Lac, to a candidate who has no experience in office work and who, judging from his writing, is not capable of personally taking charge of the post office.

And the Postmaster General sends me a photostat of a letter from the returned soldier Côté, of Notre-Dame-du-Lac. I replied to the Postmaster General that his writing was better than his or mine.

Another case. According to a return tabled recently, may I inquire what was decided with reference to the person who was appointed postmaster at Coaticooke? It is a much more important post office than Notre-Dame-du-Lac. The Coaticooke post office has a revenue of $5,255 per year.

(Text):

This certificate is number 5255, dated February 21, 1933, and reads:

The education of this candidate is, however, rather limited, and the first inclination of the examiners was to report it as inadequate. He did not complete the primary school course and his showing on the written test was not good. It was felt, however, that some allowance should be made in so far as the written examination is concerned for his obvious nervousness at the time of the examination.

(Translation):

There were ten other candidates. However, this chap, who was not qualified was appointed. The Postmaster General will contend that he was appointed by the Civil Service Commission. That is true. But, on the other hand, the Postmaster General accepted from the Civil Service Commission the appointment of an uneducated person, as postmaster of an office which has a revenue of $5,255 per year; yet he finds that a candidate considered sufficiently educated by an inspector, is unfit to take charge of a post office with a revenue of $900 per year.

As to the rating, the following is what the Deputy Minister wrote himself to the Civil Service Commission. Return No. 65 S.P. 192:

The department does not assume that the commission is bound to accept as unquestionable the rating given by the district superintendent of postal service. The department has had sufficient experience to know that this is not the case.

There is a complaint in connection with the Coaticooke post office and I trust that, in future, the hon. Postmaster will conform to the act when it is a question of making appointments or dismissals and that he will guard himself against doing an injustice and, moreover, not come to the house boasting like the Pharisees of the good deeds done and the prayers said.

The hon. Postmaster seems to have every theological virtue and all those that man may have inherited since Adam. That is splendid, but sounds like the Pharisees. It is much better to be a publican and not boast so much. The hon. Postmaster General would have been better advised to allow the members to give credit for good deeds rather than have him behead certain postmasters of their country. It would have been better for them to defend him when he was attacked. I think that it would have been more proper and decent for the party's sake that the members who requested the Postmaster General to be unjust, to rise themselves and defend his attitude. Perhaps,

many things were requested from the minister, which he now regrets and hon. members have not the courage to rise in the house and defend him.

I wish to state to the hon. Postmaster General: If he wishes to retain the esteem of our English speaking fellow-citizens in the Cabinet, the House of Commons and throughout the country, he should take as his motto these few words said by the most eminent of all French Canadians, Sir Louis Hippolyte Lafontaine: "Let us assert our rights." Let us prove our courage, let us never be intimidated by the cries of fish-hawks which fanatics set up all over the country. Fanaticism is of short duration. When an appeal is made to hatred of race, language and religion, sooner or later, it is certain to cause a revolution. Let one recall that in 1917 the election was made against Quebec, that the Union Cabinet denounced Quebec in every part of Canada and, four years later, it was Quebec who gave the majority to the party which triumphed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the house any longer, I stated part of what I had to say, I set aside much because we are nearing the end of the session; however, I would request the government to see that the injustice perpetrated by the Post Office department be atoned and that it be courageous enough to refuse the requests of its partizans who are not, themselves called upon to defend the government. I trust that, in the future, they will better defend it, that no more injustice will be perpetrated against the French or English speaking Canadians, and that the Postmaster General will act so as to be equally respected by both French and English speaking Canadians.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): Before this item is carried, I wish to suggest to the Postmaster General some means to make amends for the wrong done to Mr. Carrier, ex-postmaster of Levis. It goes without saying that the Postmaster General was unfair to this man. He knew that his services had always been of the best, that his conduct was above reproach, that nothing could be said against him from a political viewpoint and, he was aware that in retiring from the service, Mr. Carrier, the latter could not enjoy a pension. I would request the hon. Postmaster General, so as to make amends for the wrong done, to reimburse him the contribution he made to the superannuation fund, beside the gratuity already paid to him. I trust that the hon. Postmaster General wishes to do a kind act before retiring for the night and that he will think over my suggestion and carry it out.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION FOR SATURDAY SITTING

Mr. BENNETT: The notice standing for Saturday's sitting will have to be dropped from the order paper because it refers only to this Saturday. If it is desirable to move another motion for next Saturday we can do so. In order that the clerk may have his record correct, I suppose the house will have to consent to this motion being dropped, although no doubt it would be dropped automatically because it refers to no other Saturday except this.

Motion dropped.

On motion of Mr. Bennett the house adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Monday, May 15, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1933-34

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1934, was presented by Hon. E. N. Rhodes (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

CONSCRIPTION IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (West Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Sutherland) arising out of a report that appears in this morning's Citizen of a statement made by Brigadier Anderson. He is reported as saying:

> It is my own idea that militia training in Canada should be on a basis of conscription, under which every man between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five might be compelled to train so many days each year.

I wish to ask the Minister of National Defence or the acting Prime Minister if that represents the present policy of the government.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Acting Prime Minister): If my hon. friend will allow me I will take that as notice of motion. It is not the policy of this government at all, but at

the same time I think that question ought to be answered by the Minister of National Defence himself, who does not happen to be here this morning.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAR FERRY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. E. MacLEAN (Prince): I would like to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion) a question in connection with a press dispatch that I noticed stating that the operating deficit of the car ferry steamer to Prince Edward Island will be charged to the consolidated revenue of Canada rather than to the Canadian National Railways. I would like to ask if that is a fact, and if it will affect the standing of the men?

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways): I think I will have to make a few remarks in reply to that question. The Prince Edward Island car ferry has been operated in the past by the Canadian National Railways as part of eastern lines, and whatever deficit there has been on it has been absorbed into the eastern lines' deficit. There has been a great deal of pressure, as my hon. friend probably knows, from Prince Edward Island chambers of commerce and various other bodies who seem to desire very strongly that so far as accounting is concerned it should be dealt with by the government itself, while operation is still handled by the Canadian National Railways. At their request, and after a great deal of pressure,—because frankly I did not see any advantage in it myself—it has been arranged that in the future, while the Canadian National Railways will still handle the ferry as they have in the past, the accounting will be separate and the estimate for the deficit on the operation of the ferry, if any, will be submitted to the house as a separate estimate.

I do not think it will make any difference in any shape or form to the men working on the ferry, I cannot see how it should.

PRIVATE BILL

GENTER THICKENER COMPANY

On the order for the house to go into committee on Bill No. 102, respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company—Mr. Chevrier.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the hon. gentleman who is responsible for this bill I would like it to stand until the Prime Minister is present, because he has something he wishes to say on it. It can come up tomorrow night when he will be here.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

REPORTED ENGAGEMENTS OF PRIME MINISTER—PROSPECTS FOR PROROGATION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the acting Prime Minister (Sir George Perley) how much time this week he expects the Prime Minister to be here? From accounts in the press it would appear that the Prime Minister is not to be in parliament at all this week, except for one day.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Acting Prime Minister): The Prime Minister will be here tomorrow and answer for himself. As far as I am concerned I have been hoping that hon. gentlemen on the other side would allow the session to close early this week.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope the acting Prime Minister and members of the government will keep in mind that we are sitting here morning, afternoon and night, and we hope every effort will be made by the government to facilitate prorogation.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: May I say to my right hon. friend that so far there has been business before the house at all times, and certainly none of the time has been wasted by the government.

SARNIA-PORT HURON VEHICULAR TUNNEL COMPANY

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Mr. ROSS W. GRAY (West Lambton) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 41, to incorporate the Sarnia-Port Huron Vehicular Tunnel Company.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TAX FREE BONDS

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What is the amount of interest which the government pays annually on government tax-free bonds?
2. What is the amount of interest which the government pays annually on other government bonds?

Mr. RHODES:

1. On bonds presently outstanding, $39,347,950.25; after November 1, 1933, the annual interest on tax-free bonds will be $17,548,534.
2. $87,891,548.88.

BANQUE PROVINCIALE—DEPOSITS

Mr. FERLAND:

1. What is the amount of deposits in savings accounts of the Banque Provinciale du Canada in each province?
2. What are the guarantees of this bank to insure the reimbursement of such deposits?

Mr. RHODES:

1. Not reported under the Bank Act.
2. There is no statutory guarantee. Depositors in a bank rely upon the liquidity and solvency of the institution.

MOOSE BAY—WHARF

Mr. BOULANGER:

1. What was the cost of repairs made since August 7, 1930, to the wharf at Moose bay, Piopolis, on lake Megantic, province of Quebec?
2. Were the repairs carried out by contract?
3. Was the contract awarded after calling for public tenders and to the lowest tenderer?
4. To whom was the contract awarded?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. $1,642.17.
2. No.
3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

CRANE ISLAND—WIRELESS STATION

Mr. FAFARD:

1. Did the government establish a wireless station at Crane island last year?
2. If so, who is in charge of such station and what salary or remuneration does he receive?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Yes.
2. (a) Charles Narcisse Roy; (b) $100 per year.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

MAIL DELIVERY—QUEBEC

Mr. FERLAND:

1. What towns and cities in the province of Quebec have letter carriers for the purpose of mail delivery from house to house?
2. What towns and cities in such province have no letter carrier service?
3. What is the population of each town and city in the province of Quebec?

Mr. CAHAN: Tabled forthwith:

CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF PATENT SOLICITORS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What is the purpose of the body known as the Canadian Institute of Patent Solicitors named in regulation 12, governing the Unfair Competition Act of 1932?
2. What firms or individuals are members of the said Canadian Institute of Patent Solicitors?
3. Is this institute an incorporated legal body?
4. Has the institute authority to say who may or who may not practise before the Canadian trade mark office; if so, for what reason?
5. Is the attorney who is fully qualified and who has been practising before the Canadian trade mark office for years, obliged to pay fees to this institute before being recognized by the trade mark office of the government; if so, why?
6. What provision has been made for existing Canadian patent attorneys to continue practising if they should not feel disposed to join the Canadian Institute of Patent Solicitors?

[Mr. Rhodes.]

MOTION FOR PAPERS

LEASE OF ARMOURY—SHAUNAVON, SASK.

Mr. BOTHWELL:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, passing between the Canadian Legion, British Empire Service League of Shaunavon, Saskatchewan, or any representative thereof, and the Department of Public Works and the Department of National Defence, together with a copy of correspondence passing between the said two departments or between any person and either of the said departments, relative to the lease—or renewal thereof—of the armoury at Shaunavon, Saskatchewan, since August, 1930.

COMPANIES AND CREDITORS

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of and concurrence in an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 77, to facilitate compromises and arrangements between companies and their creditors.

He said: The only amendment, Mr. Speaker, is the substitution of the word "and" for the word "on".

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

CANADA-FRANCE TRADE AGREEMENT

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of Bill No. 107, respecting a certain trade agreement between Canada and France.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is framed to approve of the trade arrangement between Canada and France which was signed at Ottawa on the 12th of May of this year. It is within the knowledge of the house that the former trade agreement, which was signed in 1922, was terminated in June of last year, and this is a new agreement to provide for reciprocal tariffs on the exchange of goods between the two countries in substitution for the agreement which was terminated.

The house is well aware that since 1892, when Mr. Maline made his celebrated report to the French government, France has been one of the most highly protected countries in Europe or, I think, in the world. When that report was made the basis of the French tariff law France became predominantly protective in its tariff policy, and in that year established its new schedules under which there was a maximum general tariff and also a minimum tariff applicable to all imports into France. Especially in respect to agricultural products has France been highly protected. It has been the policy of France ever since 1892 to protect its own agricultural products with a view to making that country independent of the rest of the world, especially with regard to wheat and other grains, in case a national emergency should arise, and the French people again be called to arms. It is a very significant fact that, going back for scores of years and in fact for centuries, no man has reached the age of fifty-five or sixty in France who has not seen that country over-run by foreign troops in an attempt to subjugate that nation. France has felt unable to protect its supplies of food coming from overseas, and therefore has insisted on maintaining a highly protective policy for the purpose of encouraging the production of food supplies within its own boundaries. Those hon. gentlemen who have gone through France, as I have on many occasions, will remember passing through miles and miles of wheat fields which compare not only well but very favourably indeed with the best wheat fields of our western country.

Prior to 1892, when France adopted these maximum and minimum tariffs, Canada had no trade arrangement with that country. Our trade and commercial arrangements were governed up to that time by treaties or conventions which had been negotiated by the government of the United Kingdom and which applied to us as they did to the other dominions, colonies and possessions of Great Britain. But after this new tariff was adopted Sir Charles Tupper, then High Commissioner for Canada at London, proceeded to Paris and on behalf of the government of Canada concluded negotiations for the first trade treaty with France, which was signed by the British ambassador and by Sir Charles Tupper, on behalf of Canada, on February 6, 1893. This trade treaty was subsequently approved by the Canadian parliament in 1894.

Under the provision of that trade arrangement Canada secured the French minimum tariff on some nineteen staple Canadian products in return for concessions made by Canada, by way of reduction of our Canadian import duties on wines, soaps and a number of other products of France. But after 1893 Canadian industrial and agricultural production increased very rapidly and became more diversified than before, and the agreement which was ratified by Canada in 1895 came to be regarded with more or less dissatisfaction in this country. Further negotiations then ensued between the two countries after the close of a colonial conference at London in 1902, at which it was practically decided that this dominion would grant special preferences to Great Britain which would not be granted to foreign countries. But after the return of Sir Wilfrid Laurier from the colonial conference of 1902 the French government insisted that no modification of the existing trade arrangement with France would be made unless Canada would concede to France the same low preferential rates, which had been conceded to Great Britain, and which were comprised in the so-called "British preferential tariff." The government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier however refused to make this concession, and so for a time the negotiations continued and finally failed. But in 1907 the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier resumed negotiations with France, and on September 19 of that year a new convention was signed at Paris by the British ambassador and by Mr. Fielding, then Minister of Finance, and Mr. Brodeur, a minister of the crown, I have forgotten his office—

An hon. MEMBER: Minister of Marine.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on behalf of Canada. Owing to the opposition of the French Senate, which still continued, this convention was further modified and amended by a supplemental convention, signed January 23, 1909, and this amended convention of 1907-09 was then approved and came into force on February 1, 1910. The list of Canadian products entering France under the French minimum tariff was extended by this trade convention, and France, Algeria and the French colonies received the benefit of Canada's intermediate tariff which had then been established.

These arrangements continued until after the close of the great war, when, the French tariff having been increased from time to time, it was found that the high general tariff of France had practically precluded numerous industrial and agricultural products of Canada from access to the French market. The Canadian government then proposed to grant to all French products the advantages of Canada's intermediate tariff in return for the grant of the French minimum tariff to a more extended list of Canadian products. This the

French government of the day refused to concede, and on the recommendation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce the convention of 1907-09 was denounced by Canada on March 19, 1920, and terminated on June 19, 1920. The following year, further negotiations between the governments of the two countries resulted in a modus vivendi or temporary arrangement being concluded at Paris on January 29, 1921. Broadly speaking, this temporary arrangement was based on the convention then recently terminated. Twenty-six new items were included in this arrangement on terms more favourable to Canada, but a number of Canadian products then received less favourable rates from France, being removed from the French minimum rate and granted new tariff rates which were intermediate between the French minimum tariff and the French maximum tariff.

In the following summer of 1922 the Hon. W. S. Fielding, then Minister of Finance, and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the present distinguished member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) negotiated a new convention with France which was signed at Paris on December 15, 1922, by the British ambassador and by the two Canadian ministers mentioned. This new trade convention was approved by parliament and brought into force on September 5, 1923. Under its terms Canada afforded to France fixed tariff rates on a number of items substantially lower than Canada's intermediate tariff, so that thereafter there were fixed rates on thirty-one items or parts of items on the Canadian tariff, lower than the intermediate tariff rates then prevailing; and this new arrangement also conceded to France Canada's intermediate tariff rates, less a discount of ten per cent on ninety-one items or parts of items, and intermediate rates decreased by a discount of fifteen per cent on three items. In addition, Canada granted to France complete most favoured nation treatment in respect of all tariff matters. In return France granted its minimum tariff on one hundred and forty-one tariff items, a considerable number of which—I say this without special criticism—covered chemical and other products which have never since been produced in Canada, and on other items certain percentages of reduction in the maximum general tariff of France.

Canada was also then accorded better tariff treatment in the French colonies, and provision was made for Canadian products receiving, on importation into France, any tariff concessions then made or thereafter to be made by France to the United States of America. Under this convention of 1922 France retained the unfettered right to increase all or any of her tariff rates, minimum or maximum, at will, without consulting Canada. Widespread increases in French maximum and minimum rates have been the outstanding characteristic of the French tariff policy since that convention came into force.

In April and August of 1926, there was a general increase in French customs rates aggregating approximately sixty-nine per cent of the rates in force on nearly all commodities. These rates were effected for the purpose of readjusting French customs tariff protection to French national industry and production. Later, the French tariff revision of September 6, 1927, not only reclassified numerous sections of the French tariff but also established maximum and minimum rates considerably higher than those which had previously been in force. For example—I trust the house will allow this digression because it is of real significance under present conditions—since 1926 the French minimum customs duty on Canadian wheat and other wheat products has been raised on four different occasions. Expressing these increases in the equivalent of Canadian currency it will be ascertained that on September 3, 1927, the previously existing rate was increased to 17½ cents per bushel; by November 18, 1927, the rate had been increased to 27 cents per bushel; by May 24, 1929, it had been increased to 37 cents per bushel; by May 20, 1930, to 33 cents per bushel and since May 20, 1930, to 85 cents per bushel. These were all increases in the minimum tariff of France. The maximum rate or the general tariff was made twice the minimum rate and on the importations of wheat into France from Canada it stands to-day at approximately $1.70 per bushel. The increases I have mentioned, that is those up to 85 cents per bushel, were made in the minimum tariff to which Canada was entitled under the convention then in force. Since June of last year when that treaty was terminated, as I said before, Canadian wheat has been subjected to the maximum tariff rate which is the equivalent of $1.70 per bushel in Canadian currency.

Under the French law of December 1, 1929, importations of foreign wheat into France have been restricted by prescribing the percentages of domestic and foreign wheat which may lawfully be used in making flour to be used for bread making. The percentages of foreign wheat which have been prescribed from time to time for domestic use have varied according to the supplies of domestic wheat available. When I was in France, only three per cent of foreign wheat was permitted

to be used, but, at the present time, by a decree recently passed, I understand that this percentage of foreign wheat has been reduced from three to one per cent. While I was in France carrying on these negotiations the fall in wheat prices on the French domestic market which then averaged, as the exchange fluctuated, from $1.25 to $1.30 per bushel in Canadian money, had caused such widespread resentment in the agricultural communities throughout France that at one time it was thought the life of the government would be seriously endangered. One afternoon I attended at the Chamber of Deputies when this matter was being discussed and I noticed that a large number of deputies representing agricultural communities were strong in their denunciation of the government for allowing the price of wheat to fall as low as the equivalent in our money of $1.25 per bushel.

In 1931, under the auspices of the League of Nations, France entered into an agreement known as the Stresa convention. This convention has been published in the reports of the League of Nations and I fancy that nearly every member of the house who is interested in agricultural production and especially wheat production is familiar with its terms. Under the terms of this convention France agreed to exceptional and temporary measures in order to assist Hungary and Jugoslavia. Later on, the terms of this convention were extended to Roumania. A rebate of thirty per cent of the minimum tariff on wheat imported into France was allowed to these three countries. This convention granted to each of these three countries the privilege of supplying ten per cent of the annual importations of wheat into France. Therefore, at the present time thirty per cent of the total annual importations of wheat into France is obtained from these three countries of central Europe.

During the discussions which ensued, especially with regard to wheat items, I learned that France was vigorously encouraging the production of wheat in her colonies in northern Africa. The importations of wheat from Algeria, Tunis and Morocco increased from 14,000,000 bushels in 1931 to 24,000,000 bushels last year. Although I have no personal knowledge of the facts, it was stated to me in these conversations that the department of agriculture of France was encouraging the sowing of hard wheat in Algeria. The result has been that France is receiving an independent supply of hard wheat of practically the same standard as that previously imported from Canada. In talking this over with a gentleman who had expert knowledge of wheat growing I was told that unless France imported new seed from Canada from time to time she would be unable to keep up the production of hard wheat in Algeria. Because of the climate and the soil of that country, if the wheat produced is sown again from year to year it becomes more in the nature of soft than hard wheat. There is a gradual deterioration in the hardness of the wheat. These are matters with regard to which I am not capable of giving the house an expert opinion, save this. That, as wheat forms by far the largest part in value of Canada's annual exports to France, I have stressed the difficulties which we have to meet in that market for this important product and I also state that the question of retaining the minimum tariff for Canadian wheat in the French market was one of the greatest difficulties that beset me during the negotiations.

But to return to the trade convention of 1922, France thereafter negotiated with Germany a new trade convention which came into force on December 15, 1928, and by which Germany received from France complete most-favoured nation treatment, and owing to the competition which then ensued Canadian products were by the Franco-German treaty subjected to more severe competition in many lines in the French market. Coincident with the negotiation of this Franco-German treaty, the French government further increased their minimum and maximum rates on many Canadian products which had been included in our Canadian convention of 1922 and thus increased the customs payable on those Canadian products entering the French market. Moreover, as I have already stated, while France under the 1922 convention with Canada was at complete liberty to raise her tariff rates at will, Canada had granted to France fixed tariff rates on thirty-one items or parts of items of our tariff which were substantially lower than our intermediate rates, and by reason of these fixed rates and of the fact that by successive trade agreements Canada had granted most-favoured foreign nation treatment to twenty-three other countries, the whole tariff structure of this country was, in respect of those favoured fixed items, anchored and immovable, so that as long as the convention of 1922 remained in force, Canada was unable to increase her tariff on those items in respect of her imports from twenty-two or twenty-three other countries.

It was therefore deemed essential by this government that Canada should recover freedom of action in tariff matters. Early in February, 1931, the Canadian government sought to obtain satisfactory modifications of

the terms of the French trade agreement of 1922 and, failing in this endeavour, this government on December 15, 1931, gave to France six months' notice of the termination of the convention of 1922. At the same time Canada offered to France to enter immediately upon the negotiation of a new trade convention which might be deemed more satisfactory to both countries. The old trade convention therefore terminated on June 16, 1932. Although in the meantime the Canadian government had proposed an interim arrangement to December 31, 1932, on the basis of granting to France, during this interim, most-favoured national treatment for her products in Canada, the French government refused to consent to such an interim arrangement.

It was under these circumstances that, as I was leaving Canada to attend the general assembly of the League of Nations in September last, I was authorized by the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett), who is also Secretary of State for External Affairs, to open, on behalf of the government, conversations with the government of France regarding a new commercial convention between the two countries. In September, therefore, on my way to Geneva, with the assistance and cooperation of the Hon. Philippe Roy, Canadian Minister at Paris, who certainly has a very intimate knowledge of French political affairs and a close acquaintance and friendship with nearly every prominent statesman in France, I met the French Premier, the Minister of Commerce and some of the important officials of the French Department of Foreign Affairs. It was agreed that these conversations would be renewed after my return to Paris at the close of the general assembly of the League of Nations.

The negotiations with the French government commenced effectively in October of last year and were continued with the government of Mr. Herriot until it was defeated in the French chamber in November last. The negotiations thereafter continued with the government of Mr. Paul Boncourt who succeeded Mr. Herriot as premier, and they were practically concluded, except with regard to three or four contentious items under discussion which remained to be settled, as we anticipated, on the morning of January 26 last. We terminated the session of the commission on the 26th to resume on the 27th. On the 27th a crisis arose and I was unable to see the Premier and the Minister of Commerce who had promised to receive me that afternoon. The Minister of Commerce promised to see me later, during the recess between seven and eight o'clock, and then I received word that owing to a crisis having arisen, a caucus of his party had been called for the recess and that our meeting had to be postponed. I was awakened early the following morning from my sleep by the private secretary of one of the ministers to tell me that the discussion had continued all night; that the government had been voted out of office at six o'clock that morning and that they had handed in their resignation at seven o'clock. We therefore initialled the various items agreed to and left, I think, three or four items for further discussion.

I then returned to Canada and after my return a new government was formed with Mr. Deladier as premier. Since that date the negotiations have been concluded, resulting in this trade arrangement and in the other convention. This has been greatly due to the kindly offices of that very estimable gentleman who occupies the position of French Minister at Ottawa and who certainly has devoted himself unsparingly to bringing about a satisfactory trade arrangement between the two countries. I have to pay him a high tribute for his kindness and courtesy to me during the remainder of the negotiations.

Under this new trade arrangement, products coming from France enumerated in schedule C, including seventy-seven tariff items, will enjoy the intermediate tariff of Canada with a discount of 10 per cent therefrom. On fifteen tariff items a higher discount than 10 per cent is granted. Under this arrangement there are no increases on importations into Canada. In respect of seven items, the British preferential tariff is granted, especially in respect to books printed in France in the French language, surgical instruments and scientific apparatus, cinematograph and moving picture films made in France and speaking the French language, while certain articles of special religious significance are admitted to this country free. In respect of certain imports admitted under the same rate as the British preferential tariff, it will be noted that these items will come into force when authorized by order in council. Several of these items, especially books and surgical instruments, seemingly conflict with the Ottawa conference trade agreement between Great Britain and Canada. But during the negotiation of this trade arrangement assurances were received from the government of the United Kingdom that there would be no objection to the inclusion of these special articles in the trade agreement with France. I therefore inserted a proviso in regard to these items coming into force by order in council, in order that official recognition of

these concessions might be first obtained from the government of the United Kingdom. I think there is a clear understanding with regard to these matters.

Schedule D contains a supplementary list of tariff items in respect to which French products will enjoy Canada's intermediate tariff. This trade arrangement will be approved and confirmed, if this bill becomes law. As hon. members will notice, it is a provisional agreement which is made pending the conclusion of a commercial convention which will regulate in a more complete and permanent manner trade relations between Canada and France. There were insurmountable difficulties in the way of concluding a more permanent convention, these difficulties being due chiefly to the application of the French minimum tariff to Canadian wheat, and due also to the fact that international monetary policy has not been so stabilized as to enable the respective governments to determine on what basis duties will be levied when imported into either one country or the other. I do not wish to repeat statements about the proposed London economic conference, but it was felt by the Canadian representative that, owing to the wheat conference which was then likely to take place, and is now being held at Geneva, and owing to the subject matter of wheat being one which will come under discussion at London, it was better to arrive at a provisional agreement capable of giving temporary satisfaction than to attempt at this stage to procure a permanent trade convention with France. This trade arrangement is made for the fixed period of one year from May 12, 1933, the date on which it was signed. It may be terminated on May 12, 1934, by either party giving prior notice to the other to that effect on or before February 12, 1934. This trade arrangement may be extended beyond May 12, 1934, by the tacit consent of both parties. If it is continued after May 12, 1934, by tacit consent it may be terminted by either party giving the other three months' notice to that effect.

To this statement one exception is made in respect of No. 68 of the French tariff, which deals with wheat. That exception is to the effect that wheat and other wheat products included in tariff item No. 68 shall enjoy the French minimum tariff for the duration of the present agreement, which is fixed for one year from the date of its signature, with a proviso that not later than March 31, 1934, the two governments will examine together the conditions under which France may find it possible to extend beyond May 12, 1934, this concession of its minimum tariff to Canadian wheat. Moreover another exception is contained in the note attached to schedule A to the effect that a quota of 25,000 quintals of canned salmon will be effective until October 1, of the present year. France has entered into an arrangement with Japan with respect to a supply of canned salmon, and until October 1 next it was impossible, except by violating that convention, to grant to Canada a quota larger than 25,000 quintals.

Mr. NEILL: Is that the League of Nations quintal or the British quintal?

Mr. CAHAN: French quintals.

Mr. NEILL: One hundred pounds?

Mr. CAHAN: I shall have to look that up. As a matter of fact I did not know there was a League of Nations quintal. The one in question however is the European and continental measurement. They agreed that on October 1 of this year they will arrange a new quota. That quota will be arranged on the basis of the French quota law, and will be determined by exportations made from Canada to France in the years 1927, 1928, 1929 and 1930. I find that under this tariff arrangement the quintal is equal to 220 pounds. Moreover, with regard to canned lobsters I find we are entitled to an annual quota of 3,000 quintals. Under this trade arrangement Canadian products mentioned in schedule A covering 185 items will enjoy the French minimum tariff. Canadian products mentioned in schedule B covering sixty-five other items will enjoy percentages of reduction in the French general tariff which are specified in schedule B. Provision is also made with respect to exportation of Canadian products to the French colonies and territories. The French colonies are divided into two main groups. The first group comprises the assimilated colonies to which the French customs tariff applies. This group includes Algeria, Indo-China, Madagascar and its dependencies, Mayotte and Camores, Guadaloupe and its dependencies, Martinique, French Guiana and Reunion.

The second group, whose tariffs are not assimilated to that of France, that is, which have a special tariff of their own, includes St. Pierre and Miquelon, Tunis, Morocco, Syria and Lebanon, French West Africa, including Senegal, French Guiana, Mauritania, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, French Sudan, High Volta and Niger. Other colonies not assimilated are French Equatorial Africa, Gabun, Togoland, Cameroons, French Somaliland, French settlements in India, French Oceania, New Hebrides and New Caledonia.

Under these trade arrangements the Canadian products mentioned in schedule A which enjoy the French minimum tariff in France when imported into the French colonies which are termed assimilated, that is colonies which have the same customs tariff as France, will enjoy the minimum tariff, whether this is the French customs minimum tariff or the minimum special colonial tariff then in force in that colony. Canadian products mentioned in schedule B on importation into the French colonies whose tariff is assimilated to that of France will enjoy the percentages of reduction on the general or maximum tariff mentioned in schedule B whether that tariff is the French tariff or a special colonial tariff. In the French colonies which are not assimilated, that is, which do not come under the French tariff, as well as in all French protectorates, the products of Canada enumerated in both schedules A and B will enjoy the lowest customs tariff applicable to such goods, no matter what may be their origin.

I suppose that in looking ahead one cannot altogether ignore the advantage of Canadian products having access to the territories of France. Spread as they are throughout the world, they represent a population of sixty millions of people. According to the last statistics available to me their annual imports were $707,000,000 or $708,000,000 of our money, and their exports $588,000,000 of our money, representing a total trade of nearly $1,300,000,000. We have participated in this trade to a certain extent, but I think not exceeding $1,000,000 to $1,500,000—I thought I had the statistics at hand, but I have not at the moment. The opinion prevalent in the discussions which I had with the commission, which was composed of official representatives of the French Foreign Office, the Finance department, the Commercial department and the departments of Agriculture and Colonies, was that in many of these colonies Canada had rare opportunities for advancing its trade.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it necessary to proceed further to discuss the items of these schedules. I would only remind the house that under the conditions which now prevail throughout the world it must be conceded that I met with exceptional difficulties in the prolonged discussions which took place at Paris. In those discussions I trust I was not unduly anxious to secure a new trade arrangement with France by reason of the fact that I am one of the ministers of the crown in this government representing the province of Quebec, which province by racial ties and speech and intimate social intercourse has special affinities for France and a desire to maintain the most cordial relations between Canada and France, though I was not unmindful of such considerations. Moreover I can say with all frankness that whether I succeeded to your satisfaction or not I gave to these negotiations all my heart and mind and strength. I did the best I could, and perhaps I am egotistical enough to think that I did as well as could possibly have been done under the conditions which confronted me.

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (North Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I am sure it has been a pleasure to everyone in the house to note with what thoroughness the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) has dealt with the matter of this treaty. I think we all feel that we can extend a word of congratulation to the Secretary of State for the tireless efforts he has put forth in order to bring about the best possible convention that could be arranged at the present time. As he points out, the convention is not a permanent one, but only more or less of a stop-gap to keep the door open until after the economic conference, and therefore I am sure the difficulties encountered were even greater than had it been a permanent treaty.

Those of us sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, can naturally have no objection to a treaty being made with the republic of France. We accept the principle of a treaty with any country if by that treaty better trade can be developed between two parts of the world.

The provisions of the agreement are long and intricate. As to the actual terms of the agreement made by the Secretary of State and the actual terms of the agreement which it supersedes, there is practically no difference, as I propose to show in a few moments.

I do not object that the minister has given us such a careful and lengthy review of the treaty, but I do object to a treaty of such magnitude being presented at such a late hour in the session as to make it utterly impossible to give to it the careful study that it deserves. It is only because it is a provisional agreement that we probably should not expect to go into it as thoroughly as if it were a fixed agreement for a term of years. The minister points out that the old treaty could be terminated on six months' notice. That is quite true, it was an indeterminate treaty, but on three months' notice either party could terminate it. I cannot see a particle of difference between these terms of the old and the terms of the new treaty. The minister states that this treaty is for a year, but by tacit consent, whatever that means it will continue in force. I figure that this means that if nothing is said the treaty goes on. It can however be ter-

minated by notice, in three months' time. As to any criticism that might be made in committee on the rates of duty applicable to any of the items, I doubt if criticism can be very well founded. I am sure the minister agrees with me that it will take at least a year to find out what the workings of the customs tariff will be on many of these items. At the present time importers find it absolutely impossible to get information as to what merchandise will cost when it arrives in the country. Fluctuating rates of exchange, dumping duties and other regulations have been a tremendous barrier to importation, and I doubt if the situation will be clarified much by the terms of this treaty.

The convention to which the minister referred, which was made by the late government on December 15, 1922, was not for any specified time, as has been pointed out. The present government saw fit to terminate that treaty, and their reason was very clear. They pointed out that under the terms of the treaty there were certain definite rates given France which also applied to other countries enjoying most favoured nation treatment, and that in this case the rates were so low as to be injurious to Canadian production. I have no quarrel with the government on that score; that is their policy, but I doubt very much if the terms of the treaty will bring the relief anticipated or will increase trade to any great extent.

Under the old treaty the French colonies were all included with France. The minister has pointed out that since the old convention was made there have been some changes in the tariff structure of France by which a separate tariff is maintained in what they term the non-assimilated colonies, and the same tariff is maintained in the assimilated colonies. Under the old treaty Canada gave concessions to France with regard to the intermediate tariff and most favoured nation treatment. As the minister pointed out, on ninety-two items it also gave a ten per cent reduction from the intermediate tariff, and on three items of textiles a fifteen per cent reduction, while on one hundred and thirty-one items there were fixed duties lower than the intermediate rates. In connection with the ninety-two items on which there was a ten per cent reduction from the intermediate tariff and in connection with the three textile items the proportionate differences between the general and intermediate tariffs were to be maintained as at the time the treaty was signed. Canada was not obligated to give France any preferences accorded to other parts of the empire, and at that time no foreign country was accorded tariff reductions more favourable than those specifically granted to France in the treaty. I notice that the minister has gone further; he has given France the British preferential rate on some items.

By the former convention France granted Canada minimum rates of duty, including the guarantee of most favoured nation treatment, on 141 items or part items, and on a much longer list of items reductions were granted from the general tariff representing various specified percentages of the difference between the general and minimum rates or, if lower, the rates of duty applied to the United States on products of a similar kind. That is to say, we were given the same rates that were accorded the United States. On all other goods we came under the general tariff as it existed before the notable increase made by the decree of March 28, 1921, so long as United States products were exempted from that increase. Then, in the event of the pre-1921 general tariff being withdrawn from the United States, we were given a reduction from the existing general tariff of 25 per cent of the difference between the general and mimimum tariffs. The French colonies, possessions and so on, not having the same tariff as France gave Canada most favoured foreign nation rates, and St. Pierre, Miquelon, the French West Indies and French Guiana accorded minimum tariff treatment on some or all food products. Not all the French colonies had in force duties lower than their general tariffs.

With regard to a great many items in the French tariff the effect of the Franco-Canadian convention was to give Canada the same rates that applied to the United States, which country, as I think the minister mentioned this morning, under an agreement made in 1910 was accorded the French minimum on about one hundred items. When the French tariff was increased by the 1921 decree, mentioned a moment ago, the United States was exempted from those increases. Until 1927 the goods of the United States entered France under either the minimum rates secured in 1910 or under an intermediate tariff which consisted of the pre-1921 general tariff. On September 6, 1927, the situation changed; a French decree increased duties, both minimum and general, and a new Franco-German treaty went into force. In consequence many intermediate rates—the pre-1921 general tariff—which applied to Canada and the United States, lapsed, and as a result the United States was placed under the new general tariff with regard to many products. On the items affected Canada was at once granted reductions from the general tariff in pursuance of the Franco-Canadian convention of commerce.

After some Franco-American negotiations a French decree of November 15, 1927, followed by decrees of March 15, May 12 and June 28, 1928, in the main restored to the United States the intermediate rates previously enjoyed, except that wherever the new minimum tariff exceeded the old intermediate rates, the new minimum rates went into force. Canada, through her convention of commerce with France, was given the benefit of these decrees wherever they established rates lower than those otherwise resulting from the convention.

Such were the terms of the old agreement. I do not know that there is any need to review the terms of the new treaty, which the minister has so ably explained, before giving the bill second reading. In committee, of course, we will have to study the schedules in order to arrive at what will be the actual effect, but might I point out briefly that article I of the convention now before us provides:

> The natural or manufactured products, originating in and coming from Canada, enumerated in schedule A to this agreement, shall enjoy, on their importation into French customs territory, the French minimum tariff, that is to say the most favoured foreign nation treatment.

The minister will agree that there are no fixed rates here, so there is no particular change between this article and the old convention; France can raise her duties at any time. The minister has explained what is meant by the expression "French customs territory." He has pointed out that these words mean that some territories are under the assimilated and others under the non-assimilated rates. Article 2 provides:

> The natural or manufactured products, originating in and coming from the French customs territory, enumerated in schedule C to this agreement, shall enjoy, on their importation into Canada, the rates of the Canadian intermediate tariff—

There is not much change there from the old convention; we would have to examine the customs tariff to see where any change occurs. Article 3 states:

> The natural or manufactured products, originating in and coming from Canada, enumerated in schedules A and B to this agreement, and the natural or manufactured products originating in and coming from French customs territory, enumerated in schedules C and D to this agreement shall, on their importation into the territory of the other party, enjoy the most favourable rates accorded to any foreign country that may arise from modifications made in the tariff classification—

[Mr. Malcolm.]

That means the best rates both ways, as was provided in article 12 of the original treaty, so again there is no change. Article 4 of the present treaty is very much the same as article 14 of the old treaty except that the verbiage has been changed somewhat, though I doubt very much if it has been clarified. Under article 14 of the old treaty we could not import through United States ports but we could export through United States ports. That is the provision contained in article 4, so again there is no change. I believe article 5 of the present treaty is almost the same as article 2 of the old treaty; certain rights are reserved. Perhaps if I read article 2 of the old treaty it would explain to the house the thought behind this item better than it is explained in the new treaty:

> The grant of the minimum tariff for the products enumerated in schedule A means the treatment of the most favoured nation as respects such products, but does not entitle Canada to claim the benefit of any preferential advantage which France may grant to her protectorates or the benefit of any tariff resulting from economic agreements which France may enter into with border states, or the benefits of any tariff which France may grant for products the importation of which is designed to facilitate settlements with those countries that were at war with France during the years 1914-18.

That is identically the same thought that is contained in this long article 5. The special terms which France may have with border states, such as the Luxembourg agreement, which my hon. friend knows about, still exist and will not be given Canada under this new agreement. In the last part of article 5 there is a new clause, section (e), which has to do with exchange, and which was not necessary at the time the former agreement was drawn. Article 6 is amazing:

> The high contracting parties undertake not to interfere with the course of trade by any prohibitions or restrictions of importation or exportation.

The minister agrees in that undertaking that he will not put an embargo upon French merchandise; but the exceptions are so broad that clause (f) declares:

> All necessary measures to face exceptional or abnormal circumstances and to assure the protection of the economic and financial interests of the country. The duration of these measures shall be limited to the duration of the causes of the circumstances which have brought them into effect.

Who is to be judge? I presume the governor in council, and I submit to the minister that he has drafted a treaty which, so far as the agreement not to put on embargoes

or restrictions or prohibitions is concerned, gives him ample power under the clauses that follow to impose all the restrictions he likes. Article 7 is the same as article XVI of the old treaty.

The natural or manufactured products of the territory of either of the high contracting parties, exported to the territories of the other, shall not be subjected to other or higher duties or charges than those paid on the exportation of similar articles of any other foreign country.

In other words, there shall not be an export tax on goods sold to France any higher than the export tax which is placed on goods sold to any other country. In my opinion, that is more carefully covered in article XVI of the old agreement:

The high contracting parties grant to each other as regards export duties and taxes the most favoured nation treatment. Drawbacks on the exportation of French or Canadian products shall not be higher than the amount of the import, excise, interior consumption or town duties collected upon the said products or the materials entering into their manufacture.

There have been I believe some breaches of the next article, 8, which provides:

The internal taxes which are levied in the territory of one of the high contracting parties for the benefit of any authority on the production, circulation, conditioning, offering for sale, sale or consumption of natural or manufactured products, shall not, under any pretext, affect the goods of the other party after importation to a higher degree or in more onerous conditions than similar national products.

That is pretty well covered by article XVIII of the old agreement. Under the old agreement, which is the same in spirit, we did break that clause by some of our sales tax regulations; we applied the sales tax and then made exemptions in respect of domestic goods. I am under the impression that when you apply the sales tax and make an exemption of domestic goods you contravene the spirit of that convention. Article 9 deals with the country of origin and is practically the same as article XIX of the old convention. Article 10 is practically the same as the other article XX, and article 11 is interesting; but it is the same as article XXI of the old agreement. In this instance, however, I think the minister has probably gone further than the former government went in signing the treaty in which the old article XXI appeared. That old article XXI provided:

France and Canada grant to each other reciprocally the treatment of nationals as respects the protection of trade marks, patents, commercial names, industrial designs and patterns, names of origin of products and the prevention of unfair competition.

Article 11 of the new agreement makes this provision:

Each of the high contracting parties agrees to protect within its territorial limits the natural or manufactured products of the other party against all forms of dishonest competition, particularly with regard to the use, for commercial purposes, of false indications, relative to the place of origin, nature, kind or substantial qualities of goods.

Each of the high contracting parties agrees to insure within its territorial limits, respect for the appellations of origin of wine. . . .

I submit to the minister that he has gone quite a distance in that clause.

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. gentleman does not recall that the previous government of which he was a member signed at the Hague, on November 6, 1925, an international convention for the protection of international property rights and that that government ratified and adopted that convention on May 1, 1928, six years after that trade convention was signed. This introduced restrictions which are more severe than any that appeared in the former agreement.

Mr. MALCOLM: Does my hon. friend happen to have a copy of the Hague convention?

Mr. CAHAN: It has been distributed to members of the house; it is in the distribution office. I have my own copy here which I will let the hon. gentleman have.

Mr. MALCOLM: Does the minister know the article that has reference to this particular matter?

Mr. CAHAN: The first article gives a definition, and if the hon. gentleman will turn the pages he will see some articles marked in lead pencil.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes. It states that trade names shall be protected in all countries of the union, and so on. We are not discussing that.

Mr. CAHAN: We are discussing trade names.

Mr. MALCOLM: We are discussing more than trade names, I submit. It is a question of territorial names.

Mr. CAHAN: I suggest that the hon. member leave that discussion until we reach the particular clause.

Mr. MALCOLM: I was going to observe in passing that the minister has gone further in article 11 than Canada has ever gone before in restricting the use of such a word as, for example, champagne. Champagne originates in the Champagne district and therefore the

word champagne is a trademark in the opinion of French wine-makers, and we could not then make Canadian champagne. In the same way, Portugal tried to reserve the right to the use of the word port in all descriptions of certain wine. I presume that Cognac Jarnac and other brandy producing areas would claim the right to a monopoly of such names, so that we could call a Canadian brandy Cognac. However, I will discuss this in more detail at a later stage.

Article 12 is the same as the old articles XXII and V as to general agreement. Article 13 deals with the question of delays and is a very good clause if it can be practised. But it has not been shown of late that the practice of facilitating import has been resorted to. Article 14 is more or less like the old article VI. Article 17 has to do with the terms of the treaty. As I said, at the moment I do not see any difference and I also do not see that the tacit consent means any more than its continuance if no notice is given. The schedules have certain omissions as compared with the old list and also have certain additions. The minimum tariff granted under schedule A is the same as was granted under the old treaty. I notice the minister has secured the minimum rate for canned fish which is slightly better than the rate granted under the old treaty. The minister will however probably recall that at the time the old treaty was negotiated the Canadian packers were not willing to submit and could not agree to any standard inspection. There had been some difficulty with their product and France was not prepared to grant the minimum rate. It is very hard to follow schedule B and I believe these items will have to be dealt with when we are in committee.

I do not intend to delay the house any longer, further than to say that it is unfortunate that a long term and definite treaty could not have been made with France. I realize the difficulties raised by the economic conference and probably the minister has done well to make stop-gap treaty. I believe he has tried consistently to arrive at some satisfactory conclusion in the face of enormous difficulties against the export of Canadian wheat to France. France has a great desire to be self-sufficient in the production of wheat but in times of peace she would like to have considerable Canadian hard wheat with which to step up the quality of her bread. France can and does export a considerable quantity of soft wheat for which the exporter receives a rebate which helps to pay the duty on hard wheat imported. Canadian wheat could not have entered France over the tariffs which existed and be sold at the price at which it was sold and I believe there have been some evasions of the regulations to have permitted France to import the large quantity of wheat which she imported last year.

I want to compliment the minister upon the clarity of his explanation and when we get to the items I hope he will be able to show that the difference between the rates granted under this treaty and those granted under the old will not be destructive to trade. I do not believe any advantages the minister may claim for this convention can be clearly understood until we actually know the amount of duty which will have to be paid and the regulations which will surround importations. We always find France a difficult country with which to establish an equitable trade balance. There are some commodities we can sell them and if the minister thinks that by the terms arranged some additional export business can be built up, I am very glad to know it. I trust that this agreement will reestablish the trade which existed with France before the old agreement was cancelled.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Trade agreement approved.

Mr. NEILL: Is it the intention of the minister to take up the schedules in detail or does this section cover them? There are a lot of details in the schedules which we would like to discuss, and I think they should be considered article by article.

Mr. CAHAN: So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to discuss them now. Perhaps we had better let the section stand until we go through the schedules.

Mr. NEILL: I think the schedules should be discussed article by article.

Mr. CAHAN: We could pass this section and reserve the right to discuss the articles.

Section agreed to.

Sections 3, 4 and 5 agreed to.

On the schedule—Article 1.

Mr. NEILL: This article covers schedule A. I notice there is no provision made for the inclusion of pilchards, canned pilchards, pilchard oil and pilchard meal. I had hoped that the language used would be "fish or fish products." As this is supposed to be only a temporary measure, I suggest to the minister

that he consider the advisability of providing for pilchards, canned pilchards, pilchard oil and pilchard meal in any succeeding negotiations.

Mr. MALCOLM: We are on article 1 and the hon. member is discussing an item in schedule A.

Mr. NEILL: The schedule comes under this article and I assume that we are following the practice adopted in discussing the Imperial conference treaties. That is why I am discussing schedule A which is referred to in article 1. Item 47 reads:

Fish of the salmonoid family, preserved "au naturel," marinated or otherwise prepared.

I hope there is no doubt that that item includes what is known as canned salmon. The term "au naturel" suggests the thing in its natural state.

Mr. CAHAN: The wording of schedule A is simply a translation of the schedule to the French customs tariff. This item covers the whole salmon family.

Mr. NEILL: I want to have an assurance that it covers canned salmon as we know it.

Mr. CAHAN: It does, yes.

Mr. NEILL: There is another point which I would like to have explained. I may be stupid, but those in the industry may find this point difficult of definition. There is a note to this item reading as follows:

N.B.—As long as the bill to modify the customs tariff of the above products has not been put into force, these products shall be submitted to a rate equal to the general tariff with a reduction of 72 per cent.

That seems to be a contradictory provision.

Mr. CAHAN: That is quite clear, if I may so state. The French government have a bill which was being passed when this trade agreement was being negotiated, changing the duty on salmon. It will apply to all imports of salmon and therefore they made it clear to us that until that bill passes—and I do not know whether it has yet become a decree—these products coming from Canada and other countries will be subject to the general tariff with a reduction of 72 per cent. As soon as the new minimum tariff with respect to these items comes into force in France, we shall have that minimum tariff.

Mr. NEILL: Yes. Then it seems to me this is contradicted by the note at the foot of page 14:

Notes annexed to schedule A.

It says:

From the putting into force of the commercial agreement, canned salmonoids . . . will be admitted . . .

At a reduction—

Representing a duty of 84 francs per 100 kilogs. gross.

But it says that after the agreement is put into effect the rates shall be the general tariff less 72 per cent. That does not agree with what the minister has just said and which is borne out by the footnote of item 47 on page 10, that we have to go back to the minimum tariff as soon as the bill passes. The note on page 14 implies that we shall not go back to the minimum tariff.

Mr. CAHAN: We shall not go back to the same specific minimum tariff, but we shall go back to the minimum tariff which the French have changed in the meantime and of which they have given notice in this agreement.

Mr. NEILL: The footnote reads that from the putting into force of the commercial agreement the rate will be so much. It does not say that it will terminate when the customs bill is passed. There may be some explanation, but I must say that it is rather complicated. I notice that the proposal, which is contained in the second paragraph of the footnote, is to put through a customs bill increasing the minimum tariff by 84 francs per 100 kilos, so that the tariff will be very substantially increased, and as far as I can figure it out with the foreign coinage and weights, it will come to something like $1.50 a case which, on a salmon selling at about $4.50 a case, is perhaps not a prohibitive, but rather a heavy duty.

While I am on my feet, I would also point out, although it really should come in on a later clause, that French sardines coming into Canada have been given a very favourable rate. That appears on page 19, item 120, sardines. The rate is the intermediate tariff less a discount of 20 per cent. This will interfere, will it not, with our sardine trade on both the Atlantic and the Pacific? I understand there is on the Atlantic coast quite a large sardine trade and it declares itself to be in a very distressed condition. This will also interfere with our production on the west coast of tinned pilchards, which are really a species of sardines or are classified as such. Will the minister explain why he has given this increased import preference to an article of home production?

Mr. CAHAN: I can simply reply that you cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs; we cannot expect to receive favourable admis-

sion of our products into France unless we give certain modifications with respect to the admission of their products to this country.

The item mentioned by the hon. member refers to a special fish, the sardine, which, under the French law, is a specific fish; it is not a sprat. In this case it is cooked in oil and preserved in oil, and accompanied by a certificate. This is a high class product of France in regard to which they wish to obtain special entry into Canada, and in consideration of the rates which they granted to us, we have granted them one in this case. This was a bargaining of rates; it was nothing else. I may have failed to drive a good bargain, but I had to drive a bargain with regard to every item of the French tariff and every item of ours. Day after day for six or seven hours a day we bargained and I have obtained the best bargain I could.

Mr. NEILL: I have no doubt the minister is quite correct in that. This is only a little rough on whoever happens to own the eggs that are used to make the omelette. The minister say that this refers to a special kind of sardine as defined in the French law. But this word is defined in our tariff:

Sardines, cooked in oil and preserved in oil.

That is exactly the way it is done in Canada. The certificate does not make any difference. They are cooked in oil in sealed tin containers. This is certainly going to be pretty hard on the sardine trade in both the east and the west.

Mr. HEAPS: The clause refers to certain minimum tariffs which the French are conceding to Canadian goods entering France. I should like, as a matter of information, if the minister could give to the committee some idea of the height or otherwise of the French tariff, because the bill does not give us any information in that particular respect. Can the minister inform the committee as to the height of the French tariff on the main commodities which Canada exports to France?

Mr. CAHAN: There is in France a minimum tariff and a maximum tariff. The maximum is two, three and in some cases four times as high as the minimum. The maximum tariff is evidently intended to be practically prohibitive. The minimum tariff is designed to give in any event a reasonable protection to French industry. As between the two, where we could not obtain the minimum tariff, we did the best we could to obtain a reduction, by certain percentages named, in the maximum tariff of France. In order to explain the matter, you have to take every relative item of the French tariff and ascertain what is the maximum and what is the minimum.

[Mr. Cahan.]

Mr. HEAPS: That does not quite answer the question I asked.

Mr. CAHAN: Perhaps I did not understand what the hon. gentleman was asking.

Mr. HEAPS: Is it possible to give in specific amounts what the tariff is on our main exports to France? Is it 10, 20, 40 or 50 per cent? Can the minister give that, so that we may have a more intelligent understanding of what the treaty really means?

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. gentleman wishes to know what is the average duty that will be paid on Canadian exports to France under this arrangement?

Mr. HEAPS: That is the idea.

Mr. CAHAN: That is the average?

Mr. HEAPS: The average, of course, would not give us a proper understanding. I should prefer that he give us the actual amounts imposed by France on the main exports of Canadian goods to France.

Mr. CAHAN: If the hon. gentleman wishes, we shall take item by item; we shall take the next, wheat, and go through the list. Would the hon. gentleman indicate any particular item and give me the number of it?

Mr. NEILL: Item 47.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): It is not exactly in order now to refer to different items of the schedule. When we are discussing the schedules, it would be.

Mr. EULER: It was understood it would be.

Mr. NEILL: We are not going to go through the detailed schedules; we are dealing with the articles of the main schedule and it was understood the articles of the main schedule would have to cover schedules A, B and C.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): If it is the pleasure of the committee, we might consider schedule A.

Mr. NEILL: I am discussing article 1 which deals with schedule A, and that certainly is in order. If we proceeded in that way business would be expedited.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: As I understand it in discussing article 1 we may refer to any item in schedule A.

Mr. NEILL: The minister was going to give us the maximum tariff rates on tariff item No. 47.

Mr. CAHAN: That is the item dealing with fish, preserved. The rate of duty on December 13 last was 42·50 francs per 100 kilogrammes and was levied on the gross weight.

Mr. NEILL: 42·50 what?

Mr. CAHAN: Duty, specific.

Mr. YOUNG: On the gross weight.

Mr. CAHAN: The special provisions are these, that on February 1, 1932, the French minimum duty on canned salmon was increased and ranged from 42·50 to 75 francs per 100 kilogrammes. So that at the present time that duty is 75 francs per 100 kilogrammes on certain kinds of preserved fish. They have also given us notice with regard to a possible further increase.

Mr. NEILL: There is something wrong, there, Mr. Chairman. The minister states that the duty was raised to 75 francs per 100 kilogrammes. If he would turn to page 14 of the bill he will find we are going to get a rate, meantime, of the general tariff "reduced by 72 per cent, the rate thus obtained representing a duty of 84 francs per 100 kilogrammes gross." If we take 72 per cent of the total, and we have left 84 francs, the original rate must have been much higher than 75 francs.

Mr. CAHAN: I said it was increased in 1932, and further increased while I was in France.

Mr. NEILL: From 75 francs you are now taking 72 per cent and are producing 84 francs.

Mr. CAHAN: No, that is the new duty proposed.

Mr. NEILL: Oh, this is hopeless.

Mr. HEAPS: I should like some further information with regard to item No. 68 dealing with wheat, spelt, meslin, grains and flours. This item deals with the export of wheat from Canada to France.

Mr. CAHAN: I thought I had dealt with that item when I introduced the bill. As the hon. member has said, item 68 deals with wheat, spelt and meslin. The general tariff rate is 160 francs per 100 kilogrammes, equal to $2.84 per 100 pounds. The minimum duty is 80 francs per 100 kilogrammes or $1.42 per 100 pounds, prior to the time I was conducting the negotiations there were various increases in the minimum tariff of France on wheat. At the time I was there the selling price of wheat in France was from $1.25 to $1.30 per bushel, and the duty at that time under the minimum tariff was 85 cents a bushel. The duty under the maximum tariff was $1.70 per bushel. At the present time every bushel of wheat going into France is subject to a maximum tariff rate equivalent to $1.70. When this treaty comes into force it will be reduced one-half, but we will still pay the tariff rate of 85 cents.

The former Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm) referred to the fact—and it is undoubtedly a fact—that in certain cases the French importer receives a rebate on the re-exportation to other countries of a certain part of his French wheat, and that in certain cases when such licences for export are allowed, with the corresponding rebate, it enables them in special circumstances, for the production of certain high-grade brands of flour, to import Canadian wheat at a duty less than $1.70 as at present, or less than 85 cents a bushel, as it will be when this agreement is confirmed by statute of this parliament.

Mr. HEAPS: I presume the figures the minister has given in dollars and cents refer to the present rate on Canadian currency.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, I am not considering the fluctuation. The rate on the franc was about four cents when the computation was made.

Mr. HEAPS: Can the minister give the committee information as to the amount of Canadian wheat exported in the last two or three years from this country to France?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, I can.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. HEAPS: I have asked for some information.

Mr. CAHAN: I have a complete statement of it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Probably the minister will give it after recess.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Chairman, when the committee adjourned an hon. gentleman opposite

was asking me as to the details of Canada's exports of wheat to France.

Year ended March 31st	Exports (bushels)	Value
1928..	2,438,709	$ 3,271,220
1929..	5,170,285	6,720,062
1930..	6,346,525	7,980,918
1931..	8,556,407	7,443,681
1932..	20,071,074	12,753,116
1933..	.....	8,901,097

I have not the number of bushels for 1933.

It will be seen that there is a very considerable variation in the quantities of wheat sold to France. It is due to the fact that when there is a good crop in France wheat is not imported under the heavy import duties levied against foreign wheat, but when there is a partial failure of the wheat crop in France there is a large quantity imported notwithstanding the high duties.

In order that hon. gentlemen may see what a large proportion of our exports to France consist of wheat I have had prepared during recess the following schedule:

Year ended March 31st	Imports from France	Exports to France	Excess of imports	Excess of exports
1927..	$27,992,322	$15,220,232	$12,772,090	
1928..	26,473,732	9,946,145	16,527,587	
1929..	26,215,696	16,131,188	10,084,508	
1930..	25,158,207	16,507,011	8,651,196	
1931..	19,004,102	13,285,758	5,718,344	
1932..	13,570,000	17,954,321		$4,384,321
1933..	7,712,558	12,730,226		5,017,668

Of our exports to France over 90 per cent are what may be called agricultural products in the state in which they are produced, and raw minerals and metals. We have a certain export of agricultural implements and other manufactured products, but these are comparatively small in quantity and value; whereas our imports from France are about 95 per cent—over 90 per cent at any rate,—wines, brandies, liqueurs and manufactured goods largely for luxury consumption. The textiles which we import from France are largely textiles of very high value, not sold in large quantities in this country, and owing to the financial depression of the last two or three years the consumption of that class of goods has been reduced, while undoubtedly, owing to the rescission of the treaty, from June last the imports have been restricted by reason of the fact that instead of our intermediate tariff with a reduction of 10 per cent applying to many of these goods our general tariff has since been applied.

Mr. HEAPS: I am very much obliged to the minister for the very interesting and detailed statement he has just submitted. There is one other question on which I would like a little further information, that is the question relating to the minimum tariff. I did not quite catch what the minister said this morning on this question. Do I understand that the present minimum tariff which Canada receives from France is fixed, or is it liable to be changed at any time by the French government?

Mr. CAHAN: The minimum tariff is different on each item. The minimum tariff is liable to change at the option of the French government at any time, there is no restriction. I show the hon. gentleman my brief on the French minimum tariff concerning Canadian imports. Under each item of that tariff I had prepared a brief for the purpose of negotiations, but it is so large and varied that I am afraid this discussion would be greatly prolonged if we had to go into the details. If this treaty passes this parliament and comes into force I have no doubt the Minister of National Revenue in his department and also particularly the Minister of Trade and Commerce will circulate throughout the country a detailed statement of the duties which are imposed under each item of the French minimum tariff which is of interest to Canada, and also a detailed statement of the French maximum tariff from which certain percentages are reduced according to these schedules.

Mr. EULER: The minister stated this morning that the French maximum tariff was apparently designed to prevent entirely the importation of certain commodities into that country, and that under the minimum tariff fair protection in their market was still provided. He has stated now that there is nothing to prevent the French government from changing that minimum tariff. I take it then that if they desire to exclude from France any of the commodities which are now given the benefit of the minimum tariff they could immediately, without any notice to this country, change the minimum tariff so that it would have the same effect as their maximum tariff and exclude the goods. I suppose that is the fact?

Mr. CAHAN: That is true. They sometimes give a short notice, but they are at liberty to change it without notice, and on the other hand we are at liberty to change our tariff in like manner.

Mr. EULER: They could at any moment entirely abolish any advantage we have under this treaty, but we also have the privilege, without giving them any notice, of making similar changes in the benefits we are giving to them under the treaty?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DONNELLY: I understood the minister to say that Canadian wheat under this tariff will enjoy in the French market the minimum tariff of any country in the world. Is that correct?

Mr. CAHAN: That is correct, with the exception of the reservation made with regard to the three Danubian states.

Mr. DONNELLY: Then I should like to ask if there is any difference between this and the former agreement. Did not Canada enjoy the minimum tariff under the former agreement with France, with regard to wheat?

Mr. CAHAN: Exactly so.

Mr. DONNELLY: There was a great deal of criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to that agreement; they said we only enjoyed the minimum tariff and that France was at liberty to raise or lower that tariff at any time. Are there any restrictions in this treaty to prevent France raising or lowering her tariff against our wheat?

Mr. CAHAN: Not the slightest, so far as I know.

Mr. DONNELLY: So really there is no difference between this agreement and the previous agreement with regard to the importation of Canadian wheat into France?

Mr. CAHAN: Except that under the former tariff they were at complete liberty to increase the rate, and they did so four times during the life of the treaty. Under the present treaty they are at liberty to raise the tariff still higher, but if they raise it too high it is for us either to reduce the corresponding advantages they receive or to give notice of the rescission of the treaty. Each side is perfectly free with regard to raising or decreasing the tariff rate.

Mr. DONNELLY: Then I understand that we are in the same position as previously.

Mr. CAHAN: Except that in the old treaty there were many items which were fixed so far as Canada was concerned, and this parliament could not increase those duties except in violation of the agreement.

Mr. DONNELLY: The only difference I see is that under this agreement we do not enjoy the lowest tariff rates; there are Danubian states which enjoy that lower rate. Under the old agreement negotiated by the Liberal party, which was criticized so severely by hon. gentlemen opposite, the Danubian states did not have a lower tariff. Now we see other countries with a lower rate of duty on their wheat entering France than is given us, and that condition did not exist previously.

Mr. EULER: I should like to ask just one other question. We have not had time to examine the provisions of the treaty at all, of course, so I should like to ask the minister whether, as a result of the concessions we give to France, those concessions are given automatically to any other countries.

Mr. CAHAN: I believe they will be given automatically to twenty-three other countries which enjoy most favoured nation treatment in Canada, by reason of the outstanding agreements with those countries.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Will the minister be good enough to tell us the difference between the old treaty and the present treaty with regard to maple sugar? Under the old treaty we had only the word "sugar," while in this treaty maple sugar and maple syrup are dealt with specifically. Would the minister tell the committee the tariff rate on maple sugar and maple syrup, which come under items 91 and 93, and would the minister inform the committee what were the old rates?

Mr. CAHAN: Under the old treaty the rate was the minimum tariff, which was 170 francs per 100 kilos. At the rate of exchange existing at the time this agreement was negotiated—I have not figured it at the rate to-day—that would mean a duty of $3.02 per hundred pounds on sugar.

Mr. BOUCHARD: On any kind of sugar, or just on maple sugar?

Mr. CAHAN: Maple sugar goes in exactly as other sugar goes, except that now there is no specific reduction with regard to maple sugar. In the fiscal year 1931 Canada exported to France only 192 pounds of maple sugar valued at $61. During the fiscal year 1927 Canada exported to France 262,682 hundredweight of sugars of all kinds, valued at

$1,156,115. On inquiry in France I found that maple sugar and maple syrup were hardly known except by friends of those living in Quebec who occasionally, at Christmas and other times, send them samples of maple sugar and maple syrup, and a small quantity of maple syrup was introduced for the purpose of giving a certain taste to tobacco used in the manufacture of cigarettes. Under this agreement maple sugar and maple syrup remain under the minimum tariff.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Will the same rates apply under this new tariff? The minister said the old rate was about 3 cents a pound. Will that be the rate under this new tariff, which specifically mentions maple sugar?

Mr. CAHAN: It will be exactly the same. Under the maximum tariff it would pay twice the duty, and instead of that tariff of $6.04 per hundred pounds the sole concession I could obtain was to have it placed under the minimum tariff, at one-half that rate.

Mr. HEAPS: I am not going to direct any questions to the minister but I should like to make one or two general observations with regard to the treaty. In common with other members of the house I realize that the bargain made by the minister is perhaps as good as could be made by any other hon. member under the circumstances. In spite of the remarks of the minister, however, and the valuable services he has given in this connection, I do not see very much difference between the treaty now before the house and the previous treaty with France, which was abrogated not long ago. As a matter of fact it appears to me that the introduction of this treaty at the present time is in itself a vindication of the former treaty, which was denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite mainly, I believe, because of the minimum tariff imposed by France on commodities we exported to that country. Now we find the government coming to parliament with exactly the same provision, and at any time the government of France can increase their tariffs against goods exported by Canada.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I think this treaty indicates that the idea of blasting our way into the markets of the world has proven an absolute failure. The indications are, as this treaty clearly proves, that we have to negotiate and sometimes we cannot negotiate with other people just as we please. Thirdly, in my opinion, the old idea of treaty making is now more or less obsolete. We have before us at the present moment a trade treaty containing many scores of tariff items, and it is not really a treaty in that sense of the word because a treaty that can be abrogated at a moment's notice ceases to be such. What the minister said this morning when he introduced the measure is absolutely true, and I subscribe to it, namely, that France was trying to make herself commercially independent of all other nations. That is perfectly obvious to anyone who has attempted to understand the course of France's actions in the past few years. But what France has been doing is precisely what every other nation has been doing or attempting to do in the same period.

An hon. MEMBER: Not for the same reason.

Mr. HEAPS: No; it may not be for exactly the same reasons, but the causes are similar. Within the last few years, with the advent of modern machinery, it has become much more easy for all nations to be self contained—much more easy than it has ever been in the past. We can now manufacture our own goods more easily than we did years ago; we can produce crops from our farms much more easily with modern machinery than at any time in the past. The practice of all nations to-day is therefore to export as much as they can. The nations of the world are becoming exporters, so that treaty making in the old sense is now more or less out of date and almost impossible. The things that France needed some years ago she may not need to-day and the things we need to-day we may not need to-morrow; and what applies to France and Canada applies to every other part of the world. At the same time I am in favour of endeavouring, by every means in our power, to foster closer trade relations between Canada and other countries, but I do not believe that we can bring about such relations by having tariff barriers such as now exist in France. Take wheat, for instance; that country has a tariff against that commodity equivalent to 85 cents a bushel, which works out approximately, on the basis of present value, at about 120 per cent. If wheat goes down the percentage will be greater, though of course if it goes up the percentage will be less. There is no telling however when France may increase her tariff on wheat and thus close what might be a potential market to Canada.

Further, I believe that while we are attempting to foster trade between Canada and France or any other part of the world there is no reason why we should not also foster trade between one province in this dominion and the others. Why should we attempt to export wheat to France when we

have, or at any rate until recently had, 1,600,000 people drawing relief in Canada? It might be well for us to have Quebec supply our western provinces with the things she produces and have the western provinces supply the east with the products of the west. Naturally we should then be on a more or less self contained basis, and when we had exports in the form of surplus commodities then I would favour the interchange of commodities between nations, because the more of our surplus commodities we sell abroad and the more foreign commodities we bring in in exchange for ours the better it should be for the people of Canada.

In conclusion let me emphasize the fact that the idea of treaty making is of very little benefit in the long run to the people of Canada as it has been carried on in the last few years. We had an example last summer in connection with the imperial trade conferences, and we have before us to-day, though on a smaller scale, a replica of the agreements which we were called upon to consider last fall. Those agreements between Canada and other parts of the empire have not fulfilled expectations, and I do not believe that the agreement now before us will in any way foster trade between this country and France. On the contrary it might ultimately create a feeling which would not be in the best interests of either country.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Item 128 in schedule A deals with woods, in rough logs not squared, with or without bark, of any length, and the minimum tariff is applied to that item. I cannot find anything with regard to planed, squared or manufactured lumber.

Mr. CAHAN: What item is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Items 128, 128bis, 129 and 130.

Mr. CAHAN: The minimum tariff is granted on wood in rough logs, not squared, with or without bark, and of a certain circumference, or squared or sawn common wood, and also on paving blocks, but it is confined to that. Those products are the only ones with respect to which they were prepared to give us the minimum tariff. These items were discussed one by one, sometimes for days, but that was the entire concession obtained.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Then we are not at liberty to ship manufactured lumber to France?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, under the general tariff.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): We used to ship railway sleepers and bridge timber, partly manufactured.

Mr. CAHAN: If the hon. gentleman means sawn common lumber, that goes under the minimum tariff.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Sawn lumber, but not manufactured into flooring and other articles. This is the same as we used to ship to Japan. We can ship to Japan squared timber for further manufacture in that country, as well as to the United States, but on planed or manufactured lumber there is a duty.

Mr. CAHAN: If it is sawn lumber, I understand it goes under the minimum tariff; if planed or otherwise dressed or manufactured, it would come under their maximum tariff.

Mr. MALCOLM: The expression used in some of the other customs tariff items is, not further manufactured.

Mr. CAHAN: I have taken the items of the French tariff, and in that tariff, under 128, the literal translation would be common woods in the rough—that means not planed or otherwise manufactured—and logs not squared, with a certain circumference. Of that we exported from Canada to France in 1932, 401 metric tons, while the exports, in metric tons, to other countries were: Austria, 38,000; Belgium, 12,000; Finland, 57,000; Germany, 37,000; Latvia, 13,000; Poland, 22,000; Roumania, 11,000; Sweden, 46,000. So on exactly the same basis Canada was not able to obtain in that market a very large sale for either logs or sawn lumber.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Do they come in under lumber products and take the minimum rates?

Mr. CAHAN: They come in exactly the same as ours, under the minimum tariff.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Will they be on the same basis as Canada?

Mr. CAHAN: On the same basis.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): Does that apply to manufactured or unmanufactured lumber.

Mr. CAHAN: That manufactured is under their general maximum tariff.

Mr. MALCOLM: What is meant by the words "common woods"? Does that differentiate between soft and hard woods?

Mr. CAHAN: It excludes such special woods as mahogany and others which enter into the manufacture of high class furniture.

Mr. MALCOLM: Are birch and maple excluded?

Mr. CAHAN: No; I understand that birch, maple and spruce would come in as common woods.

Mr. MUNN: Are we obtaining any special preference under this treaty with regard to wood products?

Mr. CAHAN: No.

Mr. MUNN: There is no change? There is no advantage?

Mr. CAHAN: If the hon. gentleman refers to the old treaty which expired in June, we are getting exactly the same terms as before. If he refers to the maximum tariff which has been in effect since last June, we are getting a reduction, I think of one half or even more.

Mr. DONNELLY: I should like to ask the minister a question with reference to the regulations which might affect our exports of wheat to France. For some years past certain countries in Europe have enacted regulations whereby anybody exporting wheat would receive a token or certificate which would permit them to import the same quantity of wheat free of duty. Can the minister state whether France has such a regulation in effect at the present time?

Mr. CAHAN: The manufacturer of flour in France who exports flour made out of French wheat can obtain a special licence to import a corresponding quantity of foreign wheat. This is only done by the granting of special licences and it was under such special licences that a very considerable part of our exports of hard wheat in recent years have been imported into France.

Mr. DONNELLY: That was free of duty?

Mr. CAHAN: Upon the export of flour made from French wheat they can obtain, under certain restrictions, the right to import foreign wheat for mixing purposes. This is imported at a lower rate of duty than the minimum.

Mr. MUNN: Much lower?

Mr. CAHAN: My impression is that it is free of duty or a very low rate.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think it is ten cents.

Mr. VALLANCE: Does this treaty limit us to a quota? Just before one o'clock the minister was giving the details of the importations of wheat into France. I was not in the chamber at the time but these figures have been given to me. The minister also recited the rates of tariff which had applied to Canadian wheat and I think he went as far back as when the rate was only fifteen cents per bushel. From that rate it had mounted up until last June the rate was $1.75.

Mr. CAHAN: The maximum tariff rate.

Mr. VALLANCE: Because the treaty was nullified in June, Canadian wheat was subject to a tariff of $1.75 per bushel. As far as Canada was concerned, there was no minimum tariff because we had no treaty. I shall repeat the figures given by the minister and he can correct me if I am wrong. In 1929 we exported 5,000,000 bushels of wheat to France for which we received $6,000,000. In 1930 we exported 6,000,000 bushels for which we received $7,000,000. In 1931 we exported 8,000,000 bushels for which we received $7,000,000. In 1932 we exported 20,000,000 for which we received $12,000,000. In 1933 we shipped 15,000,000 bushels.

Mr. CAHAN: I have not the quantity for 1933 but the price received was $8,901,000.

Mr. VALLANCE: The minister does not have the volume which made up that $8,000,000?

Mr. CAHAN: No.

Mr. VALLANCE: The minister told the hon. member for Willow Bunch that under certain conditions when millers in France exported flour made from French wheat they were allowed to import foreign wheat. I do not know whether the minister can tell us but it would be very interesting to know just what percentage of the exports of 1932 and 1933 went in under the minimum tariff and what percentage went in under this other arrangement.

Mr. CAHAN: I have no statistics and I do not think they were available during the discussions.

Mr. VALLANCE: The minister will notice that our exports have been increasing from year to year. I am interested to find out just why that increase has taken place.

Mr. CAHAN: There is some difference between the French and Canadian statistics. It was stated during the discussions that the Canadian statistics contained only the quantity of wheat exported direct to France. It was stated that vessels have left Canadian ports with wheat consigned to Liverpool or Southampton and have been diverted to France while on the way. Such wheat would appear in the French but not in the Canadian statistics. Leaving that aside, I might state to the committee that the very best opinion I could form after discussing this matter for five

or six hours a day for many days is that the French have not the slightest intention of allowing wheat to come in from Canada or anywhere else which will interfere with the French domestic production. I think it will be found that in the years when the Canadian exports decreased, the production of French domestic wheat has been increased, and then, when there has been an increase in the Canadian exports, it will be found to be due to a partial failure in the French wheat crop of that year. I can offer no hope to the committee that France is likely to change this policy.

Mr. VALLANCE: In spite of the fact that under this treaty we are able to export wheat to France at eighty cents per bushel, the Canadian growers will have no larger market than they had before.

Mr. CAHAN: They will have just the market that is permitted by the French production. When I was there, only three per cent of foreign wheat was allowed to enter into manufacture of flour. Since I left France, I have seen a later decree that only one per cent of foreign wheat could enter into the manufacture of flour. Therefore our wheat market in France is unstable owing to the policy of that country to restrict by prohibitive measures, for an import of one per cent or three per cent is a restrictive measure, the importation and the use in France of foreign, including Canadian wheat.

Mr. DONNELLY: I want to thank the minister for his honest and frank statement concerning the exportation of our wheat to France. I trust this trade agreement which we now have before us has not been the cause of the French government lowering our quota from three to one per cent, as he has just stated to be the case.

Mr. CAHAN: Our quota has not been changed from three to one per cent. I said that while I was in France, the total foreign importation was limited to three per cent. I understand by a decree which I have seen since, the total foreign importation has been limited to one per cent. That percentage may be increased to 5, 10 or 11 per cent if there is a fair prospect that the French crop for the ensuing year is not coming up to the normal standard.

Mr. VALLANCE: The minister this morning, if I understood him aright, said that there are some European countries which have treaty arrangements with France whereby they are allowed 30 per cent less than the minimum—

Mr. CAHAN: They get a rebate on the minimum rate. France, under the Stresa agreement, if I remember correctly, was to advance certain funds to assist in the rehabilitation of those three Danubian states. France grants to them first the right to export to her 30 per cent of her annual imports of wheat, each state of the three to have the advantage of 10 per cent of France's annual imports, and there is on that importation of wheat a rebate in duty which is paid back to those three countries for the purpose of assisting certain public works there.

Mr. DONNELLY: What percentage of the duty paid is returned?

Mr. CAHAN: I had the figures before me this morning, but my memory is 30 per cent.

Mr. DONNELLY: At the present time that would be about twenty-four cents a bushel.

Mr. CAHAN: A little more than that.

Mr. YOUNG: Is it the practice of the French government to lower the duty on wheat in years when their own crop is not sufficient for their needs?

Mr. CAHAN: In recent years there has been no lowering of the duty; each change has been an increase of duty. The French farmer is a very potent factor in French politics. When I was in Paris I saw a demonstration against the government of the day when, by the numbers I saw in the streets there must have been some thousands who had come in to the city to make certain protests against certain proposals of the French government.

Mr. YOUNG: Did they get a hearing?

Mr. CAHAN: I saw streets of Paris lined with police and soldiers for the purpose of maintaining order in that city.

The hon. member for Willow Bunch says that I am frank. I am very frank; I am not holding out to the wheat growers of Canada the hope of getting any very substantial market in France except in those years when the French production is not up to the demands of their domestic consumption.

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not agree with the minister in the last statement he has made. I think he agrees with me that in some years when the French production of wheat has been high, we have had a fairly good export to that country. I also believe the regulations made from time to time as to rebating to the millers of flour an amount equal to the duty paid if the wheat were of foreign

origin really constitute the factor which enables us to ship wheat to France. If France does a very substantial export business of flour milled from domestic wheat, under some internal arrangements, most of our wheat enters. I cannot understand how Canadian wheat could have entered under the general duty and sold in France at the price at which it was sold there during the past year. The minister knows wheat in France to-day is not as high as wheat in Canada plus the rate of duty which has been charged during the past year.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. MALCOLM: If the prices are higher. I would like to know them.

Mr. CAHAN: I figured it up at the rate of exchange of the day—when domestic wheat was selling at $1.30 per bushel, the price having been reduced in a short time, as alleged by those arguing the case, from $1.75 per bushel, and there was a vigorous protest throughout the country against this reduction in price.

Mr. MALCOLM: What was the rate of duty that day?

Mr. CAHAN: About eighty-five cents a bushel minimum and I am told—and this is information that may not be accurate; it is not official—that they were able to buy Canadian wheat and land it at that time, at a French port at about forty to forty-five cents a bushel.

Mr. YOUNG: Was eighty-five cents the general rate at that time?

Mr. CAHAN: It was the minimum tariff rate.

Mr. YOUNG: Were we getting the minimum tariff rate at that time?

Mr. CAHAN: No; we had not since the previous June.

Mr. YOUNG: What rate of duty was Canadian wheat paying at that time?

Mr. CAHAN: It was $1.75.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is the point.

Mr. DONNELLY: It would be impossible to land Canadian wheat in France during the past year at forty-one cents a bushel.

Mr. CAHAN: It was said to be between forty cents and fifty cents.

Mr. MALCOLM: I may not have expressed myself well. At the very time of which the minister speaks, when Canadian wheat was paying a duty of $1.75, when sold in France. Even if the cost of the wheat was only fifty cents a bushel, with the duty it would cost $2.25 delivered in France.

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. gentleman means that a rebate was being given at that time?

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes.

Mr. CAHAN: A rebate was being given which brought the duty down to the present minimum tariff.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is the point I am making; the effect of the rebate permitted the sale of our wheat. Therefore I contend that if whatever wheat we have sold was by virtue of the rebate, the minister is not quite correct in saying that in future our sales of wheat to France will be governed entirely by the scarcity of production within her territory. I believe our sales to France will continue to be governed, as in the past, by the effect of the rebate on flour exported.

Mr. MORAND: Will flour exported displace our wheat in other markets?

Mr. MALCOLM: Flour exported makes an opportunity for us to ship in wheat.

Mr. MORAND: That is to France, but flour exported to other countries takes the place of our flour or wheat.

Mr. MALCOLM: It might do so or it might take the place of the softer varieties of United States wheat.

Mr. YOUNG: How much wheat does France consume in a year?

Mr. CAHAN: I have not the particulars of the production. She is one of the largest wheat producing countries of Europe.

Mr. YOUNG: I said consumption.

Mr. CAHAN: That can be found from the imports and what she produces; I have not the figures.

Mr. GIROUARD: What is the minimum tariff regarding item 37, butter, fresh, melted or salted?

Mr. CAHAN: Item 37 of the French tariff is "butter, fresh, melted or salted," the minimum tariff being 200 francs per 100 kilos which, at the time of negotiating—and I have the figures here—amounted in Canadian currency to $3.55 per hundred pounds or a little over 3½ cents a pound. At the same time the general tariff was $7.11 per 100 pounds, but there was put into force for one year—from September 28, 1932, while these discussions were going on—a higher duty for a period of

one year for the protection of French production, and that higher duty amounted to 700 francs per 100 kilos, $12.44 per 100 pounds, or nearly 12½ cents a pound. That duty will be in effect until September 28, 1933, unless previously repealed by decree of the French government.

Mr. RALSTON: I ask the minister to turn to items 46 to 49 inclusive, appearing in Schedule A. Item 46 is for "fish, dried, salted or smoked." Will the minister tell me whether there is any regulation in force in France, and if so what, providing a bonus to salt water fishermen?

Mr. CAHAN: I presume the hon. member refers to the St. Pierre fishermen. I cannot answer the question accurately, but I know that the minimum tariff rate is high, and I understood that that was so for the protection of French fishermen fishing off the St. Pierre, Miquelon and Newfoundland coasts. When I was dealing with the French government the minimum tariff ran, on different kinds of dried, salted and smoked fish, from 100 francs to 300 francs per 100 kilos. That is, there was a tariff varying from $2.67 per 100 pounds to $5.33 per 100 pounds according to the class of fish. On dried and certain other kinds of fish, which they call stock fish, salted or smoked, the tariff was $1.78 for 100 pounds.

Mr. RALSTON: Is cod classified separately?

Mr. CAHAN: Dried, salted or smoked cod is under the first classification.

Mr. RALSTON: That is, from $2.67 to $5.33 per 100 pounds.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: The minimum tariff is the same under the old treaty as under the new. It applies in both cases.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: The minister referred to lobsters, under item 49. I am a little apprehensive about the note annexed to Schedule A which has to do with the importation of lobsters, and which seems to forecast the possibility of a quota regulation. Could the minister tell us anything on that point?

Mr. CAHAN: There is a quota. To which pages did you refer?

Mr. RALSTON: Pages 14 and 15 of the bill. On page 15 there is a reference to lobsters.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, there is a quota on lobsters going into France. Our quota for the minimum tariff is 3,000 quintals or 660,000 odd pounds. We are not prevented from sending an amount in excess of that quota, but we have to pay the maximum tariff duty on the excess.

Mr. RALSTON: I did not understand that the quota is actually in force.

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, they have a regular quota system.

Mr. RALSTON: I notice that the second paragraph on page 16 reads:

> In case the importation into France of canned lobsters and spiny lobsters is submitted to quotas, the French government reserves the right to submit the importation of the above category originating in Canada to the regime of licences of importation which may be applied to similar goods from other sources.

I took that paragraph to mean that it was possibly envisaged that there would be a quota. The hon. minister states that there is one now.

Mr. CAHAN: Certainly a quota was imposed upon us, in view of the fact that under arrangements outstanding 3,000 quintals was the full amount that could be allowed to us at the time. In the previous year we had exported to France 382 metric tons of lobsters preserved or prepared. The imports of France of preserved or prepared lobsters amounted to 6,192 metric tons. Of that amount 2,779 came from Great Britain, 1,170 from Germany, 811 from Japan, 547 from the Union of South Africa, 382 from Canada, 152 from a French colony, and 129 from Soviet Russia.

Mr. RALSTON: Over half came from Canada.

Mr. CAHAN: No; the United Kingdom sent more than we did. Canada sent only 382 metric tons, whereas Japan sent 811. Those figures deal with the year before the rescission of the French treaty.

Mr. RALSTON: I believe the minister will find that those lobsters sent from Great Britain to France came originally from Canada.

Mr. CAHAN: That may be so.

Mr. RALSTON: I think it is. I do not mean that they were all Canadian lobsters, but I suggest that a very large proportion of them were.

Mr. CAHAN: As a matter of fact it would not make any difference whether or not the shipment was direct because, with respect to

lobsters, I understand Great Britain enjoys the French minimum tariff. So that whether they were shipped from Canada direct or shipped via Southampton or Liverpool they would receive exactly the same treatment, namely the minimum tariff, in France.

Mr. RALSTON: Has Great Britain enjoyed a minimum tariff under a treaty arrangement?

Mr. CAHAN: I believe Great Britain enjoys a minimum tariff in France on almost everything, in view of the fact that up until last year French productions were admitted into England at the lowest possible rates of duty. I cannot speak for the last two or three months.

Mr. RALSTON: I am wondering whether or not England and France even had the formality of a treaty.

Mr. CAHAN: Oh, yes, there is a treaty outstanding.

Mr. RALSTON: I believe the minister stated that 382 metric tons were shipped by Canada to France. Then I did not quite catch the figures that he gave as those which would be applicable to Canada. I thought it was more than that.

Mr. CAHAN: No, it is three thousand quintals at 220 pounds and a fraction.

Mr. RALSTON: That is 660,000 pounds. Now if a metric ton—here is where the minister has me completely at a disadvantage as he has been dealing with metric measures—if a metric ton is the same as our ton, that is 2,000 pounds, then 382 tons would be 764,000 pounds, whereas the quota, he is pointing out, is only 660,000, indicating that the quota could not have been in effect at that time, if I am right in my figures.

Mr. CAHAN: I cannot tell as to the quota being in effect. As far as my memory goes, at the time of our discussion there was a temporary quota in effect with regard to importation of canned and preserved lobsters into that country.

Mr. MARCIL: Coming back to cod, which is a very important product of the lower St. Lawrence, has any real advantage been secured on the French market for salted cod?

Mr. CAHAN: No, it remains under the minimum tariff as it was before.

Mr. RALSTON: In reference to cod, would my hon. friend tell me the amount of dry salt cod which the figures show was imported into France from Canada, referring to items 45 and 46.

[Mr. Cahan.]

Mr. CAHAN: I can simply give the total import into France of cod; dried, salted and smoked; which was 5,069 metric tons. That is for the year 1930, the last figures I have.

Mr. RALSTON: That is the total imports?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes. These are French figures. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has the figures at hand, tells me that our exports of dried cod to France were practically nothing in recent years.

Mr. RALSTON: They could not be, over that tariff wall. They are paying the fishermen 75 cents to $1 per hundredweight, and the minister is pointing out that the minimum tariff is $5 and $6. So I cannot see how there could be much. With regard to exports of fresh fish from Canada to France, can the minister tell me if the figures show any appreciable amount?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, $40,000 last year.

Mr. RALSTON: Will the minister tell me the minimum tariff on fresh fish, that is item 46?

Mr. CAHAN: It is about $1.33 of our money per hundredweight. I am computing at the rate of exchange as at the time of the negotiations. It has fluctuated somewhat.

Mr. RALSTON: One wonders whether there really is any advantage at all in putting items like this in the treaty. I quite understand this was in the previous treaty, but in view of the height of the minimum tariff can the minister tell me if there was any discussion about the possibility of dropping it altogether? What is the advantage of including it?

Mr. CAHAN: Perhaps there may be during the present year no advantage. There are a number of items under the minimum tariff of France with respect to which as far as my knowledge goes, which is not extensive, the Canadian producer probably cannot profit for months. But this I will say, that there is no item included under the minimum tariff in this agreement and there is no item included in the other schedule which fixes reductions from the maximum tariff, that was not asked for by somebody in Canada. The number of requests that came in with regard to this treaty was very large. We simply dealt with items with respect to which some person in Canada thought that he might do business if they were placed on the minimum tariff.

Mr. RALSTON: With all due respect to the minister, no doubt concessions were asked for, but I can hardly conceive of anyone in the fish business simply asking for the French minimum tariff, for instance, on salted fish. He must have asked for further concessions.

Mr. CAHAN: If he did he asked for something which, except in one instance, France has never granted to anyone and has absolutely and imperatively refused to grant to Canada, that is a concession below the minimum tariff. The only way that has been done is in the arrangement made with the three Danubian states under conditions accepted by the conference held at Stresa under the auspices of the League of Nations. The fact is that whether for present or future trading there was some person in Canada who put in a memorandum asking for the minimum tariff on fish.

Mr. RALSTON: Coming back to lobsters, what I fear is this. It seems to me, according to the documents in front of me—I have the French convention and I have this treaty —that this is the first time a quota is expressly recognized by us.

Mr. CAHAN: If we recognize the facts that have been evident during the past ten years we have to recognize that France did reserve absolute liberty of action, and that France has imposed quotas on many of the imports from Canada which are mentioned as being under the minimum tariff in the preceding treaty.

Mr. RALSTON: I was speaking about lobsters particularly. We now recognize that France may impose a quota on lobsters, that these lobsters must be accompanied by special certificates of origin, and that certain control has to be exercised with regard to permits. It seems to me, just on the documents that I have here, that the export of lobsters is going to be more restricted and that there is less likelihood of doing business under the treaty now put before us than there was before.

Mr. CAHAN: All I can say is that up to September 25, 1932, there had been in force quotas on lobsters. I do not pretend to have searched further than that, but on that date I have a note that there were then quota restrictions in force in France on canned and preserved lobsters.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not see any advantage in this treaty at any rate for the fishermen, either on fresh or salt fish, or lobsters.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Reverting to item 37, is the hon. minister in a position to inform the house what quantity of butter, in pounds, Canada exported to France in 1931, 1932 and 1933?

Mr. CAHAN: The Minister of Trade and Commerce will look it up. If the hon. gentleman will simply procure one of the ordinary statistical returns made by the government he will see these products set forth in detail. I cannot carry them in my mind.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not shown in the return. I think the export is very small, and would be included in the general term, "all other items." The export of butter is very insignificant. I have not the detailed returns here; it would take a little time to look them up.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Is it the same for cheese—item 36?

Mr. STEVENS: Well, cheese is small too. In the fiscal year 1932, $9,000 worth, and $5,000 in 1931.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Could the minister tell us what kind of cheese is included? Is it cheddar cheese?

Mr. STEVENS: I presume it is Canadian cheese.

Mr. BOUCHARD: But that term covers many kinds of cheese.

Mr. STEVENS: It is not subdivided.

Mr. BOUCHARD: I might remind the committee that France is perhaps second to no other country in the production of cheese, not only in variety but also in quality. Canada produces a very good cheddar cheese, but without disparaging our own products I think the committee will agree that we have not the same variety of cheese that they have in France. I was told that small cheese, such as Chateau cheese, for instance, has found quite a substantial market in France. It just shows that as the French people may have developed a taste for Canadian cheese so we may have developed a taste for French cheese, which indicates that freer trade between the two nations is more satisfactory to both.

While I am on my feet may I remind the committee that in France the tariff really has worked for the farmers, but here in Canada though the farmers have been promised during election campaigns and at other times that the tariff would work for them, that has not been the case. As soon as the tariff is lowered on wheat and other articles there is an agita-

tion in France, where I think there is more equity as between the benefits received by the different classes of the community from the tariff.

Mr. CAHAN: I can only say that when I was in France I was busy for seven or eight hours a day sitting with a commission composed of seven or eight gentlemen, experts from different departments, and I was not worrying over Canadian domestic politics at all. I was trying to make the best possible bargain for the sale of our goods in France.

In reply to the hon. gentleman who was dealing with butter, may I say that I recall that butter was not included in the schedule with the expectation of increasing our market in France for butter. We have had a considerable market in St. Pierre, Miquelon and the French West Indies, and butter was included so that we might retain the lowest rate of duty on butter entering those colonies, which are near us.

Mr. BRADETTE: I am particularly interested in item 168, which covers wood pulp chemically treated, under guarantee of clearance to be discharged by "les contributions indirectes." I do not know what those words mean, but I believe that under the previous treaty we did very little trade with France under this item, and I should like a little information from the minister in this regard. Apparently in the past we did not sell raw pulpwood to France, but I have been told by competent authorities that a potential market exists in that country. Will the minister be good enough to tell us the exports of wood pulp and similar material during the last year the previous treaty was in operation, and also whether it will be possible to create a new market in France for Canadian wood pulp.

Mr. CAHAN: I really believe that our exporters have not paid particular attention to the markets in France, which of course are highly competitive. I am sure many things could be sold there if special agencies were created for the purpose. With respect to wood pulp, our right to the minimum tariff is confined to chemical dry pulp which is used in the manufacture of artificial silk. We never have been able to compete with Norway and Finland with regard to wet pulp.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Under item 190 would the minister say how many tons of coal we exported to France in 1932, and what kind of coal it was?

Mr. CAHAN: We have not exported coal to France and we do not expect to do so. We have some advantage on coal in St. Pierre, Miquelon and the French West Indies, which are near our ports and to which at times we export coal.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Have we had any trade of that kind with St. Pierre, Miquelon and the other colonies?

Mr. CAHAN: I was told that by exporting coal there we could do some business in bunker coal, with the vessels which come there for coaling purposes. If the hon. gentleman wishes me to do so I can look up these statistics, but they are available to him just as they are to me. I remember that I was asked to have coal included, not with the expectation of sending coal from Cape Breton or British Columbia to France but in order that coal might be sent to some of the French colonies, especially to supply bunker coal to ships calling at those colonies, which might create a market of some modest value.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I do not intend to go through all these items; many questions have been asked with regard to them. I do not want to belittle the efforts of the minister in negotiating a treaty of this kind, but up to the present time I have not found any great advantages in it. Most of these items constitute what might be called a fishing expedition, an exploration into the possibilities.

Mr. CAHAN: It must be a fishing expedition when only five per cent of our exports to France are manufactured goods. France will not reduce her minimum tariff under any circumstances; it has been done only once, by treaty, and to ask for reductions in the minimum tariff is to ask in vain. What would the hon. gentleman do when met with a decisive "No" of that kind? The only thing to do is to go through the items of the French tariff one by one, as we did, and to study the correspondence received in order to ascertain on which items there was any prospect of maintaining, expending or increasing our exports to that country.

Mr. SANDERSON: I should like to ask the minister a question with regard to item 68, which covers wheat flour. I am quite well aware that for some time we have not exported much flour to France, but at one time that trade was fairly large. Is there any change in this treaty, as compared with the old agreement, in the duty on Canadian flour entering France? It is not necessary for me to remind the committee that the milling industry in Canada has been in a very depressed state for three or four years. Any outlet for Canadian flour would therefore be welcomed not only

by the milling industry but by the farmers generally. Will the minister tell me whether, in his negotiations in France, he was successful or not, he made any effort to get some favourable consideration for Canadian flour going into that country.

Mr. CAHAN: We obtained the minimum tariff, which is the lowest tariff France gives or will give to foreign flour products. I could do no more.

Mr. SANDERSON: I am quite aware it is the minimum tariff, but is that any advantage to the Canadian miller over the arrangements that were in force up to last summer?

Mr. CAHAN: I do not think so.

Mr. SANDERSON: It is just the same.

Mr. CAHAN: Just the same.

Mr. SANDERSON: As a matter of fact, there is no more advantage for the grower of wheat in Canada to sell his wheat to France than there was a year ago, and the same applies to flour.

Mr. CAHAN: Not the slightest difference.

Mr. BOUCHARD: May I direct the minister's attention to item 31, dealing with oleomargine, edible fats, and similar products. Am I wrong if I am under the impression that the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada was prohibited? I remember having made my maiden speech against this product, and I should like to have more information in regard to it.

Mr. CAHAN: This includes all sorts of edible fats, and the caption is simply the one used in the French tariff. Without defining any particular edible fats, it gives us the minimum tariff with respect to all these edible fat products.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Is there any more oleomargarine manufactured in Canada?

Mr. CAHAN: I do not know whether any has been manufactured, and it would not have made any difference, because I was not an expert who knew all the edible fats that were manufactured in Canada. I may inform the hon. gentleman however that this includes every kind and description of edible fats and therefore we used the caption as it appears in the French tariff under item 31.

Mr. MALCOLM: The minister has been refreshingly frank in admitting that with respect to a great many items in schedule A Canadian exporters can look with little hope for an increase in the existing volume of business, if any does exist. He has said with regard to wheat that there is little hope in that direction, and he has admitted with regard to flour that there is also but little hope. There has been some discussion in the press that due to this treaty pneumatic tires, and casings may go in larger quantities from Canada to France, and that we may have an increase of business in canned salmon and wood pulp for the manufacture of artificial silk. I would submit that under the terms of the old treaty we had on pneumatic tires a duty of 375 francs per hundred kilos; on lobsters, canned, 42½ francs per hundred kilos; on canned salmon 59½ francs per hundred kilos; on wood pulp ·75 to 13 francs per hundred kilos; on lead in pigs, of which we exported $571,000 worth, we had 4·25 francs per hundred kilos. Will the minister give to the committee the existing rates of duty under the French minimum tariff, with respect to the principal commodities which he thinks we may export to France, so that Canadian exporters who are looking forward to receiving considerable benefit from this treaty will be able to analyze his statement to the committee and ascertain just what duties they will have to face under the minimum tariff in trying to export their products.

Mr. CAHAN: With all deference, I suggest that the hon. gentleman is not serious in asking me to go over scores of items.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, the principal ones.

Mr. CAHAN: The Department of Trade and Commerce will undoubtedly send out to the public a complete and thorough analysis. All I have to say is that if the duties which the hon. gentleman has mentioned with respect to certain articles were the minimum duties under the old tariff treaty, they will continue under that minimum.

Mr. MALCOLM: Have they not been increased?

Mr. CAHAN: Not since last June.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am giving 1929 rates.

Mr. CAHAN: The 1929 rates remain practically the same. I should expect, from the discussions I heard, that there will be some increase in their minimum duties on lead, and it is just possible that there may be some increase in their minimum tariff on zinc. But whatever they are, we have to take them or take nothing. In dealing with France we are face to face with a choice between her minimum and her maximum tariffs. I may observe that those gentlemen regarded it as incomprehensible that we should have so slight a

difference between our minimum, that is to say our intermediate for foreign purposes, and our general tariff. They have made their maximum tariff two, three and four times as high as their minimum, with a view to compelling foreign countries to make concessions in order to obtain their minimum tariff, and they thought that we had not adopted the most efficient tariff policy because our general tariff was on so many items the same as our intermediate.

Mr. MALCOLM: Hear, hear.

Mr. CAHAN: Granted. They said it was useless for a foreign country to deal with us because they obtained no advantages by coming in under the intermediate tariff. The reason for it I did not explain to them, but I have a clear reason in my own mind, and it is this. The one large country in the world which is under the general tariff of Canada is the United States, and we have not increased the general tariff above the intermediate tariff in respect of many items, because we did not wish to restrict our importations from the United States—in other words, because we did not wish to offend the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CAHAN: That applies particularly to hon. gentlemen opposite, more particularly than to this government. But this I learned—I intended to reserve it until after the close of the economic conference at London, but I will say it now. In future, if we wish to deal advantageously with European countries in the matter of trade, and to secure concessions from them on the main exports which go from Canada, we shall find it very necessary to increase our general tariff in order to induce them to give us advantages for the purpose of procuring the admission of these products under our intermediate tariff, and if we do not do so we shall not obtain the advantages in their market which are necessary to increase our export trade with them.

This world has not reached that high plane of idealism where setting aside national interests the different nations are willing to sit together and deal fraternally with each other, giving the same favours to foreign industry in trade and commerce as they preserve for domestic industry and commerce. Any person who has that idea in his mind, that this is not a trading proposition, should have sat down day after day and week after week with me in the discussions I had with the French commission with respect to these matters. It is a trading proposition. Nationalism is not dead. The international spirit may be improving in certain respects but during my lifetime and during my generation I expect to find Canada treating foreign nations in a different manner to that in which she treats her own producers and I expect to find foreign nations treating their own domestic production more favourably than the foreign production of Canada or any other country.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry the minister cannot give the committee the exact rates of duty.

Mr. CAHAN: Can the hon. member tell me the item he wishes?

Mr. MALCOLM: I mentioned rubber products and tires.

Mr. CAHAN: Rubber products are covered by item 620g and items lower down.

Mr. MALCOLM: What is the rate on rubber tires; I think the number is 620i.

Mr. CAHAN: That item deals with solid tires. The minimum rate is 200 francs per hundred kilos, which is equivalent to $3.50 per hundred pounds.

Mr. MALCOLM: What is the rate for 620h?

Mr. CAHAN: That item covers inner tubes, pneumatic tires and covers. The minimum rate is 250 francs per hundred kilos which at the rate of exchange in effect at the time I was conducting negotiations is equal to $4.25 per hundred pounds. The rate of exchange has fluctuated a little since that time.

Mr. MALCOLM: That is a concession.

Mr. CAHAN: That is on the minimum tariff; the former rate to Canada was $6.67 per hundred pounds.

Mr. MALCOLM: 375 francs under the intermediate.

Mr. CAHAN: On 620i the former rate to Canada was $4.45 per hundred pounds.

Mr. MALCOLM: Can the minister give us the same information with regard to canned salmon? What benefit accrues under the reduced rate?

Mr. CAHAN: We have the minimum rate but they are increasing their rates on canned salmon.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): How much longer has the Japanese treaty with France to run?

Mr. CAHAN: What is the number of the canned salmon item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Forty-seven.

Mr. CAHAN: The Japanese previously enjoyed the minimum rate which is 42.5 francs per hundred kilograms, equal to 76 cents per hundred pounds. Under the old treaty the rate to Canada was $1.66 per hundred pounds. We now get the minimum tariff. I understand that this minimum tariff is to be increased from 76 cents to 84 cents. We will have the advantage of a reduction of one-half in the tariff on salmon and will be able to compete on equal terms with Japan.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This will bring us on an equality with Japan?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: For the first time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is an item in schedule A covering tobacco in leaves or stalks. Does the minister expect that we will be able to export any tobacco to France?

Mr. CAHAN: The minimum rate on this item is free but we wished to mention the minimum rate that we might be placed in a favourable position should an increase be made in the tariff. I devoted some time to this tobacco item, in connection with which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce supplied me with considerable data. From my discussions with the members of the French tobacco regie I can see no reason why our sales of tobacco to France should not increase in an equal proportion to our sales of tobacco to Great Britain. This will depend upon the producers in Canada taking the necessary measures to enter the French market. The High Commissioner at London gave me some data with regard to the increase of tobacco sales in London, not only for smoking tobacco but for tobacco to be used in the manufacture of cigarettes. I found the head of the French tobacco regie to be a very amiable gentleman. He told me that some twenty years ago he had visited Quebec city to see some people of the same speech and race as himself. He then investigated French Canadian supplies of tobacco but he found them not up to standard. He told me that he did not know that we had made any improvement since. I showed him the statistics with regard to our improved production and pointed out that certain grades were deemed by the British manufacturer to be equal to grades now produced in the United States. He told me that if this treaty went into force, he certainly would be prepared to receive overtures from Canadian producers of tobacco. He stated also that he would send experts to Canada to examine into the matter. I think there is reasonable ground for expecting an increase in the exports of tobacco from Canada to France. However, it will be necessary to convince the French experts that our tobacco is as suitable for smoking purposes and for the manufacture of cigarettes as the grades which they are now purchasing from the United States. Up to the time I was there they were purchasing tobacco in the United States at a disadvantage as compared with the discount on exchange that then existed in respect of Canadian funds. I am hopeful something may be done in the way of increasing that trade and I know the Minister of Trade and Commerce has the matter well in hand and has been giving a thorough and detailed study to the subject.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Can anybody import tobacco into France?

Mr. CAHAN: No, tobacco is imported by the government only. It is necessary to convince the experts of the government as to the quality of our tobaccos.

Mr. NEILL: I am sorry I cannot agree with the minister's interpretation of the duty on canned salmon. He told us just now that the duty was to be reduced to 84 francs per 100 kilograms. Item No. 47 states that the duty will be the minimum tariff and then there is a provision at the foot of page 14 that from the putting into force of the commercial agreement, the rates will be the general tariff reduced by 72 per cent, the rate thus obtained representing a duty of 84 francs per 100 kilograms gross. That is not my opinion; I am quoting from the paragraph. That would mean a rate of 84 francs, but then the paragraph goes on to state:

> On the other hand, it is the intention of the French govrenment, . . . to amend its customs legislation in such manner as to increase by—

Not "to" but "by".

> —by 84 francs per 100 kilos gross the minimum tariff on canned salmonoids.

If it read "to increase to 84 francs", I would understand it, but "to increase by" certainly means to add to. They are certainly going to add it to the minimum stated under item 47 which, by the footnote on page 14, is to be 84 francs per 100 kilograms. I suggest that we are going to pay exactly double that; first, the original minimum, and, if they pass that bill, there will be another 84 francs on top of that. If it does not mean that, then either I am or the English language is falling off. I ask the minister to read that paragraph.

Mr. CAHAN: There may be a mistranslation there. Has the hon. member for Quebec East the French version before him?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. CAHAN: Will he look at the notes annexed to schedule A on page 14 where it says:

In such manner as to increase—

The experts in Canada have studied the matter and have compiled this memorandum which the Minister of Trade and Commerce has kindly given to me.

The general tariff in France is 300 francs for 100 kilograms. The minimum tariff is 75 francs. The rate to Canada under the old treaty was 165 francs up to June 16, 1932. It was 300 francs after that date and until the conclusion of this treaty. The rate to Japan was 75 francs up to September 25, 1932. From June 16, 1932, under the general tariff of France our export of canned salmon paid 300 francs per 100 kilograms, while Japan paid only 84 francs per 100 kilograms. Under the new treaty there is granted a reduction of 72 per cent discount from the general tariff. That brings it down to 84 francs per 100 kilograms and 84 francs at the rate of exchange on May 15 amounted to $1.49 per 100 pounds.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The French version of the treaty says that the rate will be raised "to".

Mr. NEILL: That is very important. We should make an amendment to that effect. It makes a great difference whether it is "to" or "by"; it means a difference of 84 francs.

Mr. CAHAN: I suppose the notes were prepared by one of the translators and a mistake may have been made. We shall take pains to have that changed.

Mr. NEILL: Will the minister amend it?

Mr. CAHAN: With the consent of the committee I shall have one of the translators of the house look into the matter and amend it. It is all covered in the first paragraph to the notes in Schedule A; that is the operative part:

From the putting into force of the commercial agreement—

That is, this agreement.

—canned salmonoids coming under Ex No. 47 of the French customs tariff, exported from Canada will be admitted on French customs territory at a rate corresponding to the general tariff reduced by 72 per cent, the rate thus obtained representing a duty of 84 francs per 100 kilogs. gross.

[Mr. Neill.]

The operative part of the memorandum is correct. The note which has been annexed by one of the translators may be a misprint, or it may have been, by chance, a mistranslation.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I should like to inquire of the minister just in a general way regarding schedule C and items 549 to 564, all dealing with silks.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Schedule C is not included in this article. The article we are discussing covers schedules A and B. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will wait until we come to the next article.

Article 1 agreed to.

On article 2.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I suppose we shall adopt the same system that we did in regard to article one; that is, on article 2, schedules C and D may be discussed. Then, when we pass article 2, it carries with it schedules C and D. The hon. member for West Edmonton might ask his question now.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am interested chiefly in the silk items. I gather from what the minister has said with respect to schedule A, that, owing to the fact that the French government have been raising duties continuously since 1930, the duties on imports of Canadian goods into France are much higher than they were under the old treaty.

Mr. CAHAN: When initiated.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): And even as late as 1930. I am speaking largely from memory, but as I remember the matter, as there was no definite arrangement for fixed tariffs, the French government were continuously raising their duties, thus affecting Canadian treaty articles. In view of the fact that the duties on those silk articles as well as on textiles of wool and cotton were raised rather extensively in the Empire trade treaties, they will be at a higher rate than they were under the old schedules. Inasmuch as the duties now in effect under this trade agreement are much higher than under the old on our exports to France, so are the duties higher on imports from France, particularly as they affect silks and other textiles.

Mr. CAHAN: As a matter of fact, in a general way the textiles composed of silk and artificial silk were not largely dealt with in the agreement made at Ottawa a year ago. As a matter of fact with a few exceptions

these items have not been increased by the trade agreement made with Great Britain. And with regard to most of these items, while the tariff remains the same France is obtaining the 10 per cent reduction which she enjoyed under the old convention. As a matter of fact France is left nearly in the same position as she was prior to the rescission of the old French trade agreement. So far as the financial condition of Canadian consumers will permit, and the purchases of luxuries affected thereby, she will preserve in Canada nearly the same position as that occupied by her prior to the rescission of the treaty. I believe that general observation is quite correct.

Mr. NEILL: I suggest that in the notes appearing on page 14 of the bill the word "therefore" should be substituted for the words "on the other hand" in the line third from the bottom of the page. I am told that the word "therefore" would give a better translation, and would make better sense. Then on the first line of page 15 I suggest the word "by" should be stricken out and the word "to" substituted therefor.

Mr. CAHAN: That is merely a matter of translation. If the committee will allow it to stand I should like to have the official translator go over it so as to have the language more precise.

Mr. NEILL: The minister will let the article stand?

Mr. CAHAN: After listening to the speeches in the French language of ten or fifteen hon. gentlemen my French is improving from day to day and from week to week. I read it very well, but I should like to have the official translator look over the bill.

Mr. NEILL: Will the minister let the article stand?

Mr. CAHAN: Is it necessary to have it stand, when only a note is at fault? That part of the bill to which the hon. member has referred is simply a note in explanation. The operative clause is entirely correct.

Mr. NEILL: Pardon me; the notes relate to Schedule A. There is a reference to addenda numbers 47 and 49 of the French customs tariff. These notes must be passed as something, and I suggest they are part of the schedule. When we have passed the article we have passed it all.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bury): I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that the note is part of Schedule A, and Schedule A was passed under article 1.

Mr. NEILL: Schedule A is not passed.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes; we are now on Schedules C and D.

Mr. NEILL: We are on article No. 1.

Mr. STEVENS: No, No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bury): Article 1 is passed.

Mr. NEILL: When did it pass?

Mr. STEVENS: A quarter of an hour ago.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bury): I said, "Shall the article pass?" And it was passed.

Mr. NEILL: I do not wish to harass the minister, but it is quite evident that we must not pass part of a bill in which there appears a gross error.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is merely a mistake in translation.

Mr. CAHAN: I believe the language now in the bill is quite clear, and could not be made clearer.

Mr. NEILL: It is clear, if you accept the explanation that there is a mistake in it. But are we going to pass legislation which obviously reads wrongly?

Mr. CAHAN: I believe the hon. member is not correct in that statement.

Mr. NEILL: The minister states that these are notes. Yes, but they are part of the schedule.

Mr. CAHAN: The note is part of the schedule.

Mr. NEILL: Hear, hear.

Mr. CAHAN: And the note to which reference has been made is official. I thought the hon. member was referring to notes concerning items 47 and 49.

Mr. NEILL: I referred to page 14 of the bill.

Mr. CAHAN: I thought the hon. member was referring to a note concerning item 47 appearing at page 10.

Mr. NEILL: No, I am speaking about page 14.

Mr. CAHAN: Where is the mistake?

Mr. NEILL: We find these words, "notes annexed to Schedule A. Addenda Nos. 47 and 49 of French customs tariff." I propose that the word "therefore" should be substi-

tuted for the words "on the other hand" appearing three lines from the bottom of the page, and that at the top of page 15 the word "to" should be substituted for the word "by" so that it will read:

in such manner as to increase to 84 francs.

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. member may hold up the schedule if he wishes but—

Mr. NEILL: I do not wish to.

Mr. CAHAN: The French minister has signed for both the French and the English translations, and before changing that translation I should like to see the official translator and ascertain if it is correct. I believe the assurance given by me, that before this treaty is finally passed I should have that done, is quite sufficient.

Mr. NEILL: I did not understand it that way.

Mr. CAHAN: But I must have the consent of the French minister before I can change the translation.

Mr. NEILL: That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I ask the minister if there is any change in the rates on wine? I believe the Liberal government are responsible for the increased duties on wine. I believe, however, there is no change in the schedule.

Mr. CAHAN: No; I think French wines will come in and continue to come in at the same rate of duty as obtained before the treaty was abrogated. Of course for a few months past they have come in under the general tariff, but the treaty will restore the old rate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a great relief.

Mr. CAHAN: May I point out that the French government is anxious to have the rates still further reduced. They pointed out that in their opinion the sales being made by commissions were made at very high prices. I had to suggest that the high rates at which French wines, liqueurs, and brandies are sold in Canada were due not only to the alleged high rates of import duties imposed by the federal government, but due to the very large profits made by some of the provincial commissions in the sales of French wines.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Possibly.

Mr. CAHAN: As the liquor commissions are not under our control, and as they fix their own prices, the federal government should not be blamed too severely for the high prices charged in sales of French wines, liqueurs and brandies.

Article 2 agreed to.

Articles 3, 4 and 5 agreed to.

On article 6.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Will there be no dumping duties against importations from France now?

Mr. CAHAN: There is a provision that we do not restrict ourselves in respect of dumping duties. But I cannot give any promise in that respect. The treatment given to France is exactly the same as we give to other countries, and France gives us the same treatment as she gives to other countries. But I did obtain an oral assurance from France that if by reason of any changes in the international monetary system stability of exchange is obtained they would consider the reduction of their surtaxes in consideration of our making similar reductions on importations from France. That is as far as I could go.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I thought probably the government had changed their policy as far as France was concerned, but apparently they are still sticking to it.

Mr. RYCKMAN: If the hon. member will look at the last clause of the article he will see we were careful not to part with anything.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, I was afraid there was a catch in it.

Article 6 agreed to.

Articles 7 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the chairman reports the bill may I say that we allowed section 2, approving of the agreement, to pass before we discussed the agreement itself. I hope the members of the government will recognize that in raising no objection we simply took it as a foregone conclusion that the measure had been agreed to and being now in force was going through. I do not think, however, that this procedure should be regarded as a precedent. The schedule and agreement should be discussed and the house given a chance to consider its terms before we are asked to approve it.

Mr. CAHAN: The right hon. gentleman knows that we concluded this treaty under most extraordinary circumstances, and it was impossible to bring it before parliament at an

earlier date. We recognize that the right hon. gentleman and those sitting by him on the opposite side have shown every consideration, in view of the approaching end of the session, to enable us to bring negotiation to a conclusion, for which we are very grateful.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My point was directed chiefly to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who, I am afraid, unless the point were raised might on some future occasion endeavour to use this as a precedent, for having agreements approved before we actually discussed them.

Mr. STEVENS: No, I would never do a thing like that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was done in the case of the Canada-United Kingdom agreement and we protested then.

Mr. BRADETTE: Will article 15 take in French colonies and mandates? I allude to Syria.

Mr. CAHAN: There are only two French mandates.

Mr. BRADETTE: Well, the mandates are included with the colonies?

Mr. CAHAN: They are included.

Mr. MARCIL: Before the bill is reported, is the minister in a position to say what the trade with France is at the present time, and what trade he anticipates will be brought about as a result of this new treaty?

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. gentleman will find in the earlier part of the debate this afternoon a complete tabular statement of the trade with France, which I trust it is not necessary to repeat. I can only say with regard to the future that I think this will improve the conditions which prevailed when France was on our general tariff and we were on its maximum tariff. The extent to which trade will improve I think depends very largely on general economic conditions outside of and beyond the question of these tariffs. I can make no prognostications. With hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of present financial and monetary conditions of the world, I simply hope for the best.

Mr. DUPUIS: I understand schedule C is passed?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes, everything is passed.

Mr. DUPUIS: Item Ex 169 as to books is marked "same rate as British preferential tariff."

Mr. STEVENS: Free.

Mr. DUPUIS: All French books will be free?

Mr. CAHAN: I do not quite understand what the hon. gentleman is asking.

Mr. DUPUIS: I am asking if French books under item Ex 169 will enter Canada free?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. DUPUIS: The same as English books from England?

Mr. CAHAN: Yes.

Mr. DUPUIS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am glad that those on your right sometimes accept suggestions coming from this side, because on November 15, 1932, in the early part of this session we called the attention of the Minister of Finance to the subject and he promised us that he would ask the British government about it and ascertain if there would be any objection to allowing French books to be admitted for the use of those in Canada who wish to study French literature.

Mr. CAHAN: Let me say to my hon. friend that I do not wish to detract at all from any credit which he may deserve to receive for any suggestion he made, but he is not the only person either in the house or outside who made similar suggestions. The fact is it was practically agreed upon before the hon. gentleman made his suggestion, and we were then negotiating to that end.

Mr. DUPUIS: With all due respect to the minister I would direct his attention to the reference to this subject in the house on the 15th of November. He will note that these items, 171, 171a and 178 of the British preferential tariff were passed without comment.

Mr. STEVENS: You do not object to my hon. friend doing what you wanted?

Mr. DUPUIS: The items were passed without any notice whatsoever even against the wish of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. STEVENS: No, with my hearty approval.

Mr. DUPUIS: I am glad the minister accepted my suggestion. I know he is broad-minded.

Mr. DUPRE: Let us say all is well that ends well.

Mr. DUPUIS: I am glad to see that all the ministers are ready to admit that the

suggestion I made on November 15 was good. The Minister of Finance promised me at that time that he would look into the matter, and he has acceded to my suggestion.

Mr. MALCOLM: The Solicitor General made the remark that all was well that ended well, but I do not think this is ended yet. I should like to ask the Secretary of State if it is the intention to allow these books to enter without the application of the dumping duty.

Mr. CAHAN: This tariff does not deal with dumping duties, and those duties are not imposed upon goods which have free entry.

Mr. MALCOLM: Oh, yes they are.

Mr. STEVENS: There is no dumping duty applicable in this case.

Mr. CAHAN: Then I cannot answer.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The dumping duty applies only if they are of a class or kind made in Canada, and it would not have application here.

Mr. MALCOLM: I should like to point out that the Minister of National Revenue has answered the question by saying if they are of a class or kind made in Canada they are subject to dumping duty. If the current rate of exchange is different from the rate set by the Department of National Revenue these books, which are supposed to be free, will be subject to a dumping duty.

Mr. CAHAN: That is why I said it would not apply. They are not of a class or kind made in Canada; these books are printed in French in France.

Mr. MALCOLM: If the same books were printed in French in Canada they would be subject to the dumping duty.

Mr. CAHAN: I doubt if you will find any of them printed in Canada.

Mr. GAGNON: Since my hon. friend from Laprairie-Napierville has been so anxious to score a personal point may I ask him to remember that in the treaty put through by the late government in 1922 a duty of 15 per cent was imposed on these books. I am afraid the hon. member is not paying a compliment to those who negotiated the treaty at that time.

Mr. DUPUIS: My hon. friend is a little late; it has been mentioned already that since the English books were admitted free, it was only fair that the same provisions be made for French books.

[Mr. Dupuis.]

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to put a question to the hon. Secretary of State. Will the translation of this bill be ready to-morrow morning?

Mr. CAHAN: The French version is ready

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): No, I requested the French version but I have not received it.

Hon. Mr. DUPRE (Translation): We have it.

Mr. CAHAN: So far as the treaty is concerned, it is printed separately in French and in English, and I understood that copies were available.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I asked for a copy but could not obtain one.

Mr. CAHAN: The hon. member for Quebec East has a copy.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I could not get one. I asked for a copy similar to that which the hon. member for Quebec East has, but I could not get it.

Bill reported.

CANADA-FRANCE CONVENTION

CONCERNING RIGHTS OF NATIONALS AND COMMERCIAL AND SHIPPING MATTERS

Hon. C. H. CAHAN: (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of Bill No. 108, respecting a certain convention between Canada and France concerning the rights of nationals and commercial and shipping matters.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is introduced to approve of the convention respecting the rights of nationals and commercial and shipping matters which was concluded between Canada and France on May 12th instant. The convention appears in full as a schedule to the bill.

In some respects this convention constitutes a departure from the general practice which has been followed until a comparatively recent date. In former years it was the practice of His Majesty's government in the United Kingdom to negotiate general commercial treaties with foreign countries dealing not only with tariff questions but also generally with the rights of nationals and commercial and shipping matters. These treaties were sometimes extended in terms to their application to the whole British Empire, and their provisions governed the rights of Canadian nationals, Canadian corporate enterprises and Canadian shipping in those foreign countries with which the United Kingdom concluded these treaties. This practice is exemplified in the treaty of commerce and navigation between the United Kingdom and Japan which

was signed on May 3, 1911, and which Canada confirmed by the Japanese Treaty Act of 1913. This treaty governs the relations of Canada and Japan not only in relation to commerce and navigation but also with regard to reciprocal trade and tariff rights.

At first Canadian commercial treaty policy was almost exclusively concerned with the exchange of goods and commodities, that is to say, with tariff questions. Some progress was made towards the adoption of a broader treaty policy in the convention of commerce of 1922, which was negotiated with France by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and Mr. Fielding, the then Minister of Finance. That convention dealt more or less casually with the protection of trade marks, patents, commercial names and industrial designs and patterns, as well as the treatment of nationals and corporations. Since that time Canada has adhered to a number of international conventions dealing with trade marks, patents, commercial names and industrial designs and patterns so that, both Canada and France having adhered to these conventions, which were inaugurated by the assembly of the league of nations and at The Hague, it was unnecessary to enter into particular agreements with respect to these matters in this present convention.

In the meantime, however, the general question of the negotiation of treaties was in a state of rapid development. It became the settled practice that Canada, in common with the other dominions, should be kept advised by the government of the United Kingdom from the inception of the negotiation of treaties affecting Canadians or Canadian interests. Later the resolutions of the Imperial conference of 1926 prescribed that no treaty could be concluded by the government of the United Kingdom which would impose obligations upon any of the dominions without the express consent of the government of the dominion concerned, and the provisions of the resolutions respecting communication and consultation precluded the negotiation by the United Kingdom of treaties conferring benefits or obligations upon the dominions or upon their nationals or national interests, without the authorization of the government of the dominion concerned. Like problems arose from the conclusion of various multilateral conventions, especially at Geneva under the auspices of the league of nations, in which the dominions were separate parties, and which conferred not only benefits and privileges, but also responsibilities and duties on the governments concerned, and also upon dominion nationals, dominion corporations and dominion shipping.

It has more recently appeared that foreign countries are rather reluctant to accord, in treaties with the United Kingdom, special rights or privileges to dominion nationals, corporations and shipping, particularly in treaties and conventions to which the dominions were not parties and in respect to which the dominions did not grant reciprocal benefits and privileges. Under the existing international and constitutional practice there are two possible courses available in the negotiation of commercial conventions. Following the first course, the convention may be negotiated by a representative of one part of the British Commonwealth, usually the United Kingdom, a separate full power being granted in respect of each of the other autonomous parts of the British Commonwealth that desires to avail itself of the benefits of such treaty and become subject to all or part of its obligations. The second course is for each member of the commonwealth to negotiate its own commercial conventions, confining the operation of such convention to its own territories and to its own nationals, corporate enterprises and shipping, and conversely confining the obligations assumed under the convention to the dominion concerned.

It is this course which has now become, I think, the normal procedure throughout the British Commonwealth and which has been followed in the negotiation and conclusion of this convention. Treaties governing commercial relations between two countries deal generally with two different classes of subjects. In the first place they deal with tariff questions as business bargains directly facilitating trade between the countries concerned, by according reciprocally preferred tariff rates to commodities exchanged between the two countries. In the second place they deal with the general regulations of commercial intercourse between the two countries by providing for the rights of nationals and shipping and commercial matters with a view thus to facilitating the general commercial dealings and intercourse between the two countries concerned.

It has been the usual practice to incorporate the provisions dealing with both classes of commercial relations in one convention, but in the present instance it was deemed desirable to conclude, as I have already stated to the house, a provisional trade arrangement or agreement for a period of one year, which might be extended by consent, and a convention dealing with other important national and commercial relations in a separate convention.

While this convention may be terminated by either party upon six months' notice, it is of such character that its provisions will likely be maintained for an indefinite period of time, affording a substantially permanent settlement of the problems with which it is directly concerned. Obviously it would have been unsatisfactory to incorporate the provisions dealing with the rights of Canadian nationals, Canadian corporate enterprises and Canadian shipping in a provisional trade arrangement which may be revised at the close of a period of one year.

The present convention concerning the rights of nationals and commercial and shipping matters deals solely with the second class of commercial relations. It defines and determines the legal rights and privileges of Canadian nationals in France and in the French colonies, protectorates and mandated territories and in corresponding manner the reciprocal rights and privileges of French nationals in Canada. It defines and determines the rights and privileges of Canadian corporate enterprises doing business in France and in territories under French rule, and in corresponding manner it deals with the rights and privileges of French corporate enterprises in Canada. Similarly, and on a reciprocal basis, it provides for Canadian shipping in the ports of French territories and French shipping in Canadian maritime ports.

The present convention follows closely the precedent generally adopted for dealing with similar problems and modern commercial treaty practice. It accords the Canadian nationals and Canadian business and shipping interests in French territories, as a matter of right, as favourable a position as has been established in modern treaty practice between countries which have reached the same advanced stage of civilization as these two countries. It should be observed that it also includes the undertaking by the two governments to deal with the special problems of corporate taxation which have given rise to difficulties in recent years.

In article 2 of this convention Canada and France agree to conclude another convention with regard to the subject of double taxation of persons and companies engaged in business in both countries. We discussed that third convention as it was a matter of special importance to Canadian banks and corporations which are doing business in France by branches or agencies. There has been a very considerable and insistent demand that Canada should negotiate with France with regard to an equitable adjustment of these matters. At Paris we drew up such a convention, which has since been approved by the officials of the Department of National Revenue here and which is now under the consideration of the financial and fiscal experts of the French government. As however their approval had not been obtained by May 12, it was inevitable that there should be a delay; but we hope at the next approaching session of parliament to submit to this parliament this third convention dealing with that particular subject of double taxation.

This convention, in terms, does not infringe on the immigration laws of either country. It gives to the nationals of either country the right to acquire property interests in the other country. The nationals of each country are exempted from compulsory military service in the other. The nationals of either country are granted free access to the courts of justice, either as plaintiffs or as defendants, in all processes within the jurisdictional authority of the courts of the respective countries, and merchants and manufacturers of either country are entitled not only to travel in the other country but to bring in samples for the purpose of trading and soliciting orders, and companies and societies are authorized to establish branches and carry on business in each of the countries concerned.

Provision is made in article 8, which is perhaps an innovation, whereby Canada reserves to itself the right to appoint consuls general, consuls, vice-consuls and consular agents, to reside in the ports and towns of French territories. With regard to the shipping of goods over the railways of either country, article 9 provides that goods shipped through the territory of one of the high contracting parties, with destination in the territory of the other party, on the railways of the latter, in relation to conditions and costs of transportation, and to rates and taxes of every description affecting transportation, shall receive as favourable treatment as that which is generally applicable to similar goods in the interior traffic of that country, under the same conditions, for the same directions and for the same distances, and shall enjoy most favoured nation treatment. With regard to the right of transshipment across either country, the goods shipped through a country are entitled to most favoured nation treatment and to the same treatment as that given to the transport of domestic goods and commodities. Article 13 contains a provision with regard to the rights of the shipping of one country which enter the ports of the other. There is also a provision covering vessels entering for shelter

and those that may be stranded or wrecked. Article 20 reads:

If a dispute arises between the high contracting parties in regard to the proper interpretation or application of this convention which cannot be solved by diplomatic means, the matters in dispute shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague.

In dealing with the provisions with regard to the rights of French shipping generally and of wrecked and stranded ships, I took particular pains to keep in mind the existing Canadion law dealing with these matters and I think I can assure hon. gentlemen that the provisions of this treaty are entirely consistent with the law at present in existence in Canada. In dealing with Canadian shipping, for the purposes of this convention we confined it to shipping registered in Canada. I might have proceeded further and perhaps a little more definitely but at the time of the negotiations we knew that the shipping laws of the British commonwealth were being revised and that at an early date Canada must recast and reenact her own shipping law in compliance with the resolutions of the imperial conference. I sought to avoid any distinct engagement in this convention which was not thoroughly consistent with our existing statutes and with the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite inaugurated at London and which this government has consistently carried into effect so far as we have dealt with shipping matters. I commend this bill to the consideration of the committee.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Gagnon in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do the matters dealt with in this convention differ in any particular from the provisions of the imperial act except to be brought more exactly into conformity with our own conditions?

Mr. CAHAN: I do not think so. The former Minister of Justice will remember that when negotiations were commenced at Paris in 1921 or 1922 there was a treaty outstanding between Great Britain and France dealing with commercial matters. This treaty governed similar relations between Canada and France because Canada was then a colony or dominion of Great Britain. The hon. member will also recall that some innovations were made in the treaty of 1921 covering certain rights of Canadian nationals. The scope of the treaty of 1922 has been widened somewhat in view of the advance made since that time in the status of this country and in view of the fact that we are now exercising a larger autonomy than we did prior to that time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I understand the Secretary of State, he proceeded in this matter in the manner agreed to at the imperial conference of 1923 with respect to the negotiation of treaties. He has, as the representative of Canada, proceeded on the basis of the equality of status of the self governing parts of the empire in negotiating these conventions. I should like to congratulate the hon. Secretary of State upon his indefatigable industry and upon his high sense of public service and duty. I offer him further congratulations upon the broadening of his own views with respect to the negotiation of agreements on the part of the self-governing parts of the British Empire. I am glad to see that he has come to accept so wholeheartedly the views put forward some years ago by hon. gentlemen on this side and which he was not at that time as ready and prepared to accept as he is to-day.

Mr. CAHAN: I suppose it may be regarded as a compliment that having reached and exceeded three score years and ten I can still modify my views to meet existing conditions. I think hon. members should remember and carefully consider the proposition that once a decisive step is taken—some may regard it as a forward step while others may regard it as a backward step—whenever the parliament of Canada takes a decisive step by the voice of a majority of its members—I am not dealing with petty affairs, I am dealing with large national and international interests—succeeding governments are bound in loyalty and good faith to carry out and develop those principles. You cannot go backward and retrace your steps to the same status from which you started. I think I can say for myself, for the other members of the government and for the Prime Minister that we have faithfully endeavoured to carry out that policy in national, in interdominion and international matters.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe this parliament will always value the opinions of my hon. friend. For this reason, I am pleased to gather from his remarks that his present view has become with him a matter of sincere conviction, and that he now believes that the method of proceeding he has followed, will tend, perhaps even more than any other, towards the preservation of the solidarity of the provinces with regard to it. I have never

interest of all that each part should be conceded full recognition of its capacity to negotiate international affairs of immediate concern to itself.

Mr. CAHAN: In the same jocular manner may I say that where we have found that the right hon. gentlemen and his associates were swerving too much to the left or perhaps too much to the right, we have endeavoured as best we could to guide the progress of events in an intermediate direction so as to escape some possible evils and achieve all the good ends which they had in mind at the time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In this case my hon. friend has followed our course to the letter.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Convention approved.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This section covers the schedule. I would like some explanation of article 2 of the schedule which governs fiscal matters in relation to individuals. The two countries agree that their nationals—

—shall not be submitted, in respect of their persons, property, rights and interests, profession, occupation, business or industry and in general in all matters in the territory of the other to rates, taxes, imposts or contributions of whatever discription, and without regard to the authority on behalf of which they are levied, other or higher than those which are imposed on nationals in similar circumstances.

Has there been any communication or understanding with the provinces to this effect in regard to licence or other taxes which may be levied by them on the nationals of France who live within their boundaries and engage in some profession, trade or occupation? Will this prevent the provinces from levying a higher tax on the nationals of France than on their own nationals?

Mr. CAHAN: As a matter of fact this is a treaty dealing on the one side with Canadian nationals and, on the other, with French nationals and my opinion would be that in Canada, after this treaty goes into force, we cannot impose a higher tax on a Frenchman because of his French race and nationality.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That will bind the provinces as well.

Mr. CAHAN: If this treaty is approved, it will bind the provinces as well. I do not think there is any objection whatever from the provinces with regard to it. I have never heard of any, but I am saying to the hon. gentleman and emphasizing the fact that this treaty is made with France.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: Personally I am quite willing to accept it, but not very long ago representatives of the provinces in cases before the supreme court argued that this parliament could not bind the provinces, even through the negotiation of treaties with foreign countries, without the provinces agreeing to the provisions thereof. I have heard arguments along those lines. I do not say that I agree with that, and I trust the nationals of France will be treated by every province as well as by the Dominion government exactly as are the nationals of Canada. I wish merely to prevent any disagreement along that line in other quarters.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like the minister to allow this section to stand until we approve the schedule. This will not delay matters at all, but it will regularize the procedure.

Mr. CAHAN: Very well.

Section 2 stands.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Articles 1 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

On article 22.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: By our unquestioned approval the minister will appreciate, I am sure, the complete confidence we have placed in his discretion and judgment in these important international matters; and also, may I say, our regard for the great care and industry which we know characterizes all his work.

Mr. CAHAN: I can only say that I appreciate the compliment, but in this matter I was not influenced by any partisan aims, ambitions or counsels; I tried to do the best I could for the country.

Article 22 agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN AND BRITISH INSURANCE COMPANIES

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 104, to amend an act respecting Canadian and British Insurance Companies.

He said: This is a Senate bill embodying two amendments to chapter 46 of the statutes of 1932. The first widens the list of securities in which insurance companies may invest to include a certain group of companies which have more particular reference to the province

of Quebec with which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) may be familiar, and other securities of a similar character. The second amendment is to carry out what I have no doubt was the original intention when the act was drafted, namely, to enable, on the winding up of a company, the return of securities in the case of the whole list of companies. As the matter stands now, the authority of the minister to return securities in the case of a company which is wound up is limited to the extent that life, marine and fraternal insurance companies on being wound up could not have their securities returned.

Mr. H. E. SPENCER (Battle River): I wonder whether I might bring something to the attention of the Minister of Finance with regard to insurance. I do not know whether he would care to answer a question with regard to a certain clause in the Insurance Act. Lately there has been considerable complaint regarding insurance companies refusing to take further premiums if the holders of the policies have let them go beyond a certain date, even where the cash surrender value has been greater than the amount of the premium. I understand that insurance companies have taken advantage of this in the last twelve months owing to a certain clause not being in the last Insurance Act. Has the minister heard about this and is he in a position to make a statement to the house?

Mr. RHODES: I am sorry I did not anticipate that a question of this character would be asked, and I fear I am not in a position to give an answer as comprehensive as my hon. friend would wish.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 105, to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

He said: I believe there will be no objection to my moving a further stage of this bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not if the minister can explain the bill.

Mr. RHODES: I am afraid I cannot give any better explanation than has already been given the house. In simple language, the effect of the bill is to place members of the Senate, with respect to matters referred to in the bill, in precisely the same position as is now occupied by members of the House of Commons. Apparently the fact that there was a distinction is a matter of only recent discovery.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that Sir Allen Aylesworth suggested the amendment, and I rely upon his judgment.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RHODES: Before six o'clock is called I believe I should advise the house that after eight o'clock, if agreeable, we shall proceed with supply, taking up first the item in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Very well.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What next?

Mr. RHODES: There are still further items in Pensions and National Health, together with a list of supplementary estimates.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And if everything is voted before nine o'clock, what then?

Mr. RHODES: There are other bills on the order paper with which we could proceed.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The shipping bill?

Mr. RHODES: If we lack material with which to proceed we can take up the shipping bill.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

CANADA-FRANCE TRADE AGREEMENT

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house I should like to ask to have the third reading of Bill No. 107, an act respecting a certain trade agreement between Canada and France. A change of one word was spoken about this afternoon, and the Secretary of State has had it investigated and will make an explanation regarding it if the house is willing.

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State): On page 15 of this bill, in the first line, the word "by" should be "to." I took this up with

the French legation, and I find that through some printer's or other error the mistake crept in. It is agreed that the change should be made. I therefore ask, with the unanimous consent of the house, before the third reading to change the word "by" to "to."

Mr. CHEVRIER: I am not objecting to that, but may I take the opportunity of asking the hon. minister who translated the bill? Was it translated by the officers of the house in the ordinary way?

Mr. CAHAN: No, this is a schedule prepared with the treaty; the treaty is in both French and English. As a matter of fact the original translation of the draft was made by myself in Paris, assisted by Mr. Jean Désy and put before the translators of the French government and approved, though certain minor modifications were subsequently made. The translation in the French copy was printed from the treaty as signed, but there are typographical errors in it; the proofreading in the rush was not as careful as it should be. I understand that the officers of the house have a perfect right to correct merely typographical errors in the French proof that was put through hurriedly at a late hour.

Mr. CHEVRIER: This has nothing to do with the ordinary staff of translators of the house?

Mr. CAHAN: No, the treaty was submitted in French to the French translators. Who read the proof I do not know; I did not. There are some slight corrections from the proof, and this change of the word "by" to "to" is a proper change. It escaped notice and I took it up with the Department of External Affairs, and also with the French legation, and all are agreed that the change should be made. It should read:

—in such manner as to increase to 84 francs per one hundred kilos.

Owing to a mistake which was pointed out by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) it appeared as if it were "to increase by 84 francs." It is clear from the other clauses that that is an error.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As the Secretary of State has just pointed out, the error was drawn to the attention of the committee by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, and if he is satisfied I think the rest of us will be. It does not need an amendment; it is a typographical error.

Mr. CAHAN moved that the bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

[Mr. Cahan.]

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Plunkett in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Live stock, $1,430,000.

Mr. VALLANCE: On a previous occasion when the Minister of Agriculture came before this committee with his estimates we discussed at some length the marketing problem of the live stock men, particularly of western Canada. At that time I made a statement that there was discrimination against the farmer who was delivering his live stock by truck. The minister challenged my statement, and, I did not at the time have the figures before me. Since then I have received quite a number of communications and would like now to correct any statement I made that was misleading. I hold in my hand a communication addressed to me from Luseland, Saskatchewan, dated April 4, written by Mr. George F. Twiss. Mr. Twiss happens to be in partnership with another man in the trucking of live stock from that community to the markets of Saskatoon. I would like to place it on record so that we will have this straightened out. He says:

Dear Sir,—

The issue of the Saskatoon Star Phoenix of April 1, on the third page states in a headline: Discrimination in Amounts Paid for Hogs Denied. This headline is misleading, and the article is a comment on your question in the House of Commons, inquiring if the "penalty" against trucked-in hogs was imposed in order to encourage business for the railroads.

Up until quite recently car lot hogs in Saskatoon brought 20 cents per 100 pounds more than trucked-in hogs. Edmonton, Calgary and Moose Jaw stock yards did likewise, and North Battleford is still paying 20 cents per 100 pounds less.

The charges in effect at Saskatoon stock yards for car lot and trucked-in hogs were respectively as follows:

	Car lot	Trucked-in
Yardage	.08	.12
Commission	.10	.25
Price	.20+	.20—

This discrimination works out per head on an average hog of 200 pounds trucked-in thus:

Yardage	.04
Commission	.15
Price difference	.40

The total discrimination is therefore .59 against trucked-in hogs. The commission is based on an average carlot of 100 hogs, eighty being the minimum carload.

Your assertion that there was a discrimination of $1 per hog seems therefore too high—

That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, I want this corrected.

—except in the case of a 400 pound hog, which would be about correct.

Mr. Blackwell, manager of the Saskatoon stock yards, explains that because there is a keen demand for hogs at present, the practice of paying 20 cents less for trucked-in hogs has been discontinued. Does he mean that when this demand is satisfied the practice will be revived? As a matter of fact the farmers can better afford to lose 20 cents per 100 pounds on hogs when there is a "keen demand" for them than when not. Who gets the 40 cents per hog?

Mr. Blackwell in this article starts out with saying: "As far as the stock yards is concerned there has never been any greater difference than 4 cents per hog," and yet a man trucking hogs into Saskatoon received 59 cents less per hog than if shipped by rail. Who got the balance? Does it cost this amount for service? If so why let the farmer have 40 cents of it now? Mr. R. Grant Thompson, secretary of the Saskatchewan Live Stock Pool, draws a herring across the trail and confuses the issue. He explains by comparing charges in Saskatoon with United States yards, which had nothing to do with your question. Even the Hon. Mr. Weir evades the question, according to the report in the Star Pheonix. He said that a careful study of the stock yards in the past year had been made throughout Canada, and that his information was that the extra fee of $1 was not per hog but per truck. Where did he get this information? It must have been the wildest of guesses.

Then he goes on to say something about the minister which I do not propose to read into the record, and he concludes with these words:

Your question has not been answered and the public are looking to you to get the correct one.

I have two or three other letters here, but I do not intend to weary the committee by reading them because they are along the same line. These men have proven that there is a discrimination to a greater extent than the minister admitted when we discussed this question last. I have here a letter from a farmer in O'Malley who claims that he is penalized one hog in twenty when they are shipped by truck. I have another letter here from Brancepeth, Saskatchewan, in which a similar complaint is made, and both these writers ask me to press for an answer from the minister. The hon. gentleman has had some time in which to investigate and review this question. I do not wish to read these letters into the record because I think the first one placed very plainly before the minister the position of the farmer who trucks his hogs to the stockyards in the west.

Hon. ROBERT WEIR (Minister of Agriculture): As I recall it, the statement made by the hon. member the last time this matter was discussed was that there was a discrepancy of $1 per hog. I am sure the committee will realize that no person can give definite information with regard to this discrepancy unless he knows the number of hogs in a carload or in a truck. The answer I gave was that the difference would be roughly $1 a truck load, the extra cost being the fairest estimate the stockyards feel they can make as to the extra charge for the greater amount of work necessary in handling hogs delivered by truck, because sometimes they have to handle six or seven shipments instead of one. The hon. member for South Battleford notified me of his intention to make this correction and read the letters to which he has referred. I took the opportunity to secure a statement with reference to comparative prices for the handling of hogs in the Saskatoon stockyards, whether by rail or by truck. The following are the figures furnished me:

By rail, average car of 80 hogs:	
Unloading per car	$ 1 00
Fire insurance per car	0 15
Cleaning and disinfecting car	0 75
Yardage 80 hogs at 8 cents	6 40
Feed, approximately 4 cwt. at $1.50	6 00
Commission per car	10 00
	$24 30

Per hog 30.4 cents.

By truck, say 15 hogs in truck load or driven in:	
Unloading, no charge	—
Fire insurance	$ 0 10
Cleaning and disinfecting, no charge	—
Yardage 15 hogs at 8 cents	1 20
Feed (truck hogs not fed before sale)	—
Service charge 4 cents per hog	0 60
Commission 25 cents each	3 75
	$ 5 65

Per hog 37.6 cents.

That is a difference of 6·8 cents per hog. It is not necessary for me to make any comment on these figures. In these letters certain items have been selected, and I think the comparison is not altogether fair with regard to the cost of hogs delivered by truck and those delivered by rail.

Mr. VALLANCE: I should like to ask the minister the date of the memorandum to which he referred.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): It bears no date, but these are the accepted charges.

Mr. VALLANCE: Then I should like to read a portion of another letter in order to prove that while the statement just made by the minister may be quite correct to-day it was not correct when this question was under consideration previously. This is a

letter dated April 18, 1933, addressed to myself:

Dear Sir,—

We wish to voice our appreciation of your effort to find out why farmers who deliver hogs by truck, or any other conveyance other than the train service, to some of our stock yards are penalized.

Saskatoon stopped doing so during this past winter after the roads were blocked. They may start doing so again soon for roads are opening up.

Neither is Moose Jaw quoting "trucked-in" prices right now. But Prince Albert is and has been for the past year or so.

The penalty is 20 cents per hundredweight. Bacon hogs to-day are (in P.A. carlots $4.45 and local or "trucked-in," $4.20.

This represents a considerable loss to each farmer for each load even and then consider what it means to the average farmer over a period of time; say one year.

That is not from the constituency of South Battleford, either. I do not need to read further; I only want to show that probably the information just given the committee by the minister is correct to-day, but when this letter was written the stock yards had just ceased penalizing the farmer who trucked in his hogs, and they did so simply because no hogs were coming in trucks. What they are exercised about now, and the reason I am directing this matter to the attention of the minister, is that since the roads are open we should see to it that this practice is not permitted in the stock yards of western Canada. As I said previously, it always appears to me that whether a farmer drives his hogs ahead of him or whether he brings them by truck or in any other conveyance he should receive the same treatment that is accorded the farmer who ships in carload lots.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The figures I gave are the accepted charges throughout the year. There has been no change since the committee considered these items previously. If the farmer feels that there is anything unfair in the charges he should report it to the stock yard agent, who is an official of the government, and he will report it immediately to the department, when the necessary steps will be taken to remove as far as possible any discrimination that exists.

Mr. VALLANCE: If I hand to the minister the communications I have received will he consider this an announcement to the department that there is some discrepancy?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): I would not make a speech at this time but the matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the minister is of considerable importance. In the United Kingdom-Canada treaty, article 6 contains a provision with regard to the guaranteed market in Great Britain for 2,500,000 hundredweight of bacon and hams. I noticed in a paper published in Ontario that since the treaty went into effect the quality of Canadian bacon was going down relatively. We are all familiar with the argument that the exportable surplus determines the price in Canada. If that is so it is something which is very important from the point of view of the Canadian hog raiser. I have received from the department the live stock and meat trade review for November, December, January and February and also the weekly reports for April. I find that in November, when I believe the treaty went into effect, Canadian and Danish bacon were selling within 2 shillings per hundredweight of each other in Great Britain—62 shillings for the Canadian and 64 shillings for the Danish. That was the closing top for November, 1932. The average was 55 shillings for the Canadian and 56 shillings and sixpence for the Danish, or a spread of one shilling and sixpence per hundredweight. From that time the spread between Danish and Canadian bacon has increased, until in April, 1933, the average on the British market was 70 shillings for the Canadian bacon and 80 shillings for the Danish, or a spread of 10 shillings per hundredweight.

I thought that possibly because of the increased demand or at any rate the increased market, there was a tendency towards shortage of the good type to send to Great Britain. Looking up the records, however, showing the quantity of hogs coming forward to the markets in Canada, as well as the quality and grading, I find that the grading has certainly been keeping up, but it seems that the packing end of the industry has been falling down. The packers are continually circularizing the farmer through the bulletin of the industrial and development council of Canadian packers. They have always said that farming is one half of the live stock industry and packing the other. We have had a hog grading policy in this country for ten years, and there has appeared a marked improvement in the quality of Canadian hogs coming forward to the market, and it seems to me to have been demonstrated that the packers in Canada, if they wish to, can put on the British market a product that is up to the Danish, and at a price equal to theirs. The inference must be therefore that they are falling down where there is no justification for failure. I would

ask the minister to inquire into this matter and if there is no definite improvement then I suggest that at the next session there should be an inquiry into the whole subject to ascertain the trouble.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The spread between cured Danish bacon of the best grade and cured Canadian bacon of the best grade is on the average, I think, around 8 to 10 shillings per hundredweight. I was surprised when the hon. member said that the spread at one time had shrunk to as little as one shilling, if that was for the best bacon in both grades. It is possible that owing to the restrictions imposed by the government of the United Kingdom on Danish bacon the quality of that product might have gone up. The supply of it of course was only four-fifths of what it had been previously, and those who had developed a taste for it and formed the habit of purchasing Danish bacon might, by their demands for it when the commodity was scarcer, have raised the price. It is also possible that at that time Canadian bacon was scarcer and that those who wanted to have it when it was not available similarly raised the price by their demands. Another point which is perhaps of small consideration on the whole is nevertheless worth mentioning. The spread might have been the result of the sum total of a number of causes, one of them being this. When the United Kingdom decided that it would restrict imports of bacon to such an extent as to raise the price of the primary product in that market, Denmark had to decrease her exports of bacon to the United Kingdom by 20 per cent. So that they could get into the United Kingdom market the greatest number of pounds of the highest quality bacon, the processors of bacon in Denmark adopted the method of cutting from five to six pounds from each side of the bacon, and what they cut off from either side was the poorest bacon. The result was that it raised the average quality of their bacon, and that might have had some effect.

So far as the department is concerned, there has been no difference in the instructions given to our graders, nor has there been any difference in the operations of the graders themselves. In Denmark they have one considerable advantage over us in the grading of hogs in that the entire kill is graded on the rail. We have given a good deal of effort to seeing whether we cannot in Canada also work out some system whereby hogs can be graded on the rail. One of the greatest difficulties has been overcome, that of identity. Different means of maintaining the identity of the hog, from the time it left the farmyard until it reached the slaughter house, had been tried—branding with indelible ink and so on—but such methods were not satisfactory. However, we have at last devised a method that should leave grading very little subject to error in maintaining the identity of the hog as shipped from farm to slaughter house. But the farmer who ships his hogs and sells them on the basis of grading on the rail will have to wait for final payment until the animal has been slaughtered. To illustrate with an extreme case, there are a great number of hogs that are shipped from western Canada, in particular from Edmonton, as far east as Moncton, New Brunswick. Coming through Moncton last fall I was surprised to learn that live hogs had been shipped to that point from Edmonton. I admit that that is an extreme case but I am sure that the farmers would hesitate quite a while before being in favour of waiting that long for their returns. There would be another difficulty which would confront us before we could adopt the policy of grading on rail. Some of the biggest losses in the packing of hogs are caused by bruises or injuries en route. When strange groups of hogs are put with other strange groups they are liable to fight with each other and the teeth and hoof marks make bruises which prevent the bacon being put in the top class. A farmer might have ten select hogs which because of bruises in shipment, either by truck or rail, would not grade as select. A peculiar thing is that hogs shipped by truck are more liable to bruises than those shipped in car lots. If the car lot shipment takes two or three days en route to market the hoof and tooth marks may almost entirely disappear, and they do sometimes disappear entirely as far as leaving any marks on the slaughtered animal is concerned. We realize that grading on rail is a much more accurate method of grading but we have some difficulties yet to overcome.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I discussed this matter with the minister two or three weeks ago and at that time he gave me much the same answer he has given the committee to-night. I conveyed the information I received to one or two farmers in Ontario who had drawn this matter to my attention and I would not like to tell the minister the words they used when they heard his explanation. I simply say this to indicate that the farmer is exceedingly sceptical concerning this whole business. One of these farmers is one of the foremost men in the province of Ontario. He lives at Burlington and the minister may know him, his name being Somerset. He tells me that the farmers in his district are con-

vinced that the packers are taking advantage of the market and are not grading the farmers' hogs up to the bacon type. This provides more bacon than the graded hogs would justify. In other words, he alleges they are breaking our market in Great Britain by shipping to places where below grade bacon will be accepted. The figures given by the hon. member for Peace River would appear to indicate that there is some validity in the charges made by these men. Has the minister considered the absolute necessity of grading bacon for export? It is my firm opinion that sooner or later the minister will reach the stage where he will decide that both bacon and hams should be graded for export by government graders. Only in that way can we maintain the quality of our products, as we have maintained the quality of our grain by similar methods.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The information which I gave when I spoke before was obtained not from the packers but from the personal and impartial observations of our own officials. As I told the hon. member for Bow River when we discussed this matter, we have given consideration to the question of the grading of finished products before export. As yet no machinery has been worked out but we hope to get over the difficulties incident to grading on the rail and establish the two systems at as early a date as possible.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would not the establishment of a marketing board facilitate work of this character?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): No, I would think not.

Mr. BROWN: There is a matter I would like to bring to the attention of the minister. I would have brought this to his attention earlier but my information came to hand only to-day. The minister may not be prepared to give me an answer at the moment but I would be quite willing to obtain an explanation later on. I will read a letter which I received from Snowflake, Manitoba, as follows:

> Could you find out from Mr. Weir why they buy bulls in Ontario and ship them out west when we have plenty of them out here. I think it is unfair to the breeders here to bring bulls from the east. There are a number of bulls brought into the Carman district and the breeders here would like to know what the bulls cost in the east. There are eight or ten bulls here in the Snowflake district and good ones too that the farmers would be pleased to sell. Would be pleased if you could find what those bulls cost in the east.
>
> [Mr. E. J. Garland.]

I am not always in favour of buying at home but it does seem that where animals of equal merit can be secured within a very short distance of where they are to be used, it would be a wise policy to purchase them. I do not know what the situation is in regard to prices. If the minister can tell me now what was paid for these animals, I should be glad to receive the information but if not, I can get it at a later date.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): We had buyers at the spring shows in the west to purchase sires that were considered to be of a quality high enough to meet the demands of the policy. If anything, the prices did not vary very much although they were perhaps a little cheaper in Ontario. These men bought a large proportion of the bulls available that were of the quality required. It might be that the animals referred to by the hon. member's correspondent were not of the breed that is in demand.

Mr. BROWN: They would be Shorthorns.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): We are very anxious to locate dual purpose Shorthorns in numbers much greater than we have been able to obtain up to date. As far as we are able we purchase everything that is up to standard in the west for the west and similarly as far as the east is concerned. If this man has a number of animals of a superior type, we shall be glad to make inquiries if the hon. member will give us his name. Of course he realizes than an animal sometimes looks very different to the man who owns it.

Mr. BROWN: Do I understand that animals are purchased only at the sales?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): No, we purchase them outside the sales when we can locate them.

Mr. McINTOSH: The minister stated that the average marketing cost for hogs in carloads of eighty was 30·4 cents and delivered by truck, 37·6 cents. He then went on to say that the difference in the average marketing cost, one way as compared with the other, was 6 cents and a fraction. I am wondering if the minister is right, as the figures I gave would make a difference of 7·2 cents.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): That would be correct.

Mr. McINTOSH: Should we not have the record straight?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I made the calculation as I was reading and may have made a mistake.

Mr. BROWN: Can the minister give me the prices paid for the animals purchased in the east?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): That depends upon the quality and breed of the animals. If the hon. member will let me have the name of his correspondent we shall be glad to have one of our officials go and investigate the matter, provided it does not entail too large an expense. I shall be glad to give my hon. friend a detailed report of the prices we paid.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): Is Canada at the present time shipping any appreciable number of bulls to the old country for breeding purposes?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Not for breeding, just for canning purposes.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): I had sent to me a few days ago a communication referring in a very uncomplimentary manner to stock that had been rejected for breeding purposes here being sent to the old country and classed as breeding stock. If the minister says that breeding cattle are not being sent to the old country in any numbers, I shall not bother with the matter. Much of the stock, it was claimed, was not of a character high enough to be licenced for breeding purposes in the old country.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): After the removal of the restrictions for cattle trading, it was possible for us to ship to the old country to inland points, males and females. Many bulls that were purchased here at two, two and a quarter and two and a half cents per pound for canners and that were purchased here as such, were bought by some of the old country farmers at the stockyards. It was not intended when they were purchased and shipped from here that they would be taken out as breeding animals, and a good deal of dissatisfaction was caused in the old country by this being done. The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries there got in touch with me and I had no hesitation in cabling him that any animals which were shipped as commercial animals were to be slaughtered unless the females passed the port inspector, and that other animals for breeding purposes would be shipped as such with their pedigrees, so that the difficulty has been completely cleared up.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The matter brought up by the hon. member for Peace River strikes me as being somewhat important and serious, especially as we have been looking forward to the gradual development and very great increase of our trade in hams and bacons in the old country. I can quite appreciate that there may be a good deal of weight in the minister's suggestion that the average value and quality of Danish bacon may be on the increase as the number exported may have diminished; it will be the poroest quality that will be kept at home and the best will be exported. But an average spread of ten shillings a hundredweight, not for the average, but for the very best quality, is serious and it seems to me that it brings up the question whether the packers on our side are taking advantage of the British market to ship bacon and ham that is not of the very best quality. That, of course, is doubly serious. On the one hand it is going to discredit Canadian bacon and ham on the British market and make it extremely difficult for us to take advantage of that market as we had hoped. On the other, as our domestic prices are largely determined by the export price, if we do not succeed in securing the highest possible export price, this will have a detrimental effect on the market as a whole.

In speaking of the possibility of controlling the situation, the minister was asked, I think by the hon. member for Bow River, whether he did not believe the establishment of a marketing board would not have some effect on the matter. I understood the minister to say that he did not think it could. In the former discussion which took place in the house on the subject of a marketing board, it was suggested that one of the definite functions of such a board should be to see that the animals, meats and other products under its control, that were exported, came up to a proper export standard for the very purpose of avoiding what apparently is now taking place; that is, by seeing to it that nothing save the very best left Canada for the old country, that the credit of this country and the standard of quality for the dominion in our cattle meats and dairy products as well as in grain, should be kept to the highest possible mark. In view of the great importance of the question, an inquiry should be instituted to ascertain whether the suggestion made is correct that at least some of the packers, not all of them, are in fact shipping to the old country as No. 1 Wiltshire bacon and ham, commodities which do not come up to that quality and which have not been purchased here as such, and by so doing are destroying our market. Should this be proven to be the case, I should like the minister to consider very seriously the question of controlling that situation, because it affects not merely this year's business but our hopes of developing a market worth

while in the old country under the terms of the British trade agreements. May I ask the minister, if he has the records here: How much in the way of bacon and ham we have shipped over to the old country during the first months of this year, and how does the amount compare with what was shipped last year? The figures would bear upon the question whether we are increasing our trade and taking advantage of the market.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): We have kept in very close touch with the quality of bacon that has been shipped to the United Kingdom, so close a touch that we know a number of shipments were made that were decidedly below standard and they were checked up and traced to their source, though it is not advisable to mention it. But the machinery is being developed and we hope at no very distant date we shall be in a position to undertake the inspection of all agricultural products, manufactured or otherwise, that are exported to the United Kingdom. It must not be understood that we would think at the present time of allowing only No. 1 grade to be exported, because as regards bacon, for example, if we were to permit only the top grade to be exported, this might have a detrimental effect on the market at home by keeping our inferior product here. The hon. member for Red Deer has mentioned cattle. The poor quality of some of our cattle that were exported this spring was brought very emphatically to my attention at the time of the export. I looked into the matter carefully and the facts I obtained were these: that 87½ per cent of cattle that up to that time were exported to the United Kingdom were purchased by old country buyers themselves who had been operating on their home markets for years and who knew better than anyone else the quality they should have there for sale. Mr. Brown of Manchester who has purchased by far the largest percentage of our cattle, stated, that on any shipload he purchased he wanted some of each different quality with of course the highest percentage of good cattle; he also wanted some mediocre cattle and he could handle a few of the cheapest and poorest type of what we call our canner cow. He had a few clients for one quality, a few for another, and a number no doubt for the best quality of our goods. His feeling was this—and I was influenced a good deal in that connection because he is one of our biggest purchasers—that if he could not get in this country the kind of animal he wanted to meet his market in the old land, or, if he were purchasing in Calgary or Winnipeg and after he had purchased were to send a representative there who did not understand the old country market as well as he did and would eliminate some of the animals he had purchased, this would have a tendency to drive him off the market. That was why the action was taken. I appreciate as fully as hon. members opposite do—who I am sure realize this—the danger of creating in the old country a poor name for our cattle that are exported.

Bacon exports for the first three months of this year and last year are as follows:

Year	Exports pounds
1933	11,562,300
1932	5,648,000

Mr. SPEAKMAN: What the minister has said is perfectly true. I do not think any exception could be taken to permitting the old country buyer to come to this country and buy any cattle he wished. Nor would there be any great objection to the sale of inferior bacons, if they were purchased as such, so labelled and sold as such in the old country. That is not the point to which I had reference. The suggestion has been made, not merely in this House of Commons but throughout the country, that hogs have been bought as grades lower than select, butchered, made into Wiltshire bacons and sold in the old country as No. 1 Wiltshire sides. There could be no harm in selling the second grade quality if the product sold were represented and labelled as second grade. The difficulty comes in, however, when second grade quality is bought, but afterwards sold as first grade, thereby destroying the reputation for first grade quality. I should think we would not be so much interested in making certain that none but first grade goes to the old country, but rather that we should make certain that the customer buying first grade receives what he buys. If he buys second grade and receives second grade, it is his own lookout. That is the point to which I had reference, namely, that we should make certain that sharp practice which is suspected on the part of some farmers and some factories—I am using no names—whereby they buy lower grades which they sell as No. 1 and for which they receive the select price, should be discontinued.

Mr. VALLANCE: On previous occasions, probably two or three times during this session, there has been up for discussion a matter which in my opinion has been and still is of vital importance to the cattle breeders in Canada. I refer to the shipment of 100,000 head of Canadian cattle to Russia. The Prime Minister and probably the Minister of Trade and Commerce have taken some part in the

discussion of this matter. Hon. members will recall that on one occasion the Prime Minister promised that one item in the Department of Agriculture would be held up so that the Minister of Agriculture would be afforded an opportunity of speaking to this matter. Naturally the country is looking forward to this discussion, and is anxious to receive an expression of opinion from the minister concerning the suggested shipment of 100,000 head of Canadian cattle.

I have before me a return for which I asked earlier in the session. It contains telegrams from various organizations urging the Minister of Agriculture to put forward his best efforts to consummate the deal. Going through the correspondence I find that the minister has been sympathetic towards the deal, and to-day the cattle breeders are wondering why it did not go through. I should like the minister to avail himself of this oportunity to state to the country why the deal did not go through, after encouragement had been given to the live stock industry in Canada.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In the first place the hon. member has stated that I was sympathetic to this much-discussed and much-advertised cattle deal with Russia. I have every sympathy with the trade and have done everything I could at all times not only in this but in other connections, to supply information to any person who wished to carry on trade in agricultural products. Especially am I in favour, so far as our legislation will permit, of trade between Canada and other countries in any kind of agricultural products. I believe the correspondence which has been laid on the table is the best record of the whole matter. So far as I know under the existing statutes or legislation there is nothing to prevent any person from trading with Russia or with any other country.

Mr. YOUNG: Except the embargo.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Under the legislation of the country, as I said.

Mr. YOUNG: Except the embargo.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Is that not part of the legislation?

Mr. YOUNG: Not a very desirable part.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): That is a matter of opinion. When Mr. Serkau came to me the chief purpose of his visits was to get information as to the quality and number of cattle we had for export. He wished to know also if there was anything to prevent selling our cattle to Russia. I referred him to the Department of National Revenue so that he might learn the conditions under which he would have to carry on trade. As the correspondence will show, Mr. Serkau considered those conditions eminently satisfactory. I gave him information upon all occasions he asked for it, and that was the limit of my activity in the matter.

Mr. VALLANCE: The return which was laid on the table at my request proves what the minister has said, namely, that he facilitated Mr. Serkau's effort, and encouraged him to go ahead with the deal. The minister went so far as to give Mr. Serkau the code which might be used while that gentleman was in Russia. The point which occurs to me, however, is this, that after all the encouragement the minister gave and all the expense to which Mr. Serkau was put, he must have had some assurance from some source that he had at least a chance of putting through the deal. I am not entirely satisfied with the explanation given by the minister because the record I have before me proves to me—and I do not wish to do the minister an injustice—that he encouraged Mr. Serkau in his effort. It must have cost a great amount of money to go even as far as he went. As the hon. member for Weyburn has said, probably the embargo is the cause, or it may have been the statement made by the Prime Minister to the effect that we would have no trade with Russia.

I believe the minister agrees, as he states, in some of the communications I have before me, that such a deal would have been beneficial. I notice here a series of telegrams sent to the minister. One from Myrtle, Manitoba, is as follows:

Hon. Robert Weir,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Impending deal with Russia as reported in press the best news cattle men have received for some time. If consummated will give great encouragement so badly needed at present time. Better cattle markets means more money for other commodities. Sincerely hope you may be successful in closing this deal.

James B. Davidson.

That telegram was dated December 28, 1932. The minister's reply is dated December 29, the following day, and is as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your telegram of December 28 reading as follows:

"Impending deal with Russia as reported in press is the best news cattle men have received for some time. If consummated will give great encouragement so badly needed at present time. Better cattle markets mean more money for other commodities. Sincerely hope you may be successful in closing this deal."

This seems a repetition, although it is addressed and signed by the minister. The

letter is dated on the following day and sent to Mr. James B. Davidson. This all indicates that the minister did give this organization some encouragement, and there is still in the back of the minds of the farmers the feeling that they did not get a square deal, that the matter was not given the consideration that it ought to have had.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Did the hon. member not make a mistake in giving the impression that my reply was a telegram to him? Was not my reply a letter quoting his telegram?

Mr. MULLINS: I am somewhat surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite bringing up that foolish deal. There is nothing to it; you are only playing politics. It was the most foolish deal I have ever heard of; I have been in the cattle export trade for fifty years. It is not possible to ship cattle to Russia; you would land only shadows. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken knows that you cannot have cattle twenty-two days at sea and land anything but a bunch of skeletons. I wonder that the Minister of Agriculture did not ask a few questions of someone who has been in the business—

Mr. CASGRAIN: Condemnation of the government.

Mr. MULLINS: Now let me tell you about Mr. G. G. Serkau, because I do not think you know anything about him. He put his hand in the public treasury of Manitoba years ago—I have the list right here. I will say it outside the house as well as inside if Mr. G. G. Serkau wishes; I am not hiding behind the privileges of the house. Here is a list of the foolish deals that the Manitoba government made down through the Liberal regime and into the present regime, giving the farmers cattle at $120 and $110 apiece that were worth $30 and never should have been bought at any higher price. A lot of cows were bought and placed with farmers, and I have the list here—I will read it for your information and then I think you should be done with this matter for all time to come. And Mr. G. G. Serkau is on the list as the greatest debtor of any of them. He put his hand in the public treasury of Manitoba before he ever came here, yet you will not give credit to the man who said no when he looked at it. Serkau wanted to put his hand in this treasury and get $4,000,000 to go and play with when he had already received money from the province of Manitoba to the extent of hundreds.

An hon. MEMBER: How did he do it?

[Mr. Vallance.]

Mr. MULLINS: He got it by way of loan from the Manitoba government, and has never paid the loan back. Why would you mention a man like that? He is not a cattle man, nor are any of those associated with him cattle men. The cattle business is on too high a plane, no one in it would do a thing like that; if they borrow money they repay it. It is an insult from the opposition side of the house to say that he was a cattle man. "G. G. Serkau"—many years ago I saw that name on the list, and I wondered if it was still there. It took me a long time to get it, but I had one of my friends ask for a return in the Manitoba house and they brought it down. He owes them interest and principal which he has never paid. Now I ask my hon. friend from South Battleford (Mr. Vallance), would he trust a man like that with $4,000,000?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): He might make enough profit to reimburse the province.

Mr. MULLINS: He borrowed $1,500, to put cattle out; with interest it amounts now to $1,750, and he never repaid the government. If Mr. Serkau wishes I will make the statement outside the house, I am not writ proof.

An hon. MEMBER: Let's go out.

Mr. MULLINS: I am sorry the hon. gentleman fell in with him. I saw the Toronto Star full of it, but any man who has ever been in the business would know it was a fool deal. It would have been a nice thing for those gentlemen to have the government of Canada guarantee them against loss. I have never had anyone guarantee me against loss, and I have been exporting for over fifty years. This man is a German lawyer, and I don't believe he knows a cow from a heifer.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Explain.

Mr. MULLINS: They are getting back into live stock in Saskatchewan, but I see they are going down on mules. I see they have less mules in Saskatchewan than they formerly had.

An hon. MEMBER: They are going up on jackasses.

Mr. MULLINS: For the information of the hon. gentlemen opposite I may say that you cannot ship cattle to any Russian port and land them in any kind of condition. Twenty-two days at sea! Mr. Chairman, twelve days at sea and your ship should be docking or your cattle will not be in very good shape. I remember having cattle on a ship that

broke her shaft in mid-ocean and drifted down to the Azores; she was twenty-two days out, and the cattle were not worth anything —they could scarcely walk ashore. How would you take cattle from here and land them in a Russian port? I am astonished at intelligent men trying to bring that deal up again; I thought it was dead. You know that that is not a man you would place confidence in or give money to. What a godsend it is that there is a man at the helm of this old ship called Canada who can say no.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is it at sea?

Mr. MULLINS: That is one of our difficulties, making this kind of fool deals and getting us into the mess you have got us in.

While I am on my feet I am going to say a few plain words to the minister. I say to him: Go to the stock yards with some practical man; go out over the west and then go to the old country and see the conditions of the markets. Unless you have live stock on the farms in western Canada or any country, agriculture cannot succeed. This afternoon out at Renfrew, I walked through the best herd of Hereford cattle that I ever saw. That looks like a healthy business, but the minister should go to the stock yards with a practical man, not with a packer, and not with Mr. Todd. I say that because he is the smoothest lobbyist who has been around these quarters for some time. Take some man who has had some practical experience; I will find you plenty of them who will give the time, men who can tell you about bruising hogs. Go to the bacon market and look at the sides of bacon that come out of the cases all bruised, and selling as second grade. My friends ask how it gets to be second grade; go and watch your agricultural students grading these hogs and see them put them through the gates. It is not done by the trucks, it is not the cars, it is these students grading the farmer's hogs. Leave the farmer alone. If you want to put anyone in there get a practical man, one whose life has been forged on the anvil of practical experience, not one of these theorists out of a college. There are too many of them wearing a $10 hat on a $2 head. It is the practical end I want to see put into operation. I have sat here and listened to hon. gentlemen opposite speak on various subjects, but the most important question in this country to-day is the success of the live stock industry. I have given forty years of my life to the removal of the embargo and I am through; we are into the English market. But not a man opposite would stand up and admit that the channel had been cleared. It took forty years to get cattle back into the English market under the conditions that existed previously; this has been brought about by the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but they are not given any credit from the other side of the house. Now females get into the market just as male cattle do; the avenue is clear and the market is available.

I am not going to make very many more contributions to the live stock industry; I fully intended not to speak on the subject again. After having been told in the agriculture committee how the poor old cow has been exploited I have decided that I have been at the wrong end of the cow all these years. If I had been handling milk, probably I would have made as much as a friend from Montreal made. I sold him a few cows once and it was hard work to pay for them, but I heard him tell that committee that his plant is worth over $2,000,000. I know I did a great deal more work for the farmers than he ever did, but I did not get that much for it. I am anxious for the success of the live stock industry; I do not want it to fail, but if you do not go at it in a practical way it will be a failure all the way through. You can get a lesson from a practical Scotchman just west of here. I did not know he was a Scotchman until I asked him; no wonder it is a success. He has 250 of the best white face cattle I have ever looked at. My hon. friend from North Battleford was there, addressed the meeting and then went out in the field with this gentleman and looked over his herd of cattle. Go to the stock yards and get a few practical men and forget about cooperation. Cooperation is only exploitation; that is what it has been in every market. The farmer has been fooled; they have got him to ship his cattle through that one channel while some fellow draws a big salary and keeps a good fat position for himself.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I remember listening to one of the best broadcasts I ever heard with regard to these cooperative schemes we are talking about. This broadcast was by Bob Schuler, an evangelist in Los Angeles, who said, "Labour, you have a perfect right to be organized so long as some man at your head is not leading you for some specific purpose, to get a job in parliament or something else. Farmers, you are the biggest fools that ever went into organization." That is what he said over the radio, and he went on to say, "I am one of you; I have ten acres of walnuts just outside Los

Angeles, and my wife and I shook hands every year when we sold the walnuts, for which we received $1,600. Then a nice, clever young man, with one of these baby moustaches, came to the door and said we should join up in order to help our brethren get better organization. I went into the organization, and I have never shaken hands with my wife since. I get $400 a year for my walnuts now; that young man gets $30,000 a year and he does not know walnuts from hickory nuts."

How about your grain pool in the west, which you asked me to help get through? I worked hard to put over that idea, thinking it was a good thing, but what a farce it has turned out to be. Some of the men have not been paid for their 1928 crop yet. The farmers are being drawn into some fool scheme all the time. Leave the markets the way we had them in the old days; throw them open. The Minister of Agriculture can do it by a stroke of the pen. You do not want these close restrictions, surrounded by all kinds of fool policies. Who owns the stock yards in Canada, with the exception of a few privately owned yards in the west, which should be under strict supervision. I would have all the live stock shipped to the stock yards; I would not let them go direct to the packers. At present a truck driver will pick up a farmer's hogs out in the country and take them right to the yard of the packer. What will happen the poor farmer? If you knew some of the packers as well as I know them you would say the farmer would not get any the best of it. Who owns one of the stock yards in Winnipeg? It is owned by the three railroads. We own the Canadian National and the Canadian Northern, and that leaves the Canadian Pacific with only a minority say. The government controls the majority of the stock in that yard, so why does not the minister throw it open and give us back the system we had in the old days? You could go to the hay market then and bring back a load of hay for your cattle, but now what do you get? You buy a bale of hay weighing eighty pounds but you pay for a hundred pounds. They ask you to bale it at eighty pounds so it will be easy to lift, but when the poor farmer comes to buy it he pays for a hundred pounds. Look at the bills; they are appalling in comparison with what it cost years ago. It is no wonder the live stock industry is dwindling into insignificance; a man has no chance.

Let me say here, Mr. Chairman, that unless the railroads put back the freight rates to the level of forty years ago, and reduce them by forty per cent, no man will be able to farm successfully in western Canada, particularly in regard to live stock. When the road was coupled up at Jackfish in 1885 they said to us, "Give us fourteen cars of cattle and we will give you a trainload rate." There was a crew of five on that train and we paid 60½ cents a hundred from Winnipeg to Montreal. To-day a train consists of seventy-five cars of cattle, but the crew still numbers only five, and the railway companies charge up the increased cost to labour, though it is not labour. They are paying the men a little more money, but they are not being paid too much. The late James Hill went out through Montana and the Dakotas to make a survey of what was wrong with the farmers in order to see why they were going bankrupt and leaving the land. He came home and cut freight rates in half.

Hon. gentlemen opposite harp about the tariff. They remind me of a Chinese concert I heard in Vancouver; it was played all on one string. Why not be big enough and broad enough to help save the country and the farmers? Why not help meet the situation that exists to-day? The old ship is floundering around in the trough of the sea; why not help guide it safely through? Why play politics all the time? I am surprised at my hon. friend from South Battleford; I never thought he would leave himself wide open by referring to that man Serkau, who has done nothing but exploit the farmers of the west. The Toronto Star fell for it; the headlines said Mr. Bennett should resign. I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite are big enough now to say that Mr. Bennett was right, if they are broadminded enough to say, "You were right about this man. He had his hands in the treasury of Manitoba and you stopped him from getting hold of the funds in Ottawa." I am proud that the Prime Minister did that, and I am sorry that my hon. friend from South Battleford should get up and introduce the subject of shipping cattle to Russia under the Serkau scheme. Unless we wake up and do something right now to bring about an improvement in our pure bred sires and to distribute them throughout the country we are going to be faced with very serious competition from Russia, because representatives of that country are in Scotland right now buying all the pure bred sires they can get hold of. They are going to take those sires back and we are going to face strong competition from them. Let us build up our herds; let us buy more pure breds and distribute them among the farmers so that we can build up the live stock industry of Canada.

Don't let Russia beat us to it. I assure you, it would be impossible to sell anything but top cattle to the Russians; they know what they are about. I saw some of them in Perth, Scotland, once buying pure breds and I would hate to see them come to this country, if that were possible, and take the tops of our cattle, leaving us with the culls. Heaven knows we have enough culls at the present time without getting more. I want us to breed a better grade of cattle in this country. Serkau came to me and made this remark, "You are not too old to go back into business?" I replied, "I don't think I am. What do you mean?" Then he asked me whether I would join him and I said, "No, do you think I would go to the Minister of Trade and Commerce with such a scheme as that? Do you think I would go to the Prime Minister with such a scheme? Why, he would throw me out of his office and he would be justified."

After reading about those cows that came here with Champlain, and having heard how they were exploited, I felt that I ought to say something, and I could not keep still after my hon. friend from South Battleford broke in. I thought I would let him know all about Mr. Serkau.

Mr. VALLANCE: Our good friend from Marquette has on previous occasions read me a similar lecture on the live stock industry. I was interested when he suggested that we could not ship cattle to Russia because of the twenty-two day voyage, because I can remember the time when we made a shipment, though a limited one, that took many more days than that in crossing. The hon. gentleman knows his Bible well enough to answer this question: How did Noah manage to keep his cattle all that time on the ark? I think he will agree that we can ship cattle much more easily than horses, and we have shipped horses to Russia on more than one occasion. So that the objection from the point of view of the voyage is not well founded. Let me tell my hon. friend that I am not through with the cattle industry yet, for it happens that I am not as old as he, and naturally I am looking to a somewhat longer future in the business. I can assure him that my interest in the farmer and in the cattle breeder is as great as his own, and it was because of that interest I have in them that I wanted us to ship 100,000 head of cattle. I wanted that done in the interests of the cattle producers. As late as 1921 we were able to ship to the United States five times that number in one year, whereas last year we shipped only 18,000. We have shipped a few cattle to the old country, but what the industry needs to-day, as proved by the record that was tabled in the house, is a wider market. We need more markets. My chief reason for getting up to-night was to give the minister, and the Prime Minister as well, an opportunity to tell the country why that attitude was taken with regard to the Serkau deal. So far as Serkau is concerned, I knew nothing about him. My hon. friend from Marquette told me privately what he has told the house to-night and through the house the country; he was the one that made me acquainted with the facts. There is nothing in this document tabled in the house that would indicate to me that what he has read to-night is true. In Mr. McDonald especially Mr. Serkau had a real business man who knew the cattle business probably as well as my hon. friend from Marquette.

Mr. MULLINS: I admit that we did ship a good many cattle to the United States, but I would ask all practical men in this house this question. What man among them, if it were not for some political reason, would ship a well-bred growing yearling out of the country to be processed in the United States? Certainly I would not do it. If I had a well-bred yearling on my farm I do not think the United States would get it. I have seen calves leaving Winnipeg on their way to the United States, trainloads of cattle starved for two days until they got on the scales under 1,000 pounds. Our cattle industry has been ruined by inexperienced men who have got into the business. We shipped to the United States in 1930, just when this government was coming into office, 35,000 yearlings, well-bred animals; also trainloads of calves leaving the ranches to find their way to Minneapolis. Would not that spell disaster to the cattle trade? Surely any practical man knows that this sort of thing was the ruination of the industry. Some poor chap found himself under the necessity of going to the barn and taking out a yearling which he had to sacrifice for binder twine. My sympathy goes out to that man. That is the type of man I want to help become successful so that he will not have to make such sacrifices. Let me point out that that is not the logical market for yearlings. They do not want your 1,000 pound cattle; they want small cattle. Personally I do not care where they go after they have passed that weight.

Now, what is the use of fitting up ships to take cattle overseas when with a change of government a high duty is imposed upon them? It simply means the disruption of the

trade. We were sending constant shipments of cattle to the British market, and receiving in western Canada splendid returns, but a restriction was put on on the other side with the result that our trade was disrupted—the most important industry in the west. I do not regard it as second to wheat, because you cannot grow wheat unless you fertilize the land and you cannot fertilize it without cattle. But I emphasize the fact that the shipping of young cattle is absolutely wrong. I want to see a channel opened up to the British market; I want to see ships fitted up so that our cattle men can obtain a market, shipping their cattle at reasonable rates. More than that, I want to see the railways, which are giving cheap rates to passengers, extend cheap rates to the cattle industry. You can keep up the price of wheat; I am not as much interested in that as in cattle, because eventually you will grow more wheat and have better crops by keeping a good stock of cattle on the farm.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Has the minister still in mind the possibility of creating a marketing board at some time? In the part of Canada with which I am familiar, and throughout eastern Canada as well, the farmers' organizations and farmers generally are still very desirous of seeing such a body created. While they do not look to the board to perform miracles, they do look to it as offering the means of bringing some order out of the chaos which now exists in marketing conditions. I hope the minister has not given up the idea.

Mr. MULLINS: Let the farmer alone; he is as good a salesman as anybody.

Mr. DONNELLY: I understand that this company in Winnipeg approached the government to ask for financial backing or a financial guarantee before they made these shipments to Russia or before the deal with Russia was completed. I understand also that when their suggestion was turned down, some little time afterwards they agreed to go on with the deal without any financial guarantee; all they wanted was an assurance of what the regulations would be in the future. I was told by one of the officials of a well known oil company that they had approached the government in connection with this matter. They were willing to finance the deal, buy the cattle and take Russian oil in exchange provided the government would assure them that the regulations would not be changed. They could not get this assurance and for that reason the deal was not put through. I was told this by two officials in the oil company and I should like to know the reason why this assurance was not given to Mr. Serkau and the oil company. The same thing happened in connection with the importation of gasoline from Roumania. We found that gasoline could be laid down at Montreal for six cents a gallon but we could not get any assurance from the government as to what the rate of duty would be or whether any dumping duty would be applied. Can the minister give us any reason why this assurance was not given to either one of these companies?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): As far as I am aware, no such proposition was put up to the government by any oil company. However, granting that it had been put up in the manner the hon. member for Willow Bunch suggests it was, I think, had he been in the place of any member of the government he would have had no hesitation in stating that no government could give an assurance as to what the tariff on any commodity would be in the future. If the government did that for any company or for any individual they would be establishing a precedent and would have to act similarly in the case of all such requests. This would tie the hands of government absolutely.

Mr. YOUNG: A very excellent precedent.

Mr. STEWART (Lethbridge): Early in December of last year the press of southern Alberta carried a dispatch stating that a shipment of seventeen carloads of poultry was then between Montreal and Moncton to be shipped to the London market from Saint John. Has the minister any information as to the extent of the poultry shipments last Christmas from Canada to the United Kingdom? Did these shipments have any beneficial effect upon the local market by eliminating surplus stock, and did the producer in Canada obtain a higher price because of these shipments? What are the prospects for increasing our poultry trade in Great Britain and what percentage of that market can Canada supply? Did we receive any benefits under the Ottawa agreements as far as poultry shipments to Great Britain are concerned?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In November of last year the Canadian poultry pool investigated the possibility of obtaining wider markets for poultry. Inquiries were made in the United Kingdom but replies were received to the effect that there was no market there, that the market was glutted. In spite of this information they decided to make a trial shipment. The first shipment was collected

in Manitoba from four points just outside of Winnipeg. A number of carloads were got together. Great care was exercised in the method in which this poultry was prepared and shipped and careful records were kept of the temperatures of the shipment when en route both by ship and by rail. An effort was made to determine the best possible manner of making future shipments should this trial shipment prove satisfactory. The Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the Department of Trade and Commerce sent Mr. Brown, the chief of the poultry division along with this shipment. Elaborate and carefully prepared publicity was sent along with Mr. Brown and preparations were made to put our poultry before the public of the United Kingdom in the best possible way. I believe there were thirty-three carloads approximating one million pounds of poultry shipped. This shipment received a very fine reception, exceeding all expectations. The poultry sold in the United Kingdom for prices that return to the producer in Canada from three to four cents per pound more than the domestic price at Winnipeg. No one can say what would have happened to the domestic market had this shipment not been made. Inquiries have already been received for from two to three times as much poultry as we shipped last year. I want to take this opportunity to express before this committee my personal appreciation of the vision and foresight of the president of the Canadian Cooperative Poultry Pool in undertaking this trial shipment in spite of all discouragement. Other companies were appointed but declined to participate. When I say that the price received returned three cents per pound more than the domestic price it must not be forgotten that the depreciation in their currency at that time reduced the price of our product by from five to six cents per pound. In the case of shipments this year, the increased value of the pound together with the operations of the stabilization fund will mean a further advantage in price. No person can make an estimate of the amount of poultry that the United Kingdom market can absorb, but there is certainly a prospective demand for Canadian poultry. Under the Ottawa agreements we received a ten per cent preference.

Mr. YOUNG: Did those shippers of poultry know what the rate of duty would be before they shipped?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): There was no duty into the old country.

Mr. YOUNG: They knew that?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): They did know it. There was a preference of ten per cent applying to shipments made after November 15.

Mr. YOUNG: The point I am making is that they knew what they would have to pay in the form of duty.

Mr. MORAND: They had no assurance that it would not be raised.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): There was no duty.

Mr. YOUNG: They knew it?

Mr. MacMILLAN: I understand that some discussion took place in the agriculture committee of the Senate in regard to stock yard charges to farmers. I happen to be a shareholder in a stock yard which I think I can say I was more or less responsible for developing in my own city. It is controlled in Toronto by a bunch of financial racketeers and I know they took thousands of dollars out of the earnings of that yard and developed and extended it further. If my memory serves me aright, last year I received a dividend of 16 per cent, which is not bad. We shareholders can get no infomation. I wrote to the secretary on April 24 asking him for a financial statement and some other questions and he replied on May 12 saying that he had turned my letter over to the president. The president moved the office of the company from a downtown office to his own at the stock yards at Toronto and I presume to-day the stock yard at Saskatoon is probably paying a large portion of the rent of his office, stenographer's fees, and so forth, at the stock yard at Toronto. He soaks the Saskatoon stock yard a large sum as president although he has nothing whatever to do; then the other directors of the company who live at Toronto also soak the yard large sums of money. I should like to suggest to the minister that it might be good business in the interests of stock raisers to hold an investigation into these stock yard charges.

Mr. CASGRAIN: May I ask the minister, if I am in order in doing so on this item, whether he has any reasons to give me why a tubercular tested area has not been established in the county of Saguenay? I spoke to the minister about this matter last year. It was decided to open up such a zone in the counties of Charlevoix, Saguenay, Roberval and Chicoutimi, and I was told that zones were established in those districts with the exception of the county of Saguenay.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I am not sure whether I caught the hon. member's question

correctly, but there is part of Saguenay county that is not included in the restricted area.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why was it not included?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): No application was made for it. The application is made by the municipalities or, I believe in Quebec, by the parishes through the provincial government, but for part of Saguenay county no application was made.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am sorry I have to disagree with the minister because I think this area was established in 1930. Requests and petitions were signed by the municipalities and the farmers' clubs and sponsored by the provincial government at the same time as similar requests were made on behalf of the people in Chicoutimi and Roberval. I think at the same time as the matter was taken up by the hon. member for Chicoutimi I joined with him in signing the petitions and presenting them to the Department of Agriculture. I think one of the reasons given to me last year or the year before was that there were not enough men on the staff of the Department of Agriculture to look after this matter in the late spring and the fall, but it would be attended to as soon as it would be possible to do so. The minister may have confused the matter, because that is one of the answers he gave to me before; he told me that as soon as men were available to attend to the tests he would see to it that the tests were made.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): As I stated, I did not hear the hon. member's question very clearly in the beginning; I thought he was asking why part of Saguenay county was not included. Part of that county was not included because no request came from it. The other parts of the county were included at that time, and no doubt it is this area to which the hon. member has reference. Every effort will be made to carry on the work in that particular district. We are taking every step possible, I may say—and I am sure this will be appreciated fully by the hon. member—to get as many French speaking veterinaries as are available to do the work not only there but in all parts of Quebec where there are French speaking people.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Has the minister at the present time French speaking veterinaries to attend to this work?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): We have a number, but not sufficient to do all the work that there is in Quebec.

[Mr. R. Weir.]

Mr. CASGRAIN: When does he expect that this test will be made?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I could not state definitely.

Mr. SPENCER: Can the minister give the committee any information with respect to the Beatty live stock scheme? I do not know whether it has any connection with the Department of Agriculture, but it received a good deal of advertising when it came into operation a year or so ago.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): That is in no way connected with the Department of Agriculture and I am not in a position to give information concerning it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister give a report on the development of the pure bred sire plan which I think he inaugurated himself? It was a plan by which clubs were to be organized in districts throughout the country and when a number organized a club, they were to share a pure bred sire.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The pure bred sire area policy is a provincial one. The hon. member for Bow River, however, means, I believe, the pure bred sire policy inaugurated by me as head of this department. We have up to the end of March, 1933, some 1,280 pure bred sires, chiefly in districts where it is very difficult for the farmer to get high quality sires. I know of nothing that is more appreciated at the present time by the farmers than that policy. Because of their financial condition it is very difficult, if not impossible for many men who appreciate the value of live stock, especially a soldier settler who is starting in, to purchase such animals, and they value the assistance we have given them. One regrettable feature of the matter, however, is that we have not been able to fill the applications for one strain of sires that is in greatest demand; there are not sufficient animals of the right quality in the country.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Was this policy inaugurated recently by the minister or his department?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In the fall of 1930.

Mr. CASGRAIN: How many districts in Quebec, for instance, have taken advantage of this policy so far?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): We have not the exact number, but a large number of bulls have gone into the province of Quebec. In addition, in that province we have another policy that is particularly suited to it. In conjunction with the provincial government we pay a grant of 50 per cent for young bulls of sufficiently

good quality for dairy purposes that are sent out. A very large number of bulls have been sent out under that policy and quite a number under the other one. In 1931, under the policy that I first described, out of 839, 126 went into Quebec and while under the other policy we have not the number, it was very large.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister, before this part of the subject is disposed of, give us exactly the number of districts served in each of the provinces?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): We have not that exact information here. I believe they are very well distributed throughout the whole dominion. Under this policy there are more animals available proportionately in the west than in the east, because in the east we have supplementary policies such as the one I have described for the benefit of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister give me the figures for Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I have not that information.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister get it ?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Yes, and I shall be glad to give it to the hon. member.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister give us some figures with regard to the grants to owners of sire horses that have been passed by either the dominion or provincial veterinaries? Can he give the amount the government has paid in grants during the past year and, if possible, by provinces?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The hon. member asked for that information on the order paper, did he not?

Mr. SPENCER: No.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Someone did, and we gave the information. However, I shall be glad to let the hon. member have it.

Item agreed to.

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

War veterans' allowances, $1,650,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): When does the minister expect to have functioning the new pensions administration made possible by the legislation of a few days ago?

Hon. MURRAY MacLAREN (Minister of Pensions and National Health): That has not been considered yet. It will probably take some little time to get everything straightened out.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The other evening I discussed with the minister the condition of veterans on relief in the city of Montreal. The minister's reply was not as complete or as sympathetic as I had hoped. This government went into office on a definite pledge to end unemployment, or to perish in the attempt. Someone has suggested that it did not end unemployment, and that Canada is perishing in the attempt.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The government will perish, too.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is little doubt about that. I have in my hand a few statements submitted to me by the department in connection with questions I raised concerning relief for unemployed veterans in the city of Montreal. I refer to those who are on pensions. The committee will understand first of all that a man may receive a pension of a certain amount, and that that pension is supposed to be amplified by a grant from the department. This makes the magnificent sum of $30.60 for two adults, a veteran and his wife. If hon. members will take the trouble to figure it out they will find that the food allowance will be about $8.60 per month for the two persons, $4.30 for each person, or just five cents per meal,—I repeat; five cents per meal. I ask the minister and the committee this question: Do you think that is an adequate allowance for men who when called upon either under draft or voluntarily served their country?

Let us take the case of a married, unemployed veteran. I have before me information respecting a specific case, that of an unemployed married man with three children; I have his name and regimental number. He is receiving a total pension of 25 per cent amounting to $35, plus the amount which he had been paid as unemployment relief from the department, making a total of $41.50. According to the schedule for relief in the city of Montreal that sum is apportioned as follows: food, $19; fuel $5—I cannot imagine heating an apartment in Montreal for five dollars a month—rent $15; gas and light $2.50 —I gather that the lighting and gas service in Montreal must be much cheaper than any of those services with which I have had experience. The $19 allowed for food is utterly inadequate—it means that the five people, two adults and three children, must live on four cents a meal. As a member of this House of Commons I protest against a condi-

tion of that kind continuing in this country especially when we have a government that has promised to end unemployment or perish in the attempt. If they find, as they must have found by this time, that they cannot adequately cope with the problem, they should undertake to issue sufficient funds to the veterans so that those men may be maintained in something like decency, and may be provided with at least ten cents for each meal. That is little enough. It is interesting to note that when the family increases the amount of relief is reduced. When there is one child the allowance is 13⅓ cents per day. If there are two children it amounts to 12⅔ cents, and if there are three, only 12 cents. If there are four it comes back to 14⅓ cents, and if there are six the magnificent sum of 14½ cents is provided. A condition of that kind is in my opinion intolerable and inexcusable. Heaven knows there are sufficient funds which could be secured from those who have great wealth. If this government is afraid to tax wealth, let it issue currency for the purpose of taking care of unemployed veterans.

Mr. SANDERSON: I note in the item that the total expenditure for the fiscal year 1932-33 was $1,500,000. Could the minister give the committee some information as to how this money was paid out to the different provinces?

Mr. MacLAREN: While we are looking up those figures, I shall reply to the hon. member for Bow River. He has said that the amount allowed is too small.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister think it is adequate?

Mr. MacLAREN: It is to help people carry on, and does not necessarily amount to a substantial living, or anything of that kind. As a matter of fact unemployment relief administered through the department is working out reasonably well. I wish that understood. On the whole, under the circumstances of unemployment, poverty and distress, relief as administered is doing reasonably well. That is the report of our officials situated in various parts of Canada. I think we should bear in mind that the intention is to relieve a condition of distress. It is well to remember also that in addition there are earnings which may be made by the individual.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Rubbish; that does not apply to the city of Montreal.

Mr. MacLAREN: The relief may be small, but it is an aid. Receipts up to $10 a month are considered casual earnings, and are not included. There are certain areas in Canada in which relief has been discontinued to men causing agitations. I do not say for a moment that all men who complain are agitators and are causing discontent, but in certain areas there are such, and they are the ones we hear of. Particularly in Montreal and in an adjacent area called Verdun there are men who are agitating and causing a large amount of discontent beyond what is justified. The department is giving not less—and this is the important point—not less than the amount administered to the civilian unemployed. If it is sufficient for the great bulk of the unemployed, so is it sufficient for the veteran with a small pension. But I do say that we are doing rather better, and I believe that the feeling of the country and of the house is that we should do a little better, than is done in the municipalities. That is what we are carrying out. It is a most troublesome and unsatisfactory thing to administer relief to the distressed and those seeking employment. Personally I look forward to the time when the entire system shall be changed and it will be administered in a different way. In the meantime the department is devoting a very great deal of time to the matter—as it should—and doing the best it can, and it is achieving a very considerable amount of satisfaction and affording a great amount of relief.

My hon. friend has asked a question about the war veterans' allowances. May I make this observation about war veterans' allowances: that it is one of the branches coming under the department which is particularly satisfactory. I do not mean that there are no complaints, that there is no trouble,—

Mr. SANDERSON: I am not criticizing it.

Mr. MacLAREN: Well, I do not wish to claim too much for it.

Mr. POWER: Don't do so; you were not responsible for it.

Mr. MacLAREN: It is a very well administered part of the departmental work.

Mr. SANDERSON: I quite agree.

Mr. MacLAREN: It fills a distinct place in the country. Further, there is an increase there of $150,000, and the indications are that for a number of years there will be an increased expenditure, because as time goes on and men get older they qualify for the class.

Mr. POWER: When will the peak be reached?

Mr. MacLAREN: In seventeen years.

Mr. POWER: From the commencement?

Mr. MacLAREN: That is the estimate. I find that from time to time these estimates do not work out exactly as was expected, but that is the estimate to-day. As to the amounts, I can give them according to districts.

District—	Amount
Montreal	$118,621
Halifax	95,418
Ottawa	70,806
Toronto	277,499
London	82,620
Winnipeg	129,626
Regina	71,950
Calgary	102,910
Vancouver	267,279
Saint John	40,963

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wonder if the minister thinks a man is an agitator who protests against relief which provides him and his family with meals at the rate of five cents apiece. Would the minister not agitate under those conditions? I do not think I have ever been so disgusted in this house in twelve years as I have been to-night when I heard the minister rail at these unfortunate people because they are protesting against such a miserable pittance which does not provide them with enough to keep healthy. I ask the minister to go in person into the homes of these people, study the faces of the children, see the pallor of their countenances due to under-nourishment, and ask himself if he does not think that an officer with wealth who applies for a pension is not a more vicious type of agitator than the man who strives to secure a little better than five cents a meal for himself and his children.

The minister says that the basis upon which this relief is granted is that it is sufficient for civilians. I protest that civilian relief is not adequate, has not been adequate since the beginning of this depression; but to put a soldier on that same basis is gross injustice and inhumanity. The civilian at least has physical fitness, was not subject to the shocks of war. Here is a case I have under my hand, a man suffering from a gunshot wound in the spine and osteo-myelitis of the left ilium and chronic neurasthenia. Does the minister say that that man is not suffering more than a civilian and is entitled only to the same relief? This condition is intolerable. I do not blame these men for writing letters to this house protesting against such a condition; they would not be Canadians if they did not. It is a wonder to me that they have been so unutterably patient up to this time.

Mr. McINTOSH: I have listened to what the hon. member for Bow River has said, and I think he is speaking largely of item 198 rather than item 206.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am speaking to the point anyway.

Mr. McINTOSH: Yes, I agree with you.

Mr. MacLAREN: That is quite in order.

Mr. McINTOSH: Yes, I thank the minister. I want to say that under item 198, unemployment relief, we have for 1933-34 $2,600,000, and for last year we had $2,225,000. That is an increase of $375,000 this year. The families for whom I am speaking are families of returned men who cannot get one dollar of relief. I have had one particular letter from my own riding from a man with a family of eight who has had to haul cordwood into North Battleford, forty miles, in order to get enough for his family to live on, and the members of this family—as are many others—are not living as they should; they are simply on the verge of starvation. In this letter to me this man says that it is impossible to get any relief, and they have been practically starving all winter. Because this man has not got his pension established he cannot get a dollar to keep his family from starvation's door. Is there not something that the minister and his department can do in such a case? I think a case such as I have cited is a disgrace to Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is a disgrace to the government. It is not Canada that is responsible; it would do more.

Mr. MacLAREN: Will the hon. member inform me, is the man to whom he refers a pensioner?

Mr. McINTOSH: No; that is the point, the man is not a pensioner, but his family is starving and he cannot get any help.

Mr. MacLAREN: But that is the answer to the question.

Mr. McINTOSH: But is it fair, is it honourable on the part of the government or the country?

Mr. MacLAREN: This is a vote of parliament for pensioners; that is the point.

Mr. McINTOSH: I understand—

Mr. MacLAREN: Pardon me; let me finish. This is for pensioners, and we are not allowed by parliament to pay it to other than pensioners. That disposes of that point.

Mr. McINTOSH: Not quite.

Mr. MacLAREN: Yes, that is an absolute answer. The case is that of a returned soldier in the constituency of North Battleford who requires relief. I do not know what steps he has taken, but I do know that the proper authorities to approach would be the Department of Labour and the provincial government where he resides. It is not for me to say, but I understand that proper provision is made for these cases.

Mr. McINTOSH: May I say that this is a returned man who is not living in an unemployment area of Saskatchewan, and the Saskatchewan relief commission is loath to help men in such a situation. Being a returned man he feels that although his pension is not established he should be able to get some relief from this government, but he has found it impossible to do so. I am just asking if there is not some way to remedy a condition of that kind, or must it go on forever?

Mr. MacLAREN: I think my hon. friend must understand the procedure in connection with unemployment relief in his province; it is carried on by the municipality, with the assistance of the province and the dominion. It is not for me to say about these matters, because they are dealt with in a different way, and I am sure my hon. friend is more familiar with the procedure than I am.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am too familiar with the so-called relief procedure in Saskatchewan.

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg): I should like to say a word or two with regard to the point raised by the hon. member for North Battleford.

An hon. MEMBER: Is this the new minister?

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg): No, just one who knows something of what he is talking about.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is that the distinction?

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg): If there is any such idea in the minister's mind I am sure it is unnecessary for me to relieve him of it. The point raised by the hon. member for North Battleford is the subject to which I should like to address myself. The hon. gentleman cites an instance of a returned man in his constituency who cannot get aid from the government out of the vote now under discussion which, as the minister has pointed out, is money voted by parliament not for all ex-service men but for those ex-service men suffering from disabilities which have been found pensionable. Clearly, according to the statement of the hon. member for North Battleford, the case in question does not come within the purview of the legislation at all.

Mr. McINTOSH: The minister explained that; you have not said anything new yet.

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg): Very often my hon. friend talks without saying anything new. I am stating the premise, but my hon. friend does not wish me to go further. To continue, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the case he has cited does not come under this item at all.

Mr. McINTOSH: The minister said that half an hour ago.

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg): My hon. friend did not seem to understand it.

Mr. McINTOSH: I did understand it, but I made an appeal following that.

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg): Then the hon. member went on and in a tragic appeal to this government asked if something could not be done. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about the system of relief in this country he must know perfectly well that the relief of civilians or soldiers not in receipt of pension is administered by the municipalities, the provinces and the dominion.

Mr. McINTOSH: I admitted that.

Mr. KENNEDY (Winnipeg): So instead of appealing to this government in the name of high heaven to do something, let the hon. gentleman get in touch with the authorities in his own constituency; let him bring the matter to their attention and to that of the provincial and federal government. Further I want to add that remarks such as those uttered by the hon. member for North Battleford do not serve to assist the ex-service men; if anything they merely serve to becloud the issue and stir up discontent throughout the country. They leave the impression with many of these ex-service men that they are entitled to an allowance under this item before us, while as a matter of fact that is not so. If instead of beclouding the issue the hon. member would explain this matter clearly many individuals would be put on the right track.

Mr. McINTOSH: The hon. member rose to explain something, but in his closing remarks he beclouded the whole issue. He got up to help the minister, but by the time he sat down he was doing his best to destroy him. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the

political edge my hon. friend tried to put on my remarks does not rightly belong to them at all. I was not trying to make out a political case. If every time my hon. friend talks about returned men he must bring in politics he must not think every other person does so. I repudiate the construction my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre has tried to place on the remarks I made. I was merely speaking for a returned man in the constituency of North Battleford who wrote and said that while he was trying to get his pension established his family was practically starving and that he had appealed to the municipality and the province without result. My point was this: Cannot this government do anything in such a case? If the government cannot, let it say so. Surely a man can present a case of that kind to parliament and ask the minister in a courteous way if anything can be done without having an hon. gentleman get up and talk about politics when his own remarks are all politically biased, I am just asking the minister—and I think I know the hon. gentleman better than my hon. friend from Winnipeg South Centre knows him—if anything can be done. The minister said nothing could be done. If that is so, all right; I now know what to tell this returned man.

Mr. MacLAREN: First of all may I point out that this does not fall within my department; the Minister of Labour can inform my hon. friend in this matter, since he administers the Department of Labour. My hon. friend asks if anything can be done, and I say that a great deal can be done, and my hon. friend can so inform his correspondent when he answers his letter. He should inform the gentleman that he must apply to the municipal authorities; that is the first move, because relief is administered by the municipal authorities, the province and the federal government. I ask my hon. friend to do that, and if he does so I do not think there will be any great difficulty.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am quite willing to do that, but I think it has been done already with no result.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I should like to make it very clear indeed that the comments we have heard to-night are almost entirely concerned with unemployment relief and have nothing to do with war veterans' allowances, which we are now discussing. I agree with what the minister has said in regard to the administration of these war veterans' allowances, and I think that is the feeling among all ex-service men in the Dominion of Canada.

Item agreed to.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

The Canada Grain Act, including management, operation, maintenance and equipment of elevators, administration of, $2,295,172.20.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Trade and Commerce has promised to give me some material illustrative of the advertising he has been doing.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The right hon. gentleman asked a question with regard to the amounts spent in connection with the advertisement known as Canada Expects, and so on. I have the various amounts in connection with a list of dailies which I will give him if he wishes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest that my hon. friend put them on Hansard.

Mr. STEVENS: I will give the list to Hansard:

Montreal Gazette	$ 305 76
Toronto Globe	634 40
Toronto Mail and Empire	582 40
Calgary Herald	246 40
Edmonton Journal	246 40
Vancouver Province	376 32
Victoria Colonist	160 16
Winnipeg Free Press	394 24
Winnipeg Tribune	271 04
Hamilton Spectator	283 36
Ottawa Citizen	223 20
Ottawa Journal	223 20
Toronto Telegram	640 64
Windsor Border City Star	264 88
Halifax Herald and Mail	332 64
London Free Press	275 00
Montreal Herald	146 40
Montreal La Patrie	244 00
Montreal Star	525 00
Quebec Chronicle	125 00
Quebec L'Evenement	188 16
	$6,688 60

Another question was asked with regard to the amounts paid in previous years. In 1929-30 the amount was $76,000, in round figures; in 1930-31, $93,000; in 1931-32, $8,000; in 1932-33, $15,000. The statement is extended:

Recapitulation of advertising in Canada and elsewhere placed through the Ottawa publicity bureau of the Department of Trade and Commerce

	1929-30	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33
Daily newspapers	$26,882 31	$38,895 89	$3,334 52	$7,130 36
Weekly newspapers	7,822 50	40,020 30	....	....
Trade publications	23,656 30	10,242 76	2,984 71	1,625 00
Financial papers	4,254 40	1,712 97	105 00	175 00
Magazines	8,328 80	1,311 45	105 00	....
Foreign publications	4,935 00	251 74	369 25	3,748 04
Miscellaneous publications	525 00	874 80	1,102 62	2,535 00
Total advertising	$76,403 31	*$93,309 91	$8,001 10	$15,213 40

* Produced in Canada campaign which was stopped August, 1930	$ 1,289 14
J. J. Gibbon contract, October 22, 1930	92,020 77
Total	$93,309 91

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What about the weeklies?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Did anyone ask for this?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What about the weeklies?

Mr. STEVENS: I have somewhere a statement with regard to them. I think the question has been pretty fully answered, unless my right hon. friend insists.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the minister will give to Hansard a statement with regard to the weeklies that will do.

Mr. STEVENS: I will try to do that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I lent the minister the advertisement. Will he be good enough to give it back to me?

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly. It is such a good one, I should like the right hon. gentleman to preserve it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I want to use it.

Mr. GARDINER: Last fall when the house was in session the minister brought in a bill to amend the Canada Grain Act, to permit the Board of Grain Commissioners to make a change in the rates. Under that legislation I understand that the board changed the rate for storage from one-thirtieth to one forty-fifth of a cent per bushel. I have received communications asking whether it is possible for the board to reduce the spread between the Winnipeg price and the price paid the producer. Generally speaking, the freight rate in the west from many points in Manitoba and in eastern Saskatchewan is something like fifteen cents per bushel. The elevator companies make a reduction from the Winnipeg price of twenty, twenty-one or twenty-two cents per bushel, giving the difference between the fifteen cents and that twenty, twenty-one or twenty-two cents. May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether in his judgment the Board of Grain Commissioners under the present legislation have any means of closing up that spread to some extent? There is a complaint in the west at the present time in that regard in view of the low price of grain.

Mr. STEVENS: The answer to the first part of the question is that the Board of Grain Commissioners, under their powers extended by the grain act, and as is their duty, from year to year fix storage elevator rates. Last year they fixed one forty-fifth of a cent instead of one-thirtieth as a fair rate, but organizations, both cooperative and private, have represented that that reduction was not warranted and is improvident. The whole question will be considered by the board in July before the rate is fixed for next year, and a full hearing will be given. As regards the other part of the question, including the question of freight rates, all I can say is that the board has jurisdiction only in so far as elevator handling charges are concerned, and to the extent that they have jurisdiction they intend, as I learned talking to the chairman a few days ago, to give the whole matter careful consideration. All who desire to be heard will be heard before the rates for the next crop year are fixed.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): The matter which I am going to bring up now has been discussed in previous sessions, namely, the situation with respect to growers of durum wheat who delivered wheat to the Manitoba pool during the crop year 1930-31. I do not

wish to delay the house to-night, although it is causing considerable concern in a certain section of Manitoba; and I would not have brought it up had it not been that there was forwarded to me a letter in which the delegation representing the durum wheat growers of Manitoba apparently waited on the Minister of Trade and Commerce last fall. I presume he fully understands the situation. In the closing words of this communication they say:

Mr. Stevens was very interested in knowing what Mr. Bennett had said to us in the two interviews we had with him. We explained that he had asked us to wait for a while and give them time to sell all the balance of the wheat they were holding. Mr. Stevens told us that he sympathized with us very much but that he was in no position at present to make any promises. He promised that he would read our original letter to Mr. Bennett and also your resolution and that he would go into the matter as fully as he could with Mr. Bennett.

I want to ask the minister what answer he gave this committee when the occasion arose, and if he has not yet given an answer, what answer he is in a position to give.

Mr. STEVENS: The answer must be that which has already been given. What I said to them, and what I think all who have given consideration to the matter have also said, is that one sympathizes very much with the view taken by these producers of durum wheat. But their claim is against the pool in which they participated; there is no question about that. The Prime Minister is alleged to have said, as indicated by my hon. friend, that when the selling agency completed its sale of all holdings then possible, there would be some thing out of which the pool would be able to further compensate these growers, and that position still stands.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): That is all very well, but I do not think it will satisfy these people, who in the first place contracted to deliver wheat to the Manitoba wheat pool, which was to turn it over to the central selling agency. Durum wheat at that time was selling slightly under common wheat, and the initial payment established for durum wheat was considerably below common wheat. Durum wheat that year, however, was all sold at a price considerably above common wheat—

Mr. STEVENS: That is quite right.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): —and from a rought estimate I gather that it brought in about $500,000 more than was actually paid over to the grower. If it was dealt with on the same basis there would be roughly about $200,000 coming to these people. I think the growers have a good claim to an adjustment, particularly with respect to the difference in the initial payments when the wheat was originally taken in. It is true that these farmers were contracted to deliver their wheat to the Manitoba pool, but a general change was made and Mr. McFarland was put in charge and the responsibility is now on the Dominion government. No accounting has been made of how this business has been handled and these people do not know exactly what is coming to them. Any figures presented are merely estimates and Mr. McFarland has given no real accounting. During the past two years I have taken up this matter on different occasions. I do not want to delay the proceedings at this late stage but I think this is of sufficient importance to be looked into and some action taken. This particular area in Manitoba where durum wheat is grown has been particularly hard hit during the past two years. The growers have suffered from causes other than not getting the full amount for their wheat, and I ask the minister to adjust this discrimination at the first opportunity.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Public Archives—salaries—to provide for the continuance in office of J. B. Noble, senior bookbinder, from April 1, 1933, to March 31, 1934, $1.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. RHODES: This item really comes under the Department of the Secretary of State but I think I can explain it. This gentleman is over the age of seventy-five years and is a highly skilled bookbinder now engaged upon the fine tool work necessary in the embossing of the Book of Remembrance. The one dollar is for the purpose of legislating this man on for another year, the money for his salary being provided in the main estimates.

Mr. YOUNG: Is that subject to the ten per cent deduction?

Item agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public buildings—Ontario—Windsor—government's share of cost of local improvements, $1,950.

Mr. MITCHELL: I received a letter a few days ago in connection with the employees engaged on the bridge at Burlington canal. I understand that arrangements were made to put these men on an eight hour day

but for some reason or other this has not been done. This bridge is on one of the most travelled highways in the province and the operators are forced to work twelve hours a day for seven days a week. In view of the fact that there is considerable traffic over this bridge and also because of the amount of unemployment, I think this would be an opportune time to put these men on an eight hour basis. I think we are long past the stage where government employees should be asked to work such long hours. I know something of the conditions which obtain on this bridge because I have passed over it many times. I would like the minister to take this matter under advisement and consider the introducing of an eight hour day in the near future.

Hon. H. A. STEWART (Minister of Public Works): I have also received representations in the same direction and the matter will be taken up with the treasury board or the council with a view to ascertaining whether under the circumstances we can meet the requests.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Broad Cove Marsh—breakwater-wharf replacement, $13,400.
Cow Bay (Port Morien)—breakwater replacement, $19,000.
Dingwall—dredging, $39,000.
Grand Desert—harbour protection and repairs—further amount required, $2,700.
Hantsport—to complete siding to wharf, $9,500.
Harbours and rivers generally—for maintenance of services, no new works to be undertaken—further amount required, $75,000.
Little Judique harbour—breakwater extension, $1,900.
Liverpool—dredging, $35,000.
Malagash—mooring pier, $1,600.
Port Hood island—extension of shore protection, $2,500.
South Bar (Sydney harbour)—extensions, improvements, $3,500—Total, $203,100.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is a very large item. Is it due to repairs made necessary by high seas, or does the government expect a provincial election?

Mr. RHODES: I am not surprised at my right hon. friend asking that question, and at first blush that inference could be drawn. I may say to my right hon. friend, if my colleague will permit me—

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): You know more about it than I do.

Mr. RHODES: Last year we had the greatest storm in the memory of the oldest living inhabitant of the province of Nova Scotia. This storm washed away many wharfs and did much damage to entrances to harbours. This damage was the greatest ever known. Take the item of Liverpool, dredging. The total output of the Mersey Paper Company is shipped to New York, all from this harbour. This company has a specially constructed vessel but at the moment it is unable to load to its full depth because of the amount of sediment swept into the harbour by this storm. The item for dredging at Dingwall arises through an arrangement made with a company which is opening up a gypsum quarry to supply a market already in existence. The arrangement is that this company will file a bond and agree to expend a certain amount of money. This vote will not be expended unless the bond and proper securities are filed. The item of $75,000 arises solely because of the circumstances I have indicated—

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I thought these harbours were all closed five years ago because of a storm at that time.

Mr. RHODES: They have had two very bad storms down there in the last few years.

Item agreed to.

New Brunswick—
Campbellton—cribwork block, $2,000.
Dipper Harbour—dredging, $8,000.
Harshman's Brook—harbour improvements, $3,000—Total, $13,000.

Mr. TOTZKE: What counties are these works in?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The Campbellton item is to construct a cribwork at the Campbellton ferry to facilitate the ferry service between Campbellton and Cross Point in Restigouche and Madawaska county.

Mr. TOTZKE: In what counties are the other two works?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Dipper harbour is in Saint John-Albert. This is to provide for dredging an area inside the breakwater to a depth of five feet at low water.

Item agreed to.

Quebec

Montmagny—extension to protection wall, $16,800.
Notre Dame de Pierreville—protection work, $19,000.
Riviere St. Pierre—contribution towards dredging, the provincial government having contributed a like amount, $3,000.
St. Andrews—wharf, $3,300—Total, $42,100.

Mr. TOTZKE: What counties are these in?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): This work at Montmagny is requested by the municipal

council of that place. It is in the constituency of Montmagny.

Mr. BERTRAND: What about Notre Dame de Pierreville?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It is in Yamaska.

Item agreed to.

Dredging — maritime provinces — further amount required, $12,000.
Dredging — Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—further amount required, $17,000—Total, $29,000.

Mr. VALLANCE: I notice there is an item for dredging in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Where is the dredging in Saskatchewan? Is it in Mackenzie?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It is in lake Winnipegosis.

Mr. McINTOSH: That is not in Saskatchewan.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Those provinces have been grouped together in this one vote. This particular dredging is in lake Winnipegosis.

Mr. VALLANCE: If it is in Manitoba, why charge it up to Saskatchewan? Is there no dredging in Saskatchewan?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That has been the heading of the vote for many years just as I found it when I came in.

Item agreed to.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—additional amount required to provide for ocean service subsidies, and to assist the shipment of live stock to the United Kingdom, $70,000.

Mr. NEILL: Might I ask the particulars of this vote?

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Minister of Trade and Commerce): This item, as I intimated the other night, provides for $25,000 additional to the Canadian-Australian-New Zealand mail subsidy to make up the present subsidy to what actually the mail would cost, which cost, on investigation, we found would be roughly $95,000. There is an item in the appropriation for continuance of the Canada-China service for the balance of the year. The amount in the main estimates would carry it only until the end of September. Then there is an item for assisting in the movement of live stock to the British market.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is this to help carry out the United Kingdom-Canada agreement?

Mr. STEVENS: No, to help out the Canadian live stock exporter.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister give further particulars of that? How is the assistance given with regard to moving live stock?

Mr. STEVENS: It is a small contribution towards fitting up some of the ships.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

To assist in the conservation and development of the deep-sea fisheries and the demand for fish—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. RALSTON: Will the minister please explain this item?

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Acting Minister of Fisheries): The estimates of last year had been cut down by practically one-half in the main estimates which were voted a few days ago. We had taken into consideration the expenses made during the last fiscal year prior to the time the estimates were brought before the house. Since the estimates were voted by the house, we received further claims which increased our expenses of last year, so we think we shall be short this year by about $10,000 if this further amount is not voted.

Mr. RALSTON: Is this for advertising, or what is it for?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I do not remember exactly, but I am sure it is because the main estimate was cut by one-half.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and that was too large.

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to know whether this was for teaching the housewife how to cook fish, or whether it was for advertising or for freight or express subventions, or what in connection with the encouragement of the conservation of fisheries If the minister does not recollect, I am not going to press the question now.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have not my main estimates before me this evening. I did not think this matter would come up to-night, but I can supply the information.

Mr. RALSTON: I shall bring just one point to the minister's attention. I shall not ask him for an answer to-night, but I would like him to consider the matter. I refer to the lobster industry. The matter has been men-

tioned to me more than once by those who are engaged in this industry and it is this: The possibility of establishing some fund—and it would not be a large one—for buying from the fishermen large female lobsters so that they may be returned to the water and thus the bed be not depleted. I shall mention a fund that will be available for that purpose.

Mr. DURANLEAU: If the expense is not too large, we may have something available for it.

Mr. RALSTON: There is two years' interest on the Halifax award that has never been paid. It is referred to in the report of the Maclean commission. There is a recommendation that the money should be expended for the benefit of the fishermen. A portion of it could be used with excellent results in connection with the conservation of the lobster fisheries. Will the minister take the matter into consideration?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Labour—Combines Investigation Act—further amount required, $18,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister give us the cost of the coal inquiry which has just been made?

Mr. RHODES: I have not the details before me, but my understanding is that there have been a large number of investigations and the expense involved has exhausted the appropriation in the main estimates.

Mr. SPENCER: Can the minister give me the cost of the recent coal inquiry?

Mr. RHODES: I can secure that information from the Minister of Labour later, but I do not have it before me now.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to ask the government, all of them that are now present: In the event of Quebec failing to take action on the report of the inquiry into the coal situation, will this government take action?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I may say to the hon. gentleman that the matter will be thoroughly considered.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would have preferred that the minister had said no; that under the law the action must be taken by the province of Quebec. I want to submit this to the government: If they have found out something that should be corrected, the best way to have it remedied is to disclose it. Until public opinion is created governments of all stripes are reluctant to act; they prefer to take the quiet attitude of hush, hush. They have done that continually in the past. When the great scandals in connection with brokerage firms of eastern Canada became known, you could not get the attorney general of Ontario to act, you could not get the attorney general of the province of Quebec to act. It was not until the province of Alberta took the bit in its teeth and ran away with the whole business of prosecuting Solloway and Mills, thereby showing the public the scandalous condition of affairs, that the other provinces were compelled to act by virtue of the development of public opinion. In this case, too, I venture to predict that until public opinion is aroused the province of Quebec will not act. I urge upon this government the publication of the report at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. YOUNG: I draw the attention of the government to the fact that the idea seems to prevail in some quarters that the thing to do after an investigation is to prosecute. Actually the people are not interested in prosecutions, but they are interested in cheaper coal. Will the government take any action along that line?

Mr. MITCHELL: It would seem that the only people who do not know anything about the coal inquiry are the members of the House of Commons. We saw striking headlines in the Toronto Globe and in the Mail and Empire. I believe the publicity in connection with the report should first have come to the House of Commons. The man who wrote the newspaper articles must have received information from somewhere. I am in entire agreement with the hon. member for Bow River. After all is said and done, sunlight is good for the health of the human being, and sunlight in connection with the coal investigation would be a good thing for the Canadian people.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The people are entitled to it.

Mr. MITCHELL: Members of this house and the people throughout the country are entitled to the information contained in the report, no matter who may be implicated, or the positions such people may occupy in the life of the country. There is no doubt that the evidence should be laid on the table forthwith.

Item agreed to.

To assist tourist traffic, salaries and retiring allowances of the former national development bureau, $30,000.

Mr. VALLANCE: How does the government propose to assist tourist traffic and take care of salaries and retiring allowances with only $30,000?

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, a branch of the Department of the Interior known as the national development bureau has for a number of years been carrying on a work, part of which was the development of tourist travel. That work is to be continued in the Department of the Interior, and this amount will provide the necessary funds.

Item agreed to.

Loan to the Chicoutimi harbour commissioners for the construction of harbour improvements and facilities, additional to the amount authorized by the Chicoutimi Harbour Loan Act, 1931, and to be subject to the provisions of the said act, $332,100.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have always thought it a mistake on the part of this government to have opened the Chicoutimi harbour commission.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Not this government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The previous government. I should say. I was at that time, and still am, convinced that almost the entire expenditure of the commission is for the benefit of the aluminum company located at Chicoutimi, which is part of the Andrew Mellon outfit of the United States, and part of the great aluminum combine. Advantage to the people generally in that district does not enter into the picture at all. The port is used principally by the aluminum company. I should like to know why this additional amount is being voted in the supplementary estimates, and what it is for.

Mr. DURANLEAU: When we came into power we were faced with a contract which had been awarded for the construction of a pier, and some improvements in the harbour of Chicoutimi. This amount is to take care of the expenses made necessary partly to complete the works which had been undertaken by the previous government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the total amount of money expended up to this time, and the total amount expected to be required for the completion of the work?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have not the exact figure here, but I believe the amount expended up to date is about $3,000,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much is required?

Mr. DURANLEAU: To complete the works, including trackage and some small sheds, it will require a further amount of about three or four thousand dollars.

Mr. GARDINER: Over and above this amount?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have not that information before me, but altogether it was about $2,700,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Will this amount complete the work?

Mr. DURANLEAU: This amount is over and above the amount of the contract because, when I say "the contract" I must say that when we came into power we were faced even with verbal contracts for large amounts.

Mr. GARDINER: Verbal?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): With verbal contracts?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, for work which had been started at that time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is a verbal contract?

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend knows.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I never heard of such a thing before; I never heard of public money being spent on verbal contracts.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I was faced with that situation, and works were under construction.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the minister tell us that someone went to him and said, "I have a contract for so much"?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And he paid the money out?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, and the Liberal government—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This is scandalous. If that is the way money is being expended it is time this government went out of office.

Mr. DURANLEAU: We were faced with such things when we came into power, and we had to complete the work.

Mr. GARDINER: Does the minister mean to say verbal contracts had been entered into and works were being proceeded with when he came into power, and that he had to pay the money because the contract had been proceeded with?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: We had better let this item stand until we have further information. This is too serious.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, but that is how the matter stood when we came into power; that is the situation.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister should give the information to the committee. That is scandalous.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would advise the minister to bring his documents with him.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Documents of a verbal contract?

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, you will understand that we wish item 332 to stand.

Item stands.

Further amount to complete balance of payment for restoration of Saint John harbour, after the fire of 1931, including engineering and other services, not exceeding $50,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Let us have an explanation of this item. This is another fairly substantial sum; what is it for?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I think the item is well detailed in the estimate.

Mr. GARDINER: Is this the one for the harbour commission?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes. As a matter of fact the work of reconstruction was done at very low cost, and this is the amount required for completion.

Mr. GARDINER: Is this a loan to the harbour commission, and will interest be charged on it the same as on other loans to harbour commissions?

Mr. DURANLEAU: No, this will not be a loan to the commission.

Mr. GARDINER: Under whose jurisdiction was this money spent?

Mr. DURANLEAU: This amount was spent under our own jurisdiction.

Mr. GARDINER: Any particular reason for that?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, we had some of our own employees supervise the work and we had the engineering under our control. I can say to this committee that we have saved a large amount of money on that construction.

Mr. SANDERSON: How much?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Many thousands of dollars.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was that under contract?

Mr. DURANLEAU: It was cost plus four per cent, and the purpose was to control the whole thing, the engineering and the finances.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Who had the contract?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Two firms had the contract, the Northern Construction company for a certain part of the works, and the Foundation Company, Limited, for the other part, at cost plus four per cent.

Mr. GARDINER: Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand the situation that has developed at Saint John, in view of the fact that they have a harbour commission there to look after all the harbour work. The explanation that the minister has given is not clear to me as to the reason why the department went over the head of the harbour commission to construct certain works, or to even to supervise works being constructed. Is it usual for the department to do that where you have a harbour commission looking after the harbour works?

Mr. DURANLEAU: It was unusual; it was due to the fact that as the committee knows a large fire had taken place there and we had to rebuild the whole thing within, I think, four months. As a matter of fact the whole construction was practically completed by the first of December, when the season of navigation opened. That is the reason the department came to the rescue of the harbour commission. I think anyone who would go there and see the work that has been done for the money expended will say that the job was done very cheaply.

Mr. MALCOLM: Item 332, which the minister allowed to stand, was, he said, an inheritance from the previous government. I want to point out that the loan to the Chicoutimi harbour commission, described in this item, was authorized by the Chicoutimi Harbour Loan Act of 1931.

Mr. RHODES: We are coming back to that item.

Mr. MALCOLM: When the Minister of Marine brings down his papers to-morrow I would like him to note that the very money

he is asking for is under the Chicoutimi Harbour Loan Act which did not come into force until 1931.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: That item stands.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the fact that it is after eleven o'clock.

Mr. MALCOLM: Let us go on by unanimous consent.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: As the hon. gentleman has called attention to the time, I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

At 11.07 o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, May 16, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

DISCOUNT AND LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. SAMUEL GOBEIL (Compton): On behalf of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Sullivan), seconded by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Tétreault), I beg to move:

That the petition of Joseph Alberic Beaudry and others, of Montreal, Quebec, presented on the 9th instant, praying for an act to incorporate The Discount and Loan Corporation of Canada, together with the report of the clerk of petitions thereon, be referred to the select standing committee on standing orders for the purpose of considering the suspension of standing order 92 in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. GOBEIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. SAMUEL GOBEIL (Compton): Before the orders of the day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter my protest against a report of the meeting of the redistribution committee held on Saturday forenoon, appearing in the newspaper Le Devoir, of Montreal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The proceedings of the committee referred to are not before the House of Commons, and the hon. member is not in order in referring to them.

Mr. GOBEIL: The article I wish to refer to is a personal attack on myself. It appears under the title:

Mr. Gobeil, as a rural member, wants a larger number of urban seats.

I am not going to read the article, which is a tissue of lies. It is quite in line with the attitude taken by the representative of this particular newspaper, because it has continually, since the first meeting of the committee on redistribution, made false reports, or at any rate, reports that have not been quite correct. I cannot protest too strongly against the insinuation conveyed by the title of the article in question and the whole article itself. Let me say to the representative of Le Devoir of Montreal that he is not only a dirty individual, but a dirty, crooked public liar.

REPAYMENT OF LOAN TO BANKS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes). On Thursday last I asked the hon. gentleman a question with regard to an amount of $40,000,000 which the government owed the banks, and which I understand was repaid last December. I should like to ask in what funds that loan was paid, whether in Canadian or United States funds, and how much money it took in Canadian funds to discharge that obligation.

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): I would not attempt to answer that question at the moment. I shall make immediate inquiries and advise my hon. friend as speedily as possible.

STRAITS OF BELLE ISLE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Saguenay): I should like to ask the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) if he has been made aware of an article which appeared in the Montreal Gazette yesterday to the effect that the straits of Belle Isle were jammed with ice and, if so, whether it would not be advisable to have the government ice-breakers relieve that condition in order that navigation may be speeded up.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): The report mentioned by my hon. friend has not reached me yet. It may be that some information has been received in the department and, if so, no doubt the matter will be attended to.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Saguenay): I should like to ask the Minister of

Labour (Mr. Gordon) whether any action will be taken by the government as a result of the report of the agriculture committee in connection with the milk situation.

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): The report will be reviewed, and of course if action is necessary it will be taken.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour concerning the agreement which has just been concluded between British Columbia and the Dominion government in connection with unemployment relief projects. Is it the intention of the Dominion government to take over the unemployment relief camps and road projects and itself conduct these operations?

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): The terms of the agreement between the Dominion government and the province of British Columbia set out the agreement at length and cover the point referred to by the hon. gentleman. It has been tabled, of course.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (St. Henri): Is it a fact that there is an understanding just now between the city of Montreal and the department, with respect to relief matters, that a proportionate amount will be granted to landlords in Montreal to compensate them for losses sustained?

Mr. GORDON: If I heard the hon. gentleman correctly, the question concerns any agreement between the Dominion government and the landlords of Montreal. No agreement has been entered into in that regard that I am aware of. A question of that kind would not come from the city of Montreal to the Dominion government. Any matter arising in Montreal or any other city or municipality with reference to relief would come through the provincial government to the Dominion government.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRESENTATION OF LETTERS OF CREDENCE BY UNITED STATES MINISTER TO CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Acting Prime Minister): It is no doubt within the knowledge of the house that the new minister from the United States to Canada, the Honourable Warren D. Robbins, is at present in Ottawa. Mr. Robbins is going to present his letters of credence to His Excellency the Governor General this morning at eleven-thirty and therefore the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) is prevented from being in the house at the moment. I am going to suggest, if it is agreeable to the house, that we revert to orders of the day at three o'clock, when the Prime Minister will be here and will make a statement regarding the business of the house.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Under the circumstances mentioned by my right hon. friend we can all appreciate the reason for the Prime Minister's absence at the moment. I thank him for what he proposes. I think that will be quite satisfactory.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY

REPORT OF REGISTRAR THAT NO COMBINE EXISTS AMONGST BUYERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. GOTT (South Essex): I am at this moment in receipt of a telegram intimating that there has been an entire misinterpretation by the press and the country of the report with regard to the tobacco inquiry. May I ask the Minister of Labour whether the press is justified in saying that a tobacco combine does not exist and that the special inquiry exonerates the buyers? I wish to ask further whether the buyers are or are not in a combine, whether this report has been tabled and, if not, when we may expect it.

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): The position of the tobacco growers and their relationship to the purchasers was investigated by the registrar under the Combines Investigation Act, with a view to determining whether or not there existed a combine as interpreted by the act. The inquiry is through, and the registrar has reported to me that no combine exists as interpreted under the provisions of the statute. Under those circumstances the report of the registrar would not be tabled, nor has it been the practice in the past to table such a report. I do not think I can add anything further in connection with the matter. The registrar has reported that there is no combine within the meaning of the act.

Mr. GOTT: I asked also whether the report had been tabled or would be tabled.

Mr. GORDON: I said that the report had not been and would not be tabled.

SUPPLY

SINO-JAPANESE DISPUTE—SPEECH OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE AT SPECIAL SESSION OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved that the Speaker leave the chair for the house to go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Sullivan in the chair.

To provide for expenses of representation at the Disarmament conference (revote), $5,000.

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State): On this item I wish to make a statement, which has long been proposed, in reply to a number of criticisms which have been passed in certain quarters with regard to the address I made at the last special session of the League of Nations when the report of the Lytton commission came before the assembly.

A special session of the league of nations was convened at Geneva in December last to consider the report of the commission of enquiry into the dispute which had arisen between China and Japan from the events which took place at Mukden on the night of September 18th-19th, 1931, and the appeal of the national government of China, under article 11 of the covenant of the league "to take immediate steps to prevent the further development of a situation endangering the peace of nations." On December 10, 1931, the council of the league decided, at the request of Japan, to appoint "a commission of five members to study on the spot and to report on any circumstances which, affecting international relations, threaten to disturb peace between China and Japan, or the good understanding between them upon which peace depends."

Japan accepted the resolution of the council on the understanding that, in the meantime, it "was not intended to preclude the Japanese forces from taking such action as might be rendered necessary to provide directly for the protection of the lives and property of Japanese subjects against the activities of bandits and lawless elements rampant in various parts of Manchuria."

The Chinese representative, on the other hand, insisted that "the only sure way of restoring the normal, peaceful life is to hasten the withdrawal of the Japanese troops and allow the Chinese authorities to assume the responsibility for the maintenance of peace and order" in Manchuria.

The Lytton report, which was signed at Peiping on September 4, 1932, was first submitted to the council of the league and then, at the request of China, as provided in article 15 of the covenant, was referred by the council to the assembly, which was convened at Geneva on December 6, 1932. At that special meeting of the assembly I represented the government of Canada.

The first duty of the council and of the assembly was to consider the Lytton report upon the issues involved in the dispute, and to endeavour to effect a settlement by conciliation.

While the Lytton commission was pursuing its investigations in China, Japan and Manchuria, an intense propaganda was conducted in portions of the press which tended to condemn Japan exclusively and to create the impression that China was in no wise responsible for the disorders which had occurred.

The Times, of London, of December 8, 1932, on the morning of the meeting of the assembly at Geneva, which I addressed on that day, asserted in its editorial that:

"More harm than good is done by vague threats of coercive action, which are not warranted by the facts of the case as found in the Lytton report, and which indeed could only be made effective if public opinion in the other countries were profoundly impressed by the justice of the case of one of the disputants and the injustice of that of the other. The impartial and wise report drawn up by the league commission shows clearly that faults were committed by both sides, and that in the circumstances of the present dispute, unless they are aggravated by further violence by one party or the other, a settlement must be sought not by coercion but by conciliation."

At a later date, January 17, 1933, the Times again dealt with the controversy as follows:

"The business of the league being definitely, in this particular dispute, that of conciliation. it is worth while for it to seek, with all the patience and ingenuity which the occasion demands, a set of words acceptable to the diplomacy of both China and Japan. . . . .

The circumstances of the present dispute are peculiar to the far east, and it is wholly unnecessary to assume, because the league is unable to impose an ideal settlement there by force, that it must always be sterile in action, or that, because Japan is the country that took the initiative in military operations, therefore Japan is entirely in the wrong. Certainly her methods have given rise to justifiable criticism, and it is difficult to reconcile her policy with the spirit of the international instruments which she herself has signed. But she acted under great provocation; and the ultimate result of her action, modified, it may be hoped, by the friendly pressure of other powers through the medium of the league, may be for the benefit of the people of Manchuria, who already are being paid for the product of their labour in fairer measure than the rapacity of their previous rulers allowed to them. In any case neither condemnation nor condonation is necessary from the league. The future matters more than the past. The league's own commissioners pronounced that a mere restoration of the status quo would be no solution, even if it had been practicable. The soundest course must be—with the consent of the parties to

the dispute, if possible, but if not, without them—to hold up a settlement to the world which will serve as the rallying point of public opinion and the objective of international diplomacy."

The recognized duty of the league, when we met at Geneva, was to weigh, without fear or favour, the evidence disclosed in the Lytton report, as it affected each of the two parties to the dispute, and to endeavour to arrive at a basis for an equitable solution of the difficult problem with which it was confronted. The Nationalist government of China, which is a member of the league of nations, had applied to the league to intervene in the Sino-Japanese controversy. The council of the league had no option but to proceed to an investigation, but, in the course of such investigation, the origin, real nature and causes of the controversy could not be entirely ignored. The league, in pursuing a policy of conciliation, could not remain indifferent to the relevant facts which the report had disclosed.

The erroneous opinion is seemingly current in this country that the Lytton report contains an unqualified condemnation of Japan and a complete exoneration of China. Certainly that opinion is without foundation.

It is significant that on May 18, 1929, the government of Japan declared its intention to protect the persons and property of Japanese subjects in Manchuria, where it is admitted it enjoys important commercial and territorial rights, and to that end announced its determination to prevent civil strife between Chinese war lords being waged within the confines of Manchuria, and that the military forces of Japan would prevent any Chinese armed forces, whether victorious or defeated, from entering Manchuria.

It is significant that on the following day, May 19, 1929, Sir Austen Chamberlain, then British Foreign Minister, on behalf of Great Britain, expressly stated to Mr. Kellogg, United States Secretary of State, that the terms of the Kellogg Peace Pact "excluded any action which a state may be forced to take in self-defence; and," he continued, "there are certain regions of the world, the welfare and integrity of which constitute a special and vital interest for our peace and safety. His Majesty's government have been at pains to make it clear in the past that interference with those regions cannot be suffered."

It was not, therefore, surprising that the Japanese government contended that the events of the night of September 18, 1931, which precipitated the military strife between Japan and China, were justified as measures of self-defence, which they were entitled to take by reason of their treaty right to maintain armed forces for the protection of the South Manchurian Railway, on which an explosion took place between ten and ten-thirty p.m. on that night. The finding of the Lytton commission was that:

The military operations of the Japanese troops during this night, which have been described above, cannot be regarded as measures of legitimate self-defense. In saying this, the commission does not exclude the hypothesis that the officers on the spot may have thought they were acting in self-defense.

That finding of the Lytton commission was certainly to the effect that the measures taken by Japan were not justified on the ground of "legitimate self-defense," even though the military officials of Japan may have entertained an erroneous opinion to the contrary.

The second contention of Japan was that the state of Manchukuo had been the result of a genuine and spontaneous movement for independence, which was not precluded by Article 10 of the covenant; and the Lytton commission makes an express finding against this contention as follows:

The evidence received from all sources has satisfied the commission that, while there were a number of factors which contributed to the creation of "Manchukuo," the two which in combination, were most effective, and without which, in our judgment, the new state could not have been formed, were the presence of Japanese troops and the activities of Japanese officials, both civil and military.

To these two findings of the Lytton commission the representatives of Japan took strong exception.

But the Lytton report clearly and repeatedly points out that the chaotic conditions that prevail in China are, in a large measure, responsible for the existing difficulties between that country and Japan.

At page 13 the report says:

Political upheavals, civil wars, social and economic unrest, with the resulting weakness of the central government, have been the characteristics of China since the revolution of 1911. Those conditions have adversely affected all the nations with which China has been brought into contact and, until remedied, will continue a menace to world peace and a contributory cause of world economic depression.

The report also directs attention to the conditions existing in China at the date of the Nine Power treaty, which was signed at Washington on February 6, 1922, by Sir Robert Borden, on behalf of Canada, at a time when the present leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) was Prime Minister. The contracting parties to that treaty, other than China, then agreed:

To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China.

The report, nevertheless, finds that:

Yet, even at that time, China had two completely separate governments, one at Peking and one at Canton, and was disturbed by large bandit forces which frequently interfered with communications in the interior, while preparations were being made for a civil war involving all China. As a result of this war, which was preceded by an ultimatum sent to the Central government on January 13, 1922, when the Washington conference was still in session, the Central government was overthrown in May, and the independence of Manchuria from the government installed at Peking in its place was declared in July by Marshal Chang Tso-lin. Thus there existed no fewer than three governments professing to be independent, not to mention the virtually autonomous status of a number of provinces or parts of provinces.

I have quoted all this from the report.

It is admitted that, when the Washington conference was in session, civil war was being waged between the Southern government of Canton and the Northern government of Peiping, while in other districts five Tuchuns and seventeen minor leaders had armed forces in the field, striving to overthrow constituted authority and to maintain personal power.

At the close of the Washington conference, in submitting the Nine Power treaty for the approval of this parliament on June 19, 1922, (Commons Debates, p. 3161), the Prime Minister of that day, now the right hon. leader of the opposition, said:

Conditions in China have in recent years been abnormal and difficult. The inherent weakness of her internal political position has produced a condition and an atmosphere peculiarly conducive to discord and conflict of interest among the powers both in their relations directly with China and in their relations as between themselves in Chinese matters. One of the main objects of the Washington Conference was to endeavour to secure an improvement in this situation. Considerable progress in this direction was made, but it must be borne in mind that it was not within the power of the nations represented at Washington to provide the whole remedy. The problem is essentially one for the Chinese people themselves.

At the present time two provincial communist governments have been organized in Kiangsi and Fukien, but the number of minor soviets runs into hundreds. Communist zones of influence are even more extensive. They cover a large part of China south of the Yangtze, and parts of the provinces of Hupeh, Anhwei, and Kiangsu north of that river. Shanghai has been the centre of communist propaganda.

The boycotts which have, from time to time, been organized in China against the commerce of the United States, Great Britain and, more recently, against Japan, have also jeopardized peace in the Far East.

The Lytton report again and again accentuates the desirability of avoiding future friction between Japan and China and the restoration of mutual confidence and cooperation; but it is made clear that those desirable ends cannot possibly be attained so long as the national government of China insists upon pursuing a policy which involves the unilateral abrogation of existing treaty rights, and upon setting at naught the provisions of the Nine Power pact for the maintenance of the policy of "the open door" by resorting to the boycott of foreign merchandise and the intimidation of foreign traders. The Lytton report declares:

There is no doubt that the boycott has been among the causes which have profoundly embittered the relations between China and Japan in recent years.

In respect of these boycotts, the Lytton report insists that "the main controlling authority is the Kuomintang"; and it is evident from the appendix to the report that the Kuomintang is a powerful political association which, at its discretion, appoints and removes ministers and other Chinese officials, and determines and dictates the policy of the National government of China.

In respect of these successive boycotts the Lytton report finds that:

The Kuomintang, having from its creation supported the movement, increased its control with each successive boycott until to-day it is the real organizing, driving, co-ordinating and supervising factor in these demonstrations.

The Lytton report says that:

A powerful means of enforcing the boycott is the compulsory registration of Japanese goods held in stock by Chinese merchants. Inspectors of the anti-Japanese societies watch the movement of Japanese goods, examine those of doubtful origin in order to ascertain whether or not they are Japanese, undertake raids on stores and go-downs where they suspect the presence of non-registered Japanese goods, and bring to the attention of their principals any case of the violation of the rules they may discover. Merchants who are found to be guilty of such a breach of the rules are fined by the boycott associations themselves, and publicly exposed to popular disapproval, while the goods in their possession are confiscated and sold at public auction, the proceeds going into the funds of the anti-Japanese organization.

The boycott is not limited to trade alone. Chinese are warned not to travel on Japanese ships, to use Japanese banks or to serve Japanese in any capacity, either in business or in domestic service. Those who disregard these instructions are subjected to various forms of disapproval and intimidation...

On the other hand, it has been clearly shown to what extent the Kuomintang, using the mentality and the methods which the Chinese people have inherited from their old guilds and secret societies, has taken control of the recent boycotts, and particularly of the present one. The

rules, the discipline, and the sanction used against the 'traitors', which form such an essential part of the present boycott, show that, however spontaneous, the movement is certainly strongly organised.

And again the Lytton report emphasizes the fact that "the main controlling authority is Kuomintang"; that "illegal acts have been constantly committed, and that they have not been sufficiently suppressed by the authorities and the courts"; that "they are clearly not only illegal under the laws of China but also incompatible with treaty obligations to protect life and property and to maintain liberty of trade, residence, movement and action"; that " the injury has been done to Japanese interests by the employment of methods which are illegal under Chinese law, and that failure to enforce the law in such circumstances implies the responsibility of the Chinese government for the injury done to Japan."

The report insists upon the recognition of Japan's interests in Manchuria. It declares that:

> The rights and interests of Japan in Manchuria are facts which cannot be ignored, and any solution which failed to recognize them and to take into account also the historical associations of Japan with that country would not be satisfactory.

And again the report says that:

> So far as Japan is China's nearest neighbour and largest customer, she has suffered more than any other power from the lawless conditions described in this chapter. Over two-thirds of the foreign residents in China are Japanese, and the number of Koreans in Manchuria is estimated at about 800,000. She has more nationals, therefore, than any other power, who would suffer if they were made amenable to Chinese law, justice and taxation under present conditions.

The Lytton Commission, therefore, finds that "the present political instability in China is an obstacle to friendship with Japan and an anxiety to the rest of the world as the maintenance of peace in the Far East is a matter of international concern", but the conditions for a satisfactory solution of existing difficulties "cannot be fulfilled without a strong central government in China."

And again the report says:

> The realisation of China's national aspirations in the field of foreign relations depends on her ability to discharge the functions of a modern government in the sphere of domestic affairs, and until the discrepancy between these two has been removed the danger of international friction and of incidents, boycotts, and armed interventions will continue.

It is not surprising, in view of these findings of fact, that the Lytton commission should earnestly advise and advocate a policy of conciliation and measures of cooperation between the parties as a basis of friendly settlement.

"Criticism alone", declares the commission, "will not accomplish a settlement of the dispute; there must be practical efforts at conciliation."

The report concisely summarizes the situation as follows:

> The issues involved in this conflict are not so simple as they are often represented to be. They are, on the contrary, exceedingly complicated, and only an intimate knowledge of all the facts, as well as of their historical background, should entitle anyone to express a definite opinion upon them. This is not a case in which one country has declared war on another country without previously exhausting the opportunities for conciliation provided in the Covenant of the League of Nations. Neither is it a simple case of the violation of the frontier of one country by the armed forces of a neighbouring country, because in Manchuria there are many features without an exact parallel in other parts of the world.
>
> The dispute has arisen between two states, both members of the league, concerning a territory the size of France and Germany combined, in which both claim to have rights and interests, only some of which are clearly defined by international law; a territory which, although legally an integral part of China, had a sufficiently autonomous character to carry on direct negotiations with Japan on the matters which lay at the root of this conflict.
>
> We recognize—
>
> —continues the report—
>
> —the great importance of Manchuria in the economic development of Japan. Nor do we consider unreasonable her demand for the establishment of a stable government which would be capable of maintaining the order necessary for the economic development of the country.
>
> There is no question—
>
> —declares the report—
>
> —of returning to the conditions before September, 1931. A satisfactory régime for the future might be evolved out of the present one without any violent change. . . .
>
> It is impossible not to realize that, at the heart of the problem for Japan, lies her anxiety concerning the political development of modern China, and the future to which it is tending.

And as to China, the report declares that all her " claims should be subordinated to this one dominating need for the effective internal reconstruction of the state."

Nevertheless, so long as the existing chaotic conditions prevail in China, it is indeed difficult to find a solution of China's difficulties with other nations by applying the terms of the League Covenant, the Washington Treaty and the Kellogg Peace Pact, which are applicable to thoroughly organized and responsible national governments rather than to a

politically disorganized Asiatic state, some of whose leaders are evidently actuated by a belief that, under the protection of the international agreements, to which their country is a party, they may persist in hostile and provocative acts against foreigners without fear of retaliation.

Article 10 of the League of Nations has been the subject of considerable discussion in this country. That article reads as follows:

> The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

It is well known that at the conference at Paris, which framed the treaty of Versailles, Sir Robert Borden, then Prime Minister of Canada and senior Canadian delegate to that conference, took strong exception to the terms of this article 10.

Subsequently at the fourth assembly of the league, which was held at Geneva in September, 1923, the Canadian delegation sought to repeal article 10, or to amend it so as to provide that "no member shall be under the obligation to engage in any act of war without the consent of its parliament, legislative or other representative body."

The committee which considered the Canadian amendment reported in favour of the following interpretative resolution:

> The assembly, desirous of defining the scope of the obligations contained in article 10 of the covenant so far as regards the points raised by the delegation of Canada, adopts the following resolution:—
>
> "It is in conformity with the spirit of article 10 that in the event of the council considering it to be its duty to recommend the application of military measures in consequence of an aggression or danger or threat of aggression, the council shall be bound to take account, more particularly, of the geographical situation and of the special conditions of each state.
>
> "It is for the constitutional authorities of each member to decide, in reference to the obligation of preserving the independence and the integrity of the territory of members, in what degree the member is bound to assure the execution of this obligation by employment of its military forces.
>
> "The recommendations made by the council shall be regarded as being of the highest importance and shall be taken into consideration by all the members of the league with the desire to execute their engagements in good faith."

This resolution failed to obtain the unanimous approval of the fourth assembly; twenty-nine states voting therefor, Persia voting "No" and thirteen states abstaining from voting. Therefore this resolution has no binding effect.

I deemed it expedient at the special assembly in December last to refer to Canada's now historic point of view, inasmuch as it was then evident that there were delegates from some of the recently organized states of Europe, who foresee that coming events may place their own state boundaries in jeopardy, and who were disposed to press for an arbitrary condemnation of Japan and the premature enforcement, in their interests, of the sanctions prescribed by the provisions of article 16.

I would like to suggest that one occupying the position I did, representing Canada and standing before that assembly of representatives from all parts of the world, must necessarily feel a great responsibility indeed, in view of the fact that to attain the ultimate end sought by many of the delegates might have involved placing upon Canada the responsibility of again sending her military forces into the far east for the preservation of peace in Manchuria. And knowing as I did, the historic development of opinion in Canada with regard to article 10, I conceived it my bounden duty to state to that assembly what I believed to be the prevailing public opinion in Canada which has been accepted and endorsed by each successive government in our country, in order that there might be no misapprehension as to the position which I as a delegate of Canada was then taking.

Article 16 would involve:

> The severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant breaking state, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant breaking state and the nationals of any other state, whether a member of the league or not.

I think that I truly interpreted the opinion of this government and of this parliament, in suggesting that the time had not then arrived for the adoption of such extreme measures. I believe that the views of the governments of the British commonwealth of nations were expressed in an editorial of The Times, of London, on January 24 last:

> And there must be very few among the responsible ministers who have been watching, waiting, and deliberating upon events in Manchuria who can have much doubt that a policy of active intervention would almost certainly have produced far more catastrophic results than the passing of three or four Manchurian provinces under the direction of Japan. League action could only be effective if, on the facts of the dispute, as found impartially by its own agents, one disputant or another were adjudged to be wholly in the wrong, and if the volume of condemnatory opinion were strong enough in a sufficient number of countries to make the governments of those countries ready to sacrifice human

lives, material, trade, and money in taking action against the "aggressor." Threats of action by the league in any other circumstances would be no more than a bluff. The requisite conditions for action have certainly not existed in the case of the Sino-Japanese dispute.

The league therefore has very properly confined itself in this case to a policy of conciliation; and, in view of the temporary refusal of the two parties to the dispute to be reconciled, all that it can do now is to draw up the lines of a settlement which in its opinion would be at once feasible and just. . . .

It is at any rate certain that it is no part of the duty of the states in the league, whether collectively or individually, to pass moral judgment upon one or other of its members. Their business is to devise a solution which is likely to be practicable in the near or distant future, and which is in consonance with the principles of the league.

Informed and dispassionate public opinion in the neighbouring republic finds expression in an editorial of the New York Times, of February 22nd last, from which I quote:

No fair-minded person can deny that Japan has rights in Manchuria and a good case to argue. In the statement of it made on Tuesday by the Japanese delegation at Geneva, there is a great deal of force. One strong consideration in favour of the Japanese contention has all along been admitted. This is that there has been no well-organized and stable and continuing Chinese government with which a foreign nation can make agreements. When the covenant of the League of Nations speaks of a country made the victim of aggressive action, it manifestly intends a cohesive and recognized government able to maintain law and order within its own boundaries and to speak for the wishes of its subjects and citizens. This has not been the case with China since the overthrow of the monarchy at Peking. Other nations, including the United States, have been embarrassed and baffled by this lack of a central Chinese authority, but it is doubtless true that Japan, in her more intimate relations, has felt the awkwardness of the Chinese situation more keenly. In fairness, let it be admitted that Japan has had real complaints and grievances in Manchuria.

The New York Times continues as follows:

The league has been considerate. In this whole matter of the dispute between China and Japan it has been most cautious and considerate —many have thought too much so. Even now it will not be precipitate in pronouncing judgment. It is willing to give Japan still more time to find a way to accept some plan of conciliation and peaceful adjustment. What the Japanese people should understand, what the Japanese government should perceive, is that those who through the years have been most friendly to Japan are to-day the ones who most strongly desire that she make, if need be, some minor sacrifices of prestige in order to win back the cordial reception of her as one full worthy of being included in the sisterhood of modern and peace-loving nations.

The address which I made on the Sino-Japanese question on December 8, 1932, before the special assembly of the league, has been criticized on several occasions in Canada by those who had evidently not carefully studied the Lytton report. Notwithstanding their criticisms, I have reason to believe that that address was widely approved by eminent delegates from several of the leading states there assembled, that its delivery did not, in any measure, detract from the reputation which Canada had previously acquired at the league assemblies, but that, in part at least, it influenced the league's decision to increase the number of its committee of nineteen, and to give to Canada, as a state adjacent to the Pacific ocean, permanent representation on that committee. Now after having read over the verbatim report of that address, I have no desire to amend or modify the views which I then expressed, which I believe to be consistent with the report of the Lytton commission and in accord with predominate political opinion throughout the British commonwealth.

The assembly of the league, at which I attended, after discussion of the Lytton report, adopted, on December 9th, 1932, the following resolution, in favour of which I recorded the vote of Canada:

The assembly, having received the report of the commission of inquiry set up under the resolution adopted on December 10, 1931, by the council, together with the observations of the parties and the minutes of the council meetings held from November 21 to 28, 1932, in view of the discussions which took place at its meetings from December 6 to 9, 1932, requests the special committee appointed under its resolution of March 11, 1932:

(1) To study the report of the commission of inquiry, the observations of the parties and the opinions and suggestions expressed in the assembly in whatever form they were submitted;

(2) To draw up proposals with a view to the settlement of the dispute brought before it under the council resolution dated February 19, 1932;

(3) To submit these proposals to the assembly at the earliest possible moment.

On December 15, 1932, this special committee of nineteen drew up a resolution proposing that representatives of the governments of the United States of America and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should be invited to participate in the work of this committee, on the following terms:

In order to avoid misunderstanding and to make it plain that what is contemplated at the present stage with the cooperation of two countries not members of the league is solely the negotiation of a settlement by conciliation, the special committee suggests that it should be regarded for this purpose as a new committee, responsible for conducting negotiations, and

should be authorized in this capacity to invite the governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to take part in its meetings.

This resolution contained the following closing paragraph:

In this connection the committee of nineteen considers that in the special circumstances which characterize the dispute a mere return to the conditions previous to September, 1931, would not suffice to insure a durable settlement and that the maintenance and recognition of the present régime in Manchuria could not be regarded as a solution.

On January 18, 1933, the government of Japan made an objection, stipulating that the committee to be appointed for the settlement of the dispute should include only members of the league.

The committee of nineteen further reported as follows:

On February 8 (1933) the Japanese representative submitted to the committee further amendments to the text prepared on December 15. On February 9 the committee, after considering these amendments, deemed it desirable to ask for further information in regard thereto, in particular whether the Japanese government accepted as one of the bases for the contemplated conciliation principle 7 in chapter IX of the report of the commission of inquiry regarding the establishment in Manchuria of a large measure of autonomy consisting with the sovereignty and administrative integrity of China. This question was submitted to the Japanese delegation in a letter of the same date.

The Japanese government replied on February 14 that it was convinced that the maintenance and recognition of the independence of Manchukuo were the only guarantee of peace in the far east and that the whole question would eventually be solved between Japan and China on that basis.

The committee of nineteen replied that the Japanese proposal of February 8 did not, in its opinion, form an acceptable basis for conciliation, and thereupon proceeded to draw up its report to the assembly.

In paragraph 4 of this report the committee of nineteen briefly reviewed the political and economic development of Manchuria during the preceding quarter of a century. This report says:

4. . . . . On the other hand, Japan had acquired or claimed in Manchuria rights the effect of which was to restrict the exercise of sovereignty by China in a manner and to a degree quite exceptional. Japan governed the leased territory of Kwantung, exercising therein what amounted in practice to full sovereignty. Through the medium of the South Manchuria Railway, she administered the railway zones, including several towns and important parts of populous cities, such as Mukden and Changchun. In these areas, she had control of the police, taxes, education, and public utilities. She maintained armed forces in certain parts of the country: the army of Kwantung in the leased territory; railway guards in the railway zones; consular police in the various districts. Such a state of affairs might perhaps have continued without leading to complications and incessant disputes if it had been freely desired or accepted by both parties and if it had been the expression and manifestation of a well-understood policy of close economic and political cooperation. But, in the absence of such conditions, it was bound to lead to mutual misunderstandings and conflicts. The interconnection of respective rights, the uncertainty at times of the legal situation, the increasing opposition between the conception held by the Japanese of their special position in Manchuria, and the claims of Chinese nationalism were a further source of numerous incidents and disputes.

5. Before September 18, 1931, each of the two parties had legitimate grievances against the other in Manchuria, Japan taking advantage of rights open to question and the Chinese authorities putting obstacles in the way of the exercise of rights which could not be contested. During the period immediately preceding the events of September 18th, various efforts were made to settle the questions outstanding between the two parties by the normal method of diplomatic negotiations and pacific means, and these means had not been exhausted. Nevertheless, the tension between Chinese and Japanese in Manchuria increased, and a movement of opinion in Japan advocated the settlement of all outstanding questions—if necessary, by force.

6. The present period of transition and national reconstruction in China, despite the efforts of the central government and the considerable progress already achieved, necessarily involves political disturbances, social disorder, and disruptive tendencies inseparable from a state of transition. It calls for the employment of a policy of international cooperation. One of the methods of that policy would be that the League of Nations would continue to afford China the technical assistance in modernizing her institutions which her government might request with a view to enabling the Chinese people to reorganize and consolidate the Chinese state.

The full application of the policy of international cooperation initiated at the Washington conference, the principles of which are still valid, has been delayed, chiefly by the violence of the anti-foreign propaganda carried on in China from time to time. In two respects—the use of the economic boycott and anti-foreign teaching in schools—this propaganda has been pushed to such lengths that it has contributed to creating the atmosphere in which the present dispute broke out.

7. The use of the boycott by the Chinese previous to the events of September 18, 1931, to express their indignation at certain incidents or to support certain claims could not fail to make a situation which was already tense still more tense.

The use of the boycott by China, subsequent to the events of September 18, 1931, falls under the category of reprisals.

The resolution of the assembly on February 24, 1933, also contains findings that the

sovereignty over Manchuria belongs to China, that the presence of Japanese troops outside the zone of the South Manchurian railway and their operations outside this zone are incompatible with the legal principles which should govern the settlement of the dispute, that these troops should be evacuated, and that the first object of further negotiations should be to organize this evacuation and to determine the methods, stages and time limits thereof.

The assembly also recommends the establishment in Manchuria, within a reasonable period, of an organization under the sovereignty of and compatible with the administrative integrity of China, which should provide a wide measure of autonomy, in harmony with local conditions, and which should take account of the multilateral treaties in force, the particular rights and interests of Japan, and the rights of third states; and that "the determination of the respective powers of and relations between the Chinese Central government and the local authorities should be made the subject of a declaration by the Chinese government having the force of an international undertaking." They also recommended that the Lytton report be followed by the organization of an international force which would preserve peace and good order in Manchuria as the Japanese troops should be retired. Briefly the position of Japan, taken not only before the assembly but at committee meetings and in private conversations, was that they had rights in Manchuria which were conceded by all the nations and even by the Chinese.

Mr. HEAPS: May I ask what their rights were?

Mr. CAHAN: I am not going into that question, but if my hon. friend will study the Lytton report he will find those rights enumerated in page after page, and to some of them I have referred. At least there is this much to their claim, that they won back Manchuria from Russia after China had failed to protect it and ceded it; under existing treaties they had the right to maintain railways through Manchuria; they had the right to maintain military forces there for the protection of those railways and the rights incidental thereto. They were in control, as the report said, of cities and towns; they had their own police, their own schools and their own educational system; and they occupied in Manchuria, by right of treaty, a position such as no other sovereign country enjoys in any other country in the world. And with regard to the protection of these rights it was conceded by the Lytton report that they were entitled to give that protection, although the report found that they had exceeded their right in using their armed forces as they had done for that alleged end and purpose.

The issue that at once arose was this. Should the league assembly confine itself to making reasonable efforts towards effecting conciliation and the cooperation of these two countries, Japan and China, in Manchuria, under the nominal sovereignty of China? That was the supreme question we had in view at the time I delivered that address. There were representatives of other parties at the assembly who were insistent that the league should proceed to sanction more extreme measures. Such measures had to be considered, but they might have meant ultimately involving Canada in a war in the far east for the protection of certain ill-defined interests, and it was certainly my duty, as a representative of Canada, to avoid saying or doing anything which would seem to imply that the government and the parliament of Canada were prepared to take such extreme action under the then existing circumstances. Further than that, the Lytton report suggested the formation of an international army of police for the maintenance of peace and good order in Manchuria, and the question at once arose as to who were to supply and maintain the troops, necessary to attain that end. Japan, through its representatives, daily in the corridors stated that it was prepared to withdraw its troops, but not for the purpose of admitting the bandit chieftains of China to come in and pillage and lay in waste that country again. That was their contention. But they took the view that if an international force could be organized and they could be relieved of the responsibility of maintaining peace in Manchuria they were quite willing to withdraw. I ask hon. members to put the question to themselves as it was put to me. How many thousands of troops, ten, twenty or twenty-five thousand, would Canada be prepared to put into the far east as part of a joint international force? I had to tell them in private, not in public, that I did not believe that under the then existing conditions the parliament of Canada would appropriate a single dollar toward maintaining a single company of troops in the far east for that purpose. And that was exactly the same position taken in private by the governments of England and France and by other governments of the chief European states. They were unwilling to sacrifice thousands of lives and to expend again millions of money for the sake

of preserving, through an international organization of their military forces, continued peace in Manchuria.

I am not defending Japan. I think she went to the very extreme and committed acts that are indefensible, and I said so in that discussion. But I do say that I do not believe that any representative of the government and parliament of Canada who has thoroughly studied the situation can find very much to criticize in the statement which I then made. The hour is getting late, Mr. Chairman, and I have taken a much longer time than I anticipated, though I could in more detail have presented the case with regard to the maintenance of peace by an international armed force. I thank the committee for its courtesy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is wholly appropriate that the hon. the Secretary of State, if he and the government deemed it necessary and desirable, should make a statement to this house of the position taken by himself at the League of Nations in Geneva last year. I question very much however the propriety of that statement being made at this particular time and without any notice having been given the house in advance of the government's intention to introduce this subject at this session.

We have now reached what looks as if it might be the last day of the session and we are discussing the last but one of the items which appears in the final supplementary estimates. The question which my hon. friend has raised is of all controversial questions the largest in the world at the moment, and I submit that the government are not justified in having permitted this subject to be brought on without at least having given the house some advance notice of its intention to introduce it at this session.

I think it would be most unfortunate were the remarks made by the hon. the Secretary of State now to become the subject of comment and debate in this house. The parliament at Westminster has carefully avoided a discussion of the Sino-Japanese situation; the parliaments of most of the countries of Europe as well as the congress of the United States have done the same. I do not see that we in Canada would be acting wisely were we to depart from what has been, I think, a very wise restraint on the part of other deliberative assemblies, and to begin now a discussion of the Sino-Japanese situation. I prefer not either to approve or to disapprove of anything which the hon. the Secretary of State has said this morning, but to let his statement speak for itself as the statement which he made at Geneva did. The time may come when the whole question can be discussed without danger of the remarks of anyone being interpreted by the nations that are at the moment in conflict as the taking of sides one way or the other with respect to the great questions which are at issue. It would be impossible, without going into the merits of the whole Sino-Japanese dispute, to comment on what my hon. friend has said and I do not think when these countries have been at war for the period they have, during all of which period we have kept out of the controversy, that we in Canada would be justified in choosing the dying moments of the session to raise a discussion on the questions at issue. I wish to be consistent with the view I have expressed by refraining from saying anything more at the moment. In my opinion this question might well have been made, if it was to be discussed at all, the subject of one of the most important debates of the session; but seeing that it has not been discussed up to the present time I think that we might well reserve until a subsequent session, at which time we trust the Sino-Japanese war will have concluded, such further discussion as we may wish to have on the statement of the Secretary of State at Geneva and on his statement to parliament this morning. I have profound respect for my hon. friend's integrity and ability, as he knows, as well as for his years and for himself, but I question very much the soundness of his judgment in bringing up this question at all and more particularly at this time of the session.

Mr. IRVINE: In connection with the remarks of the Secretary of State I wish to say pretty much what the leader of the opposition has said. I think the subject which the minister has brought before the house to-day is of very great importance not only to Canada but to the world, and if it was the intention of the government to have it discussed some notice should have been given the house in order that members who are interested in the international situation might have had an opportunity of preparing their material so as to discuss the subject as it ought to be discussed.

I could not always tell when the minister was quoting and when he was speaking for himself, but to me the whole trend of his discourse seemed to be towards the futility of the League of Nations, the futility of the signatories to all the peace pacts and the virtual declaration that the only hope of protection which any nation has, is in its own individual military powers. If, as the minister so emphatically declared, Canada is not

prepared to put one dollar or one man behind the League of Nations, then I do not think we ought to spend one dollar to send delegates over there to make speeches which we cannot back up and which we have no intention of backing up.

During the historical summary of the eastern situation by the minister I could not help noticing that great emphasis was placed upon the internal weakness of China and upon certain rights which Japan had to the occupation of Manchuria. In this case I think the League of Nations by its inaction has declared to the world as clearly as any declaration could be made in words that the whole idea of the league is impossible and that the institution is impotent. If it had been otherwise, surely the weakness of China to which the minister has referred should have been the chief cause for the League of Nations taking action. But it is stated that China is too weak for us to assist, that her internal troubles are too great and therefore we will let Japan go in with a disciplined force and do what she wants to do.

I am not going to argue this matter because I agree with the minister when he suggests that there should be no pronouncement of opinion on this affair without an adequate knowledge of all the facts. Under the circumstances it would be impossible for any member to become possessed of all the facts necessary to enable him to make a pronouncement. However, I do make this pronouncement: either the League of Nations means something or it means nothing. If it means anything at all, it should endeavour to make effective the steps provided for in its own articles. I venture to suggest that when the minister made the speech to which he referred he did not represent the general opinion of the people of Canada. They had at that time some faith in the League of Nations, they believed that Japan was invading China and that it was the duty of the League of Nations to stop that sort of invasion. Instead of doing that the League of Nations did nothing and left the whole situation to time and time was the very thing that Japan required. The invasion is continuing at the present moment. I suggest that there are only two possible courses for Canada to take. The League of Nations should be considered as an instrument of serious use and it should be used as a means of maintaining world peace; we should urge the enforcement of the provisions of the covenant against Japan and we should withdraw our official representatives from Japan as a protest against the invasion of China. We should either do that or throw up our hands as far as the League of Nations is concerned and have nothing more to do with it.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I agree entirely with the views of the leader of the opposition that it would be undesirable to discuss this far eastern question under present conditions. We would have certainly given notice if we had had an idea that there would be a debate upon the subject, but the government considered that the Secretary of State should make his statement so that it would be on record, not for discussion at the present time but for the information of hon. members.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The only exception I take is to the subject being brought up at all at this time. I would much rather have seen the statement of the Secretary of State appear in his autobiography which I hope he will give to the world some day and which I feel sure will be extremely valuable to those who have the privilege of reading it.

Mr. CAHAN: I shall never publish an autobiography as I do not expect ever to have leisure sufficient to write one. But in my case, as with Japan, there was a great deal of provocation. Statements have been made on the public platforms in various parts of this country and in the press to the effect that there was only one side to the Sino-Japanese controversy. It was alleged that the position which I had taken had discredited Canada before the world. I trust I will not be considered egotistical when I say that my address before the assembly was listened to most intently. It was made after consultation with the other dominion members from time to time as they gathered together. The British delegation told me that they approved of what I had said, and some of the most eminent men in the assembly came to me afterwards to congratulate me upon having expressed the views I did, and others considered that it was the duty of Canada to call attention to certain facts because of our situation on the Pacific and our friendly relations with both China and Japan. I did not intend to provoke a controversy but I think it was due to me that I should be permitted to point out to this parliament the grounds underlying the expression of views which I made there. To-day is the first opportunity I have had of doing this.

Mr. EULER: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of continuing this discussion but I should like to ask a question of the Secretary of State. He stated that one of the reasons why Japan had certain rights in Manchuria was because China had ceded that province to Russia and that Japan had wrested it from Russia. I should like to know when the government of China ceded complete sovereignty over the province of Manchuria to any country. I should like to know whether she did that or just simply granted certain railway and trading rights.

Mr. CAHAN: Did I say "ceded"?

Mr. EULER: Yes, you used the word "ceded".

Mr. CAHAN: Perhaps that was not the correct word for me to use. As a matter of fact, China did acquiesce in the acquisition of Manchuria by Russia.

Mr. EULER: Complete sovereignty?

Mr. CAHAN: Russia took charge just the same as she is taking charge at the present time of northern Mongolia.

Mr. EULER: Did China consent?

Mr. CAHAN: She began to treat with respect to it. I do not know that Germany has ever consented to Alsace Lorraine being taken over by France but she has acquiesced. I am not emphasizing the position taken by Japan. But what I do say is this: Japan took Manchuria back from Russia. Japan then restored Manchuria to China in consideration of certain rights in and to Manchuria being retained by Japan, so that, so far as China is concerned, she has, one might use the word, ceded or granted to Japan certain rights which Japan now claims.

Mr. EULER: My point is simply this: When the word "ceded" is used, I thought the cession of a country meant handing over complete sovereignty, and I understood China had never done that to any other nation with regard to Manchuria.

Mr. HEAPS: Was the statement made by the minister to the house this morning the official viewpoint of the government in regard to the dispute between China and Japan?

Mr. CAHAN: I am not pretending to make an official statement for the government with regard to the controversy between China and Japan; the time has not come for this government to make an official statement with regard to that, and the leader of the opposition has very properly taken that view. But the time had come for the Secretary of State, who had represented Canada at the League of Nations and whose statements have been misrepresented throughout the length and breadth of this country, to show, by quotations from official documents that those who misrepresented those statements and who from time to time exaggerated them, have never thoroughly appreciated the purport of the report of the Lytton commission on which my statements were based.

Item agreed to.

MARINE DEPARTMENT

Loan to the Chicoutimi harbour commissioners for the construction of harbour improvements and facilities, additional to the amount authorized by the Chicoutimi Harbour Loan Act, 1931, and to be subject to the provisions of the said act, $332,100.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Last night the Minister of Marine made a statement which I do not think he should have made. He left the impression that this item was inserted because of some verbal agreement that had been made by the former Liberal administration. I just want to make it quite clear that this item is for a—

Loan to the Chicoutimi harbour commissioners for the construction of harbour improvements and facilities, additional to the amount authorized by the Chicoutimi Harbour Loan Act, 1931, and to be subject to the provisions of the said act.

The present administration of which my hon. friend is a member, came into office in the summer of 1930. The Chicoutimi Harbour Loan Act was passed in 1931 and what is now being asked for is something in addition to the legislation which parliament enacted at that time. I do not think the minister should have even mentioned the former Liberal administration in connection with the item.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): I was understood yesterday as saying that this item was to cover works performed under verbal contract. That was not what I meant. I mentioned those facts only to show the difficulties we had to meet when the new commission took office.

I desire to explain this morning exactly the situation. The verbal agreement about which the contractor spoke to me when I was in Chicoutimi was in regard to an approach that he was building for the new bridge that the provincial authorities were supposed to build later on across the Saguenay river a few hundred feet above the pier in course of construction. The contractor contended then that

he had a verbal promise from the former harbour commissioners that this approach was to be paid by them to the extent of $70,000. This morning I asked for information concerning the matter and I was told that the claim of the contractor was denied by the former commissioners and also denied by the present ones and was never paid. I am informed that the contractor is now endeavouring to obtain compensation from the provincial authorities. That is the situation in regard to the verbal contract about which he spoke to me, but it is over two years ago now and I spoke last night only from memory, so there is in this item nothing in connection with work done under a verbal agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do I understand the minister now to withdraw the statement he made last night which certainly would be understood as a reflection upon the previous administration and which he should not have made in the house?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have just given the exact information which, I think, is satisfactory to my right hon. friend; that is, that the claim of the contracts for $10,000 for work under supposed verbal agreement was denied by both commissions, past and present and never paid.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then the statement the minister made last night is withdrawn.

Mr. YOUNG: That does not explain the item. Last night the minister gave us an explanation of the item. Now he says that that is not the explanation. Perhaps there is another one.

Mr. DURANLEAU: This is to cover the amount due by the commission to the Bank of Montreal for money borrowed by the commissioners to liquidate outstanding liabilities. As a matter of fact, there were moneys overexpended before September, 1930, the date when the new commission came into office, to complete the works which had been undertaken by the former administration, and additional commitments after that were necessary to complete the work. When the present commission took office, there was an amount outstanding at the bank and it was carried by the new commission. Later on they paid the bank, borrowing from another bank, and this is an oustanding liability, but it was to complete works undertaken under the contract entered into in 1927 by the former commission for the construction of that pier.

[Mr. Duranleau.]

Mr. GARDINER: What was the amount outstanding owing to the bank under the old contract?

Mr. DURANLEAU: At the present time?

Mr. GARDINER: No, at the time the new commission took office.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I cannot give the exact amount, but it was between $225,000 and $300,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Was there any authority for the expenditure of that money by the old commission?

Mr. DURANLEAU: The contract was authorized, but the expenditure was over the estimate mentioned in the contract. There were certain works done by the former commission under the direction of the engineers to protect the works. A bulkhead was constructed and tie rods were fixed to solidify the works. That was done under the direction of the firm of A. D. Swan, the supervising engineers. Everything has been done under the direction of the engineers.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that harbour commissions must come to the government and then to parliament for the necessary funds to make their improvements. From the statement which the minister has made, it appears that the former commission overspent the amount of money which was authorized by parliament for the improvements at Chicoutimi harbour. Is that not the situation?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I can say that at the time the new commission came into office in September, 1930, there was a certain amount over-expended by the former commission.

Mr. GARDINER: I just take this opportunity of drawing to the attention of the committee the report made by Sir Alexander Gibb with regard to our different ports and harbours. Ever since I have been a member of the house, I have always supported any move which would make our ports more efficient in handling our imports and exports. When conditions were better than they are at the present time, Canada's trade was growing very rapidly. In order to facilitate the exchange of our goods for the goods of other countries it was absolutely essential that we should have the best facilities that we could provide for the time being. I have even gone so far as to say that our facilities should be a little ahead of our requirements in view of our expanding trade. No doubt at the

present time the facilities are more than ample, in view of the decline in the volume of business, to take care of our exports and imports.

I have watched the development of our harbours very closely since I have been a member of the house, and I am quite satisfied of this fact, that we need some central authority which will take into consideration our port requirements from a truly national aspect rather than considering them merely as local requirements. I am afraid that there has been too much local pressure brought to bear upon governments—I do not refer to any particular government—to provide facilities in ports which were not of any real value to the country. I am not, as I have already said, one of those who would skimp our ports of the facilities they should have, but I do think that between now and next session the government should take seriously into consideration the elimination of the harbour commissions that we now have and the placing of this work under one central authority who will look at the question in a national instead of merely in a local way.

Mr. CARDIN: In this item this amount is described as a loan to the Chicoutimi harbour commission. I would ask the minister why he is following that procedure? In the past the practice has always been to supply the money which is necessary for the harbour commissions, for port development, by means of legislation instead of through an estimate. In the past when a harbour commission required a certain amount of money for the development of a harbour, parliament was asked to vote the money through a special bill which provided for the payment of interest on the loan which was being made. But there is no provision here as to the interest which the Chicoutimi harbour commission may be called upon to pay to the government. Do I understand that the government will expect the Chicoutimi harbour commission to pay interest on this advance of money when it is in a position to do so, as harbour commissioners have always been bound to pay interest on moneys advanced to them by special legislation. This has always been the practice in the past. Why this change in procedure?

Mr. DURANLEAU: The demand was made a little late in the session, and we thought it would be shorter to bring down an estimate. I do not think it will make any difference, so far as the paying of interest is concerned, whether the loan is made through an estimate or by legislation.

Mr. CARDIN: There is no indication here at all that they are bound to pay interest on the loan.

Mr. DURANLEAU: They are supposed to pay interest on all moneys loaned if they can afford to pay it.

Mr. CARDIN: But they are not supposed to pay interest that is not required of them, and there is no provision for the payment of interest in this item.

Mr. STEVENS: You cannot get blood out of a stone.

Mr. CARDIN: I know that many of these harbour developments were made at a time when business was better and prospects were brighter, and undoubtedly many of the developments in the different harbours could not be justified if you looked at them simply in regard to the volume of business to-day.

Mr. MANION: Such as the Montreal harbour bridge.

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend is always referring to that. Yet he has in his own department the Welland canal, which has never paid a cent to Canada, and which was supposed to cost, when the first estimate was brought before the house, $50,000,000.

Mr. MANION: How about the National Transcontinental?

Mr. CARDIN: Yet the Welland canal which was first estimated to cost $50,000,000 has cost this country to-day $125,000,000, and nobody says a word, but my hon. friend is constantly referring to the Montreal harbour bridge. There are ten or fifteen undertakings under the government which have cost much more than the amount which was first estimated, yet my hon. friend objects every time to the bridge in the port of Montreal. Everybody was in favour of the building of that bridge. The Conservative party was as strong for it at that time as the Liberal party. Nobody on the opposition side had the courage at that time to stand up and say that they were opposed to the building of that bridge —nobody. During the last parliament when we brought forward the proposal for the building of the Caughnawaga bridge, the opposition of that day opposed the building of that bridge and any contribution from the federal government for that purpose, on the ground that it was going to be a toll bridge. The opposition of that time argued that the bridge should be a free bridge, and if we had proposed that it should be a free bridge the opposition of that day would have en-

dorsed the building of the Caughnawaga bridge. In the county of Chateauguay-Huntingdon the Conservatives went around saying, "The Liberals want to give you a toll bridge, but we are going to give you a free bridge." And now the Conservatives are denying the justification for the building of the Montreal bridge. It is true that we are not getting all the revenue at the present time that we expected from the Montreal bridge, but the revenues are increasing from year to year, and we hope that when the business of the country is once more reestablished we shall have very reasonable returns from that bridge, returns which will take care of all the expenditures. It is true that the bridge has cost more than was originally estimated, but as I said, the Welland canal is in a much worse position in that respect than the Montreal bridge. There are many other undertakings of the government which have cost two or three times the amount estimated by the engineers, and that experience is not confined to government business alone. Any man who has had experience in construction knows that it is almost impossible to point to any work, even a construction costing only a few thousand dollars, that does not cost in the end more than was first estimated by the engineers or architects.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The parliament buildings, for example.

Mr. CARDIN: That is a common experience because there are always certain changes and new developments. The Montreal harbour bridge has cost a larger amount of money than was at first estimated because changes were made in the plans since the estimate was first presented to parliament. The steel, for instance, has been increased in strength and many changes were made in the concrete work. It can be very easily explained how the first estimate was seriously increased by these changes. The increase can be justified certainly just as well as my hon. friend can justify the increase in the cost of construction of the Welland canal over the first estimate.

Mr. MANION: I should like to point out that the opposition of that day did not oppose the Montreal harbour bridge because they thought it was going to be built at a reasonable price, instead of costing $19,000,000. The opposition of that day expected, and the government implied, that the bridge would cost eight or nine million dollars, but the government of that day that built the bridge spent $19,000,000 on a property that should have been built for eight or nine million dollars. That is what happened in that case.

In regard to the Welland canal, my hon. friend's government while it was in power spent probably more money on the Welland canal than this government has spent. His government were in power from 1921 to 1930, and they carried on the building of the Welland canal. My hon. friend implied that it was our fault that the Welland canal cost a great deal more than the first estimate. My hon. friend can go back to his own party. He will perhaps remember the estimate that Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave of $13,000,000 for the building of the Transcontinental, a road which cost $178,000,000. My hon. friend, and this will come closer to home, can probably go back to the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway purchase, which he forced upon the Canadian National Railways against the wishes of Sir Henry Thornton. Sir Henry Thornton said that it was not worth $5,000,000, and the hon. gentleman practically forced him to pay $6,000,000 for a road that has never yet paid its way in one day of its operation.

Mr. CARDIN: I am very glad indeed to discuss the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway. Since I have been in this house I have on many occasions noticed the expenditure of money for the building of railways which were not as important as the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway. This railway runs through one of the oldest sections of the province of Quebec, a section which has been established since the very first days of Canada, and that section of the province of Quebec has been the worst served of all Canada so far as railway facilities are concerned. That section of Canada has been retarded in its development for twenty or thirty years, during which time its people have had to stand conditions so far as the lack of railway transportation is concerned that no other section in the whole of this country could have sustained. I have voted, and hon. members opposite have voted, for the construction of branch lines where no people were established. We did that with a view to having people established there, or to having possession of a certain piece of territory in order to prevent one railway or another taking advantage of it. There were not many people established, but the purchase was for the purpose of future development. In the section in which the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway was built there is a large farming population

and small industrial centres which for twenty-five or thirty years had been deprived of reasonable or fair railway communication. The small town of Sorel has been kept behind for a period of twenty-five or thirty years; it has not developed, along with other small towns, because of lack of necessary railway facilities. We had no regular train service. Freight rates were prohibitive, and it would cost more to transport merchandise from Montreal to Sorel than from Montreal to Quebec. That was the position in which we were placed at the time.

However no matter what was said by the Minister of Railways and Canals, the government need not be afraid or ashamed because the Quebec, Montreal and Southern has been acquired. It is the best acquisition the Canadian National Railways ever made.

Mr. MANION: It has never paid its way.

Mr. CARDIN: It is a paying proposition.

Mr. MANION: It is not a paying proposition.

Mr. CARDIN: The minister cannot indicate a single branch line which has been acquired by the Canadian National Railways and is capable of giving a better showing than is the Quebec, Montreal and Southern railway. It was a good buy. It is not a load which has been placed upon the shoulders of the Canadian National. I am not afraid to put all the cards on the table, and when the cards are on the table I am ready to fight. I admit that certain officials of the Canadian National Railways were not strongly in favour of the acquisition of the line. They were not familiar with it. They did not know the circumstances under which that railroad had been operating, and they are always opposed to something new or something which had not originated in their minds. There is no man among all human beings who has a more one-track mind than has the railway man. He can see only one way. Everything coming from someone else he opposes or is ready to put aside.

Look at the returns of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern, and compare them with the returns obtained from other lines, and you will be forced to the conclusion, if you are reasonable and fair, that it was a good buy. It is the most promising line that the Canadian National Railways ever acquired. It was the intention of officials of the Canadian National to dispense with certain of their lines running from Montreal to Quebec and passing through St. Hyacinthe so that because of the absence of grade, the lines of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern could be used. The road is level, because it is at the level of the St. Lawrence river. When business was good the Canadian National was contemplating moving all their freight traffic and even their best passenger trains along the Quebec, Montreal and Southern roads. That was the decision and proposal of officials of the Canadian National Railways. I repeat the line in question is not a burden, and even if it had been I humbly submit that the province of Quebec has less mileage per head of population than any other province in the dominion. The province of Quebec, which has not been used as well as other provinces in Canada, was entitled to something. It is unfair for the Minister of Railways and Canals to start an agitation on that point. Our claim was justified. The operation has justified the buying of the Quebec, Montreal and Southern.

Going back to the other argument concerning the Montreal bridge, offered by the Minister of Railways and Canals, may I say that everything he has said is a justification for my argument. I refer the minister to an answer to a question asked in the house to the effect that the first estimate on the construction of the Montreal bridge was $12,000,000. That was the estimate of the engineers made at a time when the plans were not completed. Detailed plans had not been prepared, and to a large extent the minister could not do otherwise than resort to a certain amount of guessing when he was asked to give the price for the building of the Montreal bridge. If the estimate made by the engineers was $12,000,000, there is nothing so extraordinary in the fact that the bridge cost $19,000,000, especially in view of the changes which were made in the material used, and in view of other circumstances including interest which was charged to the Montreal harbour commissioners on the cost of the land acquired for the bridge and the construction itself. In the $19,000,000 is included $2,000,000 interest. So, if we take everything into consideration there is nothing so extraordinary in the cost of the Montreal bridge. The discrepancy is far below that which existed between the estimated and the real cost of the Welland canal.

Mr. MANION: I have two minutes to speak before one o'clock. The hon. member stated repeatedly that the Quebec, Montreal and Southern was an advantage to the Canadian National Railways. The information I get from officials of the Canadian National is that the Quebec, Montreal and Southern

has never paid its operating expenses,—and I believe my information is probably a little more correct than is that of the hon. member.

Mr. POWER: They tell you what you ask them.

Mr. MANION: No, they do not. If they told me only what I asked them they would be very poor officials.

Mr. POWER: When they do not tell you what you ask them, you get angry about it. That happened in committee.

Mr. MANION: Because one of the officials told a falsehood, I objected.

Mr. POWER: If he told a falsehood, fire him; that is the answer to that.

Mr. MANION: He told a falsehood in reply to one of the hon. member's questions; that is why he remembers it so well. The hon. member (Mr. Cardin) who just took his seat implied that I was objecting to the Quebec, Montreal and Southern and to the Montreal bridge because they were in the province of Quebec. I deny that, absolutely. There is no man in this house who is or always has been more friendly towards expenditures, or towards the friendly treatment of the province of Quebec, than I am, and I have been that way all my life. I think this is not a very broad attitude to take when, upon a matter touching the province of Quebec, the suggestion is made that we are attacking the French-Canadian population. I do not think that attitude is worthy of any hon. member on either side of the house. Hon. members on this side of the house definitely—

Mr. BOUCHARD: You are the only one who mentioned it.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member pointed out that because it was in Quebec I would have nothing to do with it. I submit that the statements which I made were correct, and had nothing to do with the portion of Canada in which the money was spent. I do not think it is fair to bring in a question of race in connection with a matter which we are discussing.

Mr. POWER: It was not brought in.

Progress reported.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

The house resumed at three o'clock.

[Mr. Manion.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER AS TO REMAINING LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the house was good enough to grant permission to revert to the orders of the day when we resumed at three o'clock, since I was inadvertently—that is a good word—detained by reason of the arrival of the United States minister.

This afternoon we propose to proceed with order No. 24, with the house in committee on Bill No. 99, if the item of business under consideration is disposed of. We propose to proceed also with Bill No. 100, which stands in my name, and with Bill No. 106. It was thought that possibly the difficulties to which attention has been directed in connection with the latter bill would be modified if not overcome by adding as a new paragraph a provision that this act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by the governor in council. That is the proposal we shall make with respect to that measure.

There still remains the redistribution bill, and I have asked the committee to report the bill to the house at the earliest possible moment. I am told that it might not be possible to report it until the morning, but I suppose that when it is reported it will take some time for consideration, though just how long I am not in a position to say. I regret that with respect to some of the provinces an agreement has not been reached, but that very often happens. I was on a committee twenty years ago, and the matter was finally disposed of only in the last two or three days. The present chairman of the select committee was on the redistribution committee ten years ago, and it will be recalled that the measure was not proceeded with as intended on the first occasion but was taken up at the following session.

Having regard to the fact that this is 1933, however, I think there is great anxiety on the part of the house that the bill should be enacted, and if we are unable to do so by consent I suppose the only other way is to invoke the aid of what is sometimes called the brute majority, but which constitutes the means by which under democratic institutions we carry on government, the history of which is very interesting but to refer to which would serve no good purpose. I believe an agreement has been arrived at with regard to most

of the provinces; I understand that the particular differences are very few but that unfortunately when an effort is made to overcome them new ones take their places. That being so it is quite obvious that the only proper thing is to report the bill to the house, and that will be done at the earliest possible moment.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks of the Prime Minister I might touch first on what he has proposed with respect to Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act. I understood the Prime Minister to say that he would propose that the measure should not come into force until so directed by the governor in council. I do not see that this alters in any particular the principle of the measure, which is one to which we at least on this side of the house cannot agree, and which we shall oppose on the second reading of the bill. I say that at once; the principle of the bill is not one which we can accept, and the proposed amendment would not help the situation at all.

With regard to the redistribution measure, I cannot agree with the Prime Minister when he says that previous redistributions have not been effected by consent, that is, if we confine the statement to the last three redistribution acts. In 1892, I think it was, there was a redistribution which resulted in a long drawn out battle in the House of Commons. At that time Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was leading the opposition, put forward the suggestion that there should be a joint committee of the house appointed to prepare the schedules to be attached to the bill to be presented to hon. members for their approval. In that year the government of the day itself prepared the bill without reference to the opposition, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier's view was that if a joint committee could be formed its members might be expected to rise above matters of party difference and do what would be generally recognized as fair and just to all concerned. After Sir Wilfrid came into office in 1896, and was confronted in 1902 with the first redistribution thereafter, he had redistribution carried out in that way. A joint committee was appointed from both sides of the house, and that committee arranged the constituencies as a result of agreement after some discussion and brought in a report which was unanimously accepted. To the bill was attached a schedule containing the redistribution map, and that bill was carried in the commons without disagreement of any appreciable extent.

A few days ago I was speaking with Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden with regard to redistribution in his day. Sir Robert made it rather a boast to me at the time—and I think he quite rightly spoke with a degree of pride —that when he was in office which would be in 1912, a committee of the house had been appointed which joint committee came to an agreement, so that there was no controversy. With respect to the last redistribution, which was carried out in 1923 when the late Liberal government was in office, I recall the circumstances quite vividly because I had the responsibility in the matter that to-day rests with my right hon. friend. It did take the joint committee some little time to come to a final agreement but an agreement generally approved was reached. I believe that at the end there was one constituency with respect to which there remained some controversy. As I recall the circumstance it was not a matter that affected the boundaries of the constituency; it was I believe some other feature which at the moment I cannot recall. I do remember, however, that the measure was brought into the house with the understanding on the part of the committee not that the particular difference whatever it was would be decided on the floor of the house but rather that the parties would declare their respective positions which I believe had reference to the returning officer to be appointed and that the bill should go through without any controversy, which it did. That was the last redistribution, and I have referred to the only other occasion on which we have had redistributions since we adopted the practice of having the redistribution map prepared by a joint committee of the house.

I do think it would be most unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, if at this time, after having been successful for the last thirty years with this method of effecting the necessary redistribution of constituencies, it should be found that the present ministry was not able to effect what three previous ministries effected in regard to a redistribution which would be regarded as fair and just by all parties concerned. I know there are some differences, but there may also be older and wiser heads in the house than those perhaps which have had thus far to do with the present redistribution, and I would submit that even yet, advantage might be taken of that added experience which in political life comes with years, to see if it is not possible to bring into this house before we prorogue a measure that

will commend itself with unanimity to hon. members and to the country. Having regard to the conditions which exist not only in our own country but throughout the world as well I cannot think of anything that would be more unfortunate than to have the popular belief in parliamentary institutions further shaken or undermined in any way. I would urge that very strongly upon the ministry as a reason why above all others, we at this time, should seek by our action here, irrespective of the parties to which we may belong, to let the general public see that with regard to the basis on which our whole parliamentary institutions rests we are prepared to do the thing which will be regarded by the public at large, as fair, just and honourable. I believe the Prime Minister himself can bring his influence to bear in this matter. I cannot but think he wants to be fair, and he has a way of getting his own way when he wants it. I should say this was a time for him to exert that influence in the interests of fairness and justice.

Mr. BENNETT: With the character of the observations which the right hon. gentleman has been pleased to make to this house I am in accord but—and it is the "but" that is the difficulty—it is not quite fair to expect that every concession must be made by the majority and the right hon. gentleman will be the first to agree with that. What he said about our institutions is so true that I shall not do more than say that I wholly agree with him, but it must not be forgotten by this chamber, for instance, that when redistribution took place ten years ago the Conservative party now in power had no member from Saskatchewan.

Now, I put it to the fair judgment of public opinion whether or not when, for instance, there was an earnest effort by a member of the committee from Saskatchewan to rearrange one seat in particular about which there has been so much talk by a very highly respected but very old member of this house, who took the attitude, "No! My map or nothing"—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. VALLANCE: That is not right.

Mr. BENNETT: That is practically what it meant.

An hon. MEMBER: Not at all.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, there you have an initial difference. My advice to-day is, and I have inquired carefully, that certainly the map which our friends from Saskatchewan insist upon is practically their map or nothing. My right hon. friend opposite knows from long experience—and he has had a longer experience of the responsibilities of the head of a government than I have had—that there is a point always reached where you cannot expect men who belong to the majority to be told that they must subordinate entirely their views to the will of a sometimes arrogant and almost insolent minority. That is the fair way to put it. I am not putting it disrespectfully; I think I am putting it fairly when I say that.

The committee is called for half past three this afternoon, and if there is a real disposition to overcome these difficulties it will then become apparent. If the older members of the house can assist in arriving at an amicable disposition of a highly contentious question, I shall be very glad; indeed, I shall ask the leader of the opposition whether he has any suggestion to make as to a member or two on his side who will cooperate with the older members on this side to enable such a disposition to be arrived at.

Mr. MALCOLM: Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT: But I say at the threshold of the discussion that a frank recognition of the fact that there are Conservative members from Quebec and Saskatchewan is essential to the reaching of a conclusion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely.

Mr. BENNETT: That must be done; if it is not done, then the fault will rest not with the government but with those who assert their right to rule regardless of the rights of majorities.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Prime Minister has referred to the provinces of Quebec and Saskatchewan as they were at the time of the last redistribution, and has said that the Conservative party was not represented on the committee that dealt with that redistribution. I submit that there could be no greater evidence of the fairness of the redistribution as effected in 1923 than the fact that to-day there are large numbers of representatives both from Saskatchewan and from Quebec sitting in the seats of hon. gentlemen opposite, whereas under the previous redistribution made when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, there was in one parliament at least, only one Conservative member, I think, from the province of Quebec and none from the province of Saskatchewan. The question is not whether there were representatives from these provinces on the committee at the time, but whether the representatives generally were able to effect a redistribution which was regarded by all as

fair, and I submit that unless the members of the Conservative party on the redistribution committee representing other provinces had regarded the redistribution in that light, as regards both Saskatchewan and Quebec, the bill would not have received the unanimous consent it did.

I wish to take very strong exception to one phrase used by the Prime Minister. I believe that on reconsideration he will probably wish to withdraw it. He said if the matter were not settled by consent that no recourse would be left other than that of deciding the matter by brute majority.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I said, what has been sometimes described as the brute majority.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Aptly described.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, we here are the minority and hon. gentlemen opposite are the majority. We do not ask for any privileges but for fair play and justice—

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —but we do ask for the exercise of those qualities rather than brute force in the settlement of all questions which affect the rights of the people. After all, it is not merely our individual constituencies that are at stake but the representation of the people of Canada in their House of Commons. A more sacred duty does not exist than that which is imposed upon this house at the present time to see that that representation is made as fair and just as it can possibly be made, and if such is possible, that it be arrived at through agreement and fair play as the result of common consent.

I shall be very happy to join with the Prime Minister in naming two or three ex-ministers of the crown from this side to meet with some of his colleagues, if he is agreeable to having that course adopted, and to allowing these gentlemen to see whether they cannot help to work out a joint agreement. I think it ought to be possible to attain such a result for I still believe that a desire for fair play and justice is what is uppermost in the minds of the majority here, irrespective of the parties to which they belong.

CONSCRIPTION IN CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. D. M. SUTHERLAND (Minister of National Defence): The right hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) has directed my attention to a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott), based on a report in a paper of an address supposed to have been given by the district officer commanding No. 3 military district, upon which article the hon. member based the question whether this government is favourable to conscription in the militia. Let me say very definitely that conscription in the milita is not the policy of Canada nor is it the policy of this government. The department as at present administered is simply carrying out the well known policy of the country which is not conscription.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

To provide for payment to Miss Edith Tillie, of the balance of her subscription to the national service loan, $630.44.

Mr. NEILL: What are the details of this vote?

Mr. RHODES: This is to reimburse Miss Tillie of Edmonton, Alberta, who subscribed for a $1,000 Dominion of Canada four per cent bond, issue of 1932. The subscription was misappropriated by W. Ross Alger of the W. Ross Alger Corporation, Limited, with whom Miss Tillie was transacting this business. He was arrested and imprisoned. The amount of the cheque misappropriated was $936.70 with interest to May 1, 1933, at four per cent, of $21.35, making $958.05. They recovered from Mr. Alger before his arrest $280 and secured from the management committee his share of the commission of $17.61 and they have secured through Mr. Alger since the sum of $30. The Department of Justice has been consulted and has expressed the opinion that Miss Tillie has a legal claim against the government, and it is proposed to pay her this difference which she lost in this manner.

Item agreed to.

Federal District Commission—to provide for maintenance and improvement of properties under the control of the Federal District Commission, $55,000.

Mr. MARCIL: What new work is to be undertaken?

Mr. RHODES: This amount is in addition to the regular appropriation. It will be recalled that the commission has recently taken over the work of attending to the Rideau Hall grounds. The details are as follows:

Maintenance	$10,000
Filling	2,000
New fence	22,800
Improvements	12,000
Research building:	
Maintenance of grounds	5,200
Planting	3,000

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If they construct any more fences, please have them put up a fence different from that at Government House.

Item agreed to.

Grant to Reverend Doctor D. B. Marsh, $1,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): What is the reason for this vote?

Mr. RHODES: Dr. Marsh is an elderly clergyman who has devoted himself to science, more particularly as it is applied to astronomy. He headed the Hamilton contingent which was able to secure a record of the recent eclipse, I understand the most perfect record of all those obtained. His work is recognized and I hold in my hand a copy of the Illustrated London News which indicates the value of the scientific work performed by that expedition. He did this work gratuitously and is now entirely without funds. It was felt that as this work had brought a certain amount of eminence to Canada it should be recognized in this manner which is comparable to other recognitions which have been made from time to time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to join with the Minister of Finance in saying that I think this recognition is eminently worthy in every way. If there is any fault to be found with the vote, it is that it is much too small.

Item agreed to.

To provide for payment from the consolidated revenue fund to Indian trust funds of amount of defalcations of A. H. Lomas, former Indian agent, Cowichan, British Columbia, $15,770.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What is this for?

Mr. MURPHY: I think it was in 1929 that this Indian agent was brought up in court for retaining moneys for his own use that belonged to the Indians. Certain timber lands had been surrendered to certain companies in British Columbia and this agent reported that timber was not being cut when as a matter of fact cutting was taking place. The dues paid by the companies to this agent were diverted to his own use instead of being sent to the department. He was apprehended, convicted and sentenced to a prison term. Certain moneys were recovered from the bond company and from amounts owing to him by the department but the amount in the estimates, $15,770, was not recoverable. This amount is being asked for to replenish the Indian trust funds.

Item agreed to.

To provide for payments in connection with additional movements of coal under conditions prescribed by the governor in council—further amount required, $750,000.

Mr. RALSTON: Could the Minister of Mines advise if any orders in council have been passed since March 30, the date upon which this matter was dealt with under the main item? I should like to know if any additional orders in council have been passed to provide for subventions, particularly on coal from the maritime provinces?

Mr. GORDON: My recollection is that there have been no new orders in council passed. As the hon. member knows, the moneys required for the payment of subventions under the various orders in council have to be voted yearly and the orders in council that run out have to be renewed. There is possibly one with regard to the extension on railway coal which may have been passed subsequent to that date, but my recollection is that it was passed prior to that date. No others have been passed.

Mr. RALSTON: In view of the way in which this vote is worded, I should like to know whether it is intended to pass any further orders in council to provide for increased subventions? I am referring to increases in the rate per ton on coal moving from the maritime provinces, that is, either water borne, railed or water borne from Sydney to Montreal to be forwarded inland by rail or via the St. Lawrence.

Mr. GORDON: This matter of assistance has been the subject of conferences on a number of occasions between the producers, representatives of the miners and representatives of the government. The orders in council presently obtaining were the result of those conferences. It was stated that the assistance now given would permit coal from Nova Scotia to reach those points westerly which it was deemed by all those concerned would be the farthest point west that could be justified so far as help from the government is concerned. Therefore, it is not now in the contemplation of the government that further assistance by way of increased subventions will be given to the coal industry in Nova Scotia. I feel confident and I am sure the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth, with his intimate knowledge of the situation, will agree that if there is any considerable increase in the consumption of coal, the assistance now given will, I believe, take care of the matter perhaps as well as can be done, at least from the standpoint of direct assistance from the government.

Mr. RALSTON: My point is that it seems that only by way of assistance of this kind or some other kind to which I am going to refer in a moment, increased sale or consumption of maritime coal can be effected. I think my hon. friend is putting the cart before the horse when he suggests that if there is increased consumption, the assistance now given will take care of it. On the other hand, it seems that the assistance is needed in order to produce increased consumption or sale.

In that connection may I ask the minister whether there is in contemplation—and perhaps I am entitled to ask the intention of the government in this regard in view of the fact that this is a definite appropriation in connection with coal—any provision respecting the imposition of import licences with regard to United States coal? That has frequently been talked about in the press; rumours have come to us that it has been discussed by the authorities—I presume by the minister—and I want to ask whether that policy is being seriously considered by the government or whether there is any likelihood of such a system being put into force with respect to coal?

Mr. GORDON: During the course of the discussions that took place between me and those interested in the coal industry of Nova Scotia, the question of invoking import licences was gone into at great length. It presents some most difficult problems. My view is that a measure of that kind is not capable of being worked out. I do not think the government would be justified and I do not think the industry would be well served if, having regard to its implications and also the difficulty of administration, such action were taken.

Mr. SPENCER: Could the minister give the committee the amount of money granted by the government to the different provinces last year in connection with this vote?

Mr. GORDON: No moneys were given to the provinces with respect to this vote.

Mr. SPENCER: To the producers of coal?

Mr. GORDON: That information was given at length when the main estimates were under review; it is on Hansard. I have not the figures before me at the moment.

Mr. NEILL: Am I correct in assuming that this appropriation will complete the provision of enough money to take care of all the subventions now in existence to the end of the present fiscal year, and further, that it will not be necessary to pass any orders in council extending any existing ones? The whole thing is complete now for the duration of this fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. GORDON: Some of the orders in council providing for subventions expired about the end of the last fiscal year. They were renewed. My recollection is that some, probably one or two orders in council, do not expire until some time in the month of June, but they will be renewed in order that the money parliament has already voted and the present appropriation, if parliament votes it, will be available to take care of expenses under all the orders in council.

Item agreed to.

To provide for payment, as an honorarium, to His Honour Judge Edmund R. Wylie, for services as royal commissioner in connection with the Estevan mining dispute, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Judges Act, $1,000.

Mr. YOUNG: In connection with the Estevan strike, there is an incident to which I should like to direct the attention of the government. It appears that a woman, a weaver by trade, living in England, was visiting relatives in the Estevan district that summer. On the day of the strike she went into Estevan to consult a doctor. While the rioting was in progress, she was sitting in the doctor's office. It appears that the policemen lost their heads and in firing, as they thought, over the heads of the strikers, they fired through the walls of the building in which the doctor's office was, one of the bullets striking this women in the arm. She was taken to the hospital where she remained for a considerable time. Her friends tried to get compensation for her from the provincial government, but they refused even so much as to pay her hospital bill, claiming that the mounted police were a federal body. Her friends wrote to me and I wrote to the Minister of Justice who replied that the federal authorities had no jurisdiction in the matter, because, although the mounted police were a federal body, they were at the time acting under the instructions of the provincial government. I do not think it is the intention of the people of Canada that their governments should resort to passing the buck in that manner. That is conduct befitting men like Messrs. Dodson and Fogg, but we expect something different from the federal government, and I would ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance whether he would not take the matter into consideration.

Mr. BENNETT: I am frank to say that the details of this matter have been presented to me for the first time in what has just been said by the hon. member for Weyburn. But I believe there is involved in all these matters a principle that has to be settled, and I think members of the house as well as the public generally consider governments should disregard principles because of the hardships of a particular case. The old saying "Hard cases make bad law" is never better exemplified than when pressure is exerted upon a government to pay claims which are not valid, legal claims against it.

The question of the responsibility of the mounted police in a case of the character indicated by the hon. gentleman is not so easily disposed of as by a mere statement of the facts. The province of Saskatchewan pays to the federal government an annual sum, for which this government supplies police force to that province. Saskatchewan has some executive responsibility with respect to the matter, and if the Minister of Justice has advised that at the moment in question the police force was acting under the direction of the provincial authorities, obviously the federal authority is not responsible. The question is one of fact. But I can only say this, that now that the matter has been brought to the attention of the government in the manner in which it has, I shall ask for the papers for the purpose of endeavouring to ascertain just whether any question of fact is at issue. But if one were to establish the precedent of responsibility, I can hardly see where the whole thing would end. I do not think I need remind the hon. gentleman that matters such as this are constantly arising and sometimes governments are charged with having hard hearts because they do not yield to pressure in any particular case. But if they did, then within a short time a hundred cases would arise of claims that would be asserted to be quite as substantial as the one that was acknowledged. This is one of the difficulties connected with the continuity of government and the maintenance of a proper relationship between responsibility and finance. If the financial responsibility is to be entirely disregarded, it follows that payments are made whenever a hard case is created. But if on the other hand a principle is to be adhered to, the payments are made very infrequently and usually in response to an appropriation submitted as an estimate to parliament or a judgment recovered in the exchequer court against the crown. Broadly, the rule has been, I think by most governments recently, especially having regard for the fact that in England it has been decided that the crown can be sued without its being necessary in certain instances to file a petition of right and receive the fiat of the sovereign, that permission to sue has been granted wherever there appears to be, shall I say, the semblance of a valid claim against the crown. I can only repeat that I will myself try to read the file and ascertain whether or not it is a case in which there is any responsibility, and if there is a doubtful case, without endeavouring to involve persons of little property in litigation, we may be able in some way to refer the matter to the decision of a judge for the purpose of having it disposed of. I cannot really state the case better perhaps than by directing attention to what has recently happened. The privy council this week gave judgment in connection with the old Yonge street corner in the city of Toronto. During a short interval when I was Minister of Justice I referred the matter to the exchequer court. Subsequently the judgment of the exchequer court and of the supreme court of Canada went to the privy council and the judgment of the supreme court of Canada was reversed by the privy council last week. There was involved a question of great principle which touched the relations of the crown with the subject. When the incurring of liability is at issue, the question of responsibility for negligence in connection with giving an order to fire is one that has engaged the attention of courts and of parliaments for a long time, the last concrete case heard in England being, as will be recalled, the case at Amritsar in India, where the order to fire was given, improperly it is claimed, resulting in a substantial number of people being killed. The hon. gentleman has anticipated what might be decided when he says that the police lost their heads, and that when the order to fire over the heads of the people was given they fired through the wall. If the wall shot through was higher than the people standing by, obviously the police fired over their heads but not high enough to escape going through the wall.

Item agreed to.

To provide for expenses of representation at the world economic conference, $15,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This item is to provide for representation at the world economic conference. I imagine if the Prime Minister is in a position to make a statement at the moment that the public would be interested in knowing something of the extent of Canada's representation at the world economic conference, and also something of

the personnel. I understand that there may be reasons why the Prime Minister cannot give full information but perhaps he will give us as much as he can.

Mr. BENNETT: It will be observed that it is a very modest sum that is being appropriated for this purpose. It is a much lesser sum than was appropriated for the disarmament conference. My own personal views with respect to the world economic conference are that the position of ten millions of people on the northern half of this continent with respect to trade matters is of very considerable importance, and the voice of this country will have considerable influence by reason of the fact that our trading position is that of fifth or sixth among the nations of the world. It is therefore essential that we should have such representation as will enable it to be clearly understood at the conference what our position is. But when you deal with what you might call the purely monetary and financial side of it I need hardly say to any member of this committee that the position of this dominion is not nearly so important because our relative wealth is not very great. That is best illustrated by the position to which I directed attention some time ago, that the half-yearly payment of gold made by Great Britain in December last really amounted to several million dollars more than the entire gold reserves of this country. The fact is that the representation of this country in my judgment will have to be determined in the light of the order in which the problems will be discussed, and I am not in a position to make any statement as to either the personnel or the extent to which this country will be represented because we are in much the same position as are other countries in that regard. The settlement of the order of business will have much to do with the representation that may be necessary.

My own personal view, I say to this committee frankly, is that I should be placed in a position where I could advise Ottawa as to what representation would be required to enable particular business to be dealt with. Once more I am giving my own personal view when I say that no good purpose is served by asking busy ministers to sit around London weeks at a time without being able to have their minds directed to the consideration of the problem with which they wish to deal. I shall endeavour to ascertain the order of business and how it will be taken up, and then by communicating with those who I think are best able to deal with it I shall endeavour to see that adequate representation is afforded to this dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On this item I might as well ask the Prime Minister for information on one other point. The Prime Minister indicated that the government intended to appoint a royal commission to deal with monetary matters. I do not see any item in the estimates for the purposes of that commission and I was wondering whether the matter had been overlooked or whether the government had in mind other means of making the necessary provision.

Mr. BENNETT: I thank the right hon. gentleman for directing attention to the matter. It was not thought that any sum that we might think reasonable to put in the estimates would be more than a guess at the moment. We propose to set up the commission, and there are means whereby we can provide for unforeseen contingencies of that character, as the right hon. gentleman knows, and as was done I think in connection with the radio commission. That is in our mind, but it is just possible that the necessity for the payment of any substantial sum of money may not arise until after parliament will again be in session. That is the reason it is not in the estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the Prime Minister say when the commission will be appointed?

Mr. BENNETT: As a matter of fact our present view is that the commission should consist of five members. That seems to be a rather large commission, but it is not so having regard to the necessity of obtaining the services of experienced men outside of this country, possibly to the number of two, together with three Canadians who might represent the practical operations of our banking act, the legislative position—shall I say? —of the country and—shall I say?—the great mass of the public who use credits and who are the customers of banks and are interested in the practical application of theories to the expansion of credits—that would be the third of the three Canadians. That is, practical banking experience; broad general knowledge of the operations of our credit system as relating to banking and currency and what is sometimes euphemistically referred to as the consumer; that is the user of credits and the applicant for credit. We feel that three Canadians should be appointed together with two whom we have not determined upon who should live outside of this country in order that, if possible, a detached view might be obtained in matters of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Prime Minister has not answered the question I directed to him as to the time at which the commission would be appointed. In that connection, may I ask a question which I had intended to ask later, namely whether or not the Prime Minister contemplates the possibility of a fall session. I ask that question now because it relates in part to the possibility of having this commission sit in the interval, and also because hon. members would be glad to know at as early a date as possible if anything in the nature of a fall session is contemplated?

Mr. BENNETT: I have considered the question with my colleagues. We do not feel that we are in a position to make any statement about it, in view of the conference to which attention has just been directed, and to the results which might be obtained therefrom. Legislation might be required, in a given contingency, at as early a date as the late fall of this year. On the other hand that might not be so. Therefore I cannot make any statement that would enlighten the committee, because I have not yet been enlightened myself. I diffuse no light, as I have not yet received it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What does the right hon. gentleman say about the commission?

Mr. BENNETT: I had hoped that we would appoint the commission between now, and say, the middle of June. It might be that with respect to discussions as to the personnel of it, in one particular, it would be later than that when they could get to work. Some hon. members of the house know that the vacations in England do not begin until July 31, and it might be that we could secure the services of some eminent authority in that country who would not be unwilling to come to find a change in this country, and the work could be carried on during the months of August and September. That is as far as I can inform the right hon. gentleman at the present time, but the commission will be appointed, we hope, within—well, I was hoping by the middle of June.

Item agreed to.

British and foreign news service, $15,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like an explanation.

Mr. STEVENS: The contract with Reuters expires this year. For a long period of years the contract has been for $32,000. We have thought it desirable to continue the services for another year and we are asking for $15,000.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are Reuters agreeable?

Item agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, before you leave the chair I should like to know if the Minister of Finance can tell us the total of the estimates for the year.

Mr. RHODES: At page 4 of the estimates the right hon. gentleman will find that the total amount was $358,656,488.11. The supplementaries totalled, $2,087,964.56.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did we not have one other supplementary? I refer to the vote for the railways and steamships.

Mr. RHODES: I have not that figure before me.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

SUPPLY BILL

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Mr. RHODES moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1934, the sum of $174,127,778.15 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Rhodes thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 109, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1934.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, considered in committee and reported.

Mr. RHODES moved the third reading of the bill.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Before this bill is read the third time, Mr. Speaker, let me say that a moment ago I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) if he could give me the total amount of appropriations made by the house this session. If it should be possible to have that information we should be glad to get it.

Mr. RHODES: I think perhaps it would be better for me to give those figures to the right hon. gentleman in the morning and I will tell him why I think so. A portion of this bill is for five-sixths while the supplementaries are in full, and I think I could give the figures more accurately to-morrow if that would be satisfactory.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to delay matters, but I was going to point out to my hon. friend that in view of the size of this year's deficit and the probable deficit next year that I believe, the country must feel that the total estimates for this year show very little in the way of reduction over those for the previous year. Having regard to the amount of additional taxation the government has found it necessary to impose I think the public expected from the administration something more in the way of economy. I do not wish to make a formal motion but I do think the matter is sufficiently important to bring to the attention of the administration in the hope that when they are paying out sums under the estimates that have been appropriated they will see if it is not possible yet to effect some economies which it may be possible to make in the expenditure of these public moneys.

Mr. RHODES: Of course I am debarred from replying to my right hon. friend now, but at the earliest possible opportunity I shall take occasion to do so. Perhaps in just a word I might say that there have been very substantial reductions in controllable expenditures and that any increase or any lack of shrinkage in the total volume is due entirely to expenditures over which we have no control.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the third time and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

NON-CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house disagrees with their amendment to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, for the following reason: Because the deletion of subsection 3 of section 3 of the bill makes the said section ineffective.

And that the clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): What is the change made by the Senate?

Mr. DUPRE: The Senate did not concur in the amendment contained in section 3, which deals with offences against morality and especially the corruption of children. Subsection 3 deals with an irrebuttable presumption; it was carried in this house and deleted in the Senate. I have reason to believe that at present pourparlers are going on with some senators, especially the leader of the Senate and Hon. Mr. Dandurand, as well as with some representatives of societies for the welfare of children, and that very likely some compromise will be arrived at and a new clause enacted which I hope will meet with the approval of this house.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny): I have had a certain amount of experience in criminal affairs, and I must say that in deleting this subsection I think the Senate showed more common sense than was shown by this house and conformed to the traditions of British justice as we understand it. Under the bill passed rather hurriedly in this house a man going into his own home while under the influence of liquor, even though it may be without the knowledge of his children, or permitting adultery even without the knowledge of his children, is liable to commitment on being found guilty of this offence. More than that, the onus is on the accused; he is not presumed to be innocent but must prove himself not guilty before the court.

I believe the bill should remain as it has been amended by the Senate; otherwise it will be an absolutely puritanical blue law. In my humble opinion, therefore, I think we should concur in the amendment made by the Senate and I would press the acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Dupré) to do so. I think we should remain faithful to the principle that an accused man is presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty, and I do not think we should put on our statute book laws which are not capable of being applied or which, if they are applied, may lead to absolute tyranny.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. Under this bill a man who is in his own house under the influence of liquor, if there are children, is presumed to be guilty of an indictable offence and liable to commitment whether or not they know of his condition, and he must prove himself innocent instead of the crown being compelled to prove him guilty. After my experience with criminal law, which unfortunately has extended over almost thirty years, I think this house should accept the amendment made by the Senate and thank that chamber for having made it.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has misstated the case.

The Childrens Aid Societies of Canada have been endeavouring to prevent the corrupting of children's minds in their early days by reason of improper home surroundings. The new subsection 2 of subsection 215 read as follows:

> Every person who, in the home of a child, participates in adultery, or in sexual immorality, or indulges in habitual drunkenness or any other form of vice, thereby endangering the morals of such child or rendering the home of such child an unfit place for such child to be in shall be guilty of an offence and liable, upon summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year, or to both fine and imprisonment.

I need not say that this subsection in its entirety is not new; it existed before. The words added are, "Participates in adultery or indulges in habitual drunkenness." Drunkenness itself was an offence so far as that section was concerned, but the words now proposed are as I have just quoted. These provisions are intended to render it less easy for the child to have improper conceptions of things early in life. Subsection 3, which the Senate deletes, read:

> It shall be an irrebuttable presumption, in any prosecution under subsection two of this section, that the child was in danger of being or becoming immoral, its morals injuriously affected and its home rendered an unfit place for it to be in, upon proof that the person accused did in fact, in the home of such child, participate in adultery, in sexual immorality, in habitual drunkenness, or in any other form of vice.

All that is new. Now, the irrebuttable presumption was not that of guilt at all. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read the subsection he would have observed that that is not what the irrebuttable presumption relates to. The irrebuttable presumption in any prosecution would be that the child was in danger of being or becoming immoral by reason of such surroundings as are described. That is, as the law stood previously, to prove drunkenness was not sufficient; it was necessary to prove something else. Now we say that it is an irrebuttable presumption under this subsection that the child was in danger of being or becoming immoral or of having its morals injuriously affected if the home conditions were as I have indicated. The Senate struck out that subsection. There is a medium course that has been suggested and I believe the Senate will probably accept it. The minister is therefore moving that the statute be sent back to the Senate for that purpose.

[Mr. LaVergne.]

I may say that the Childrens Aid Societies of the country have been most active in connection with this matter, and this morning I received a telegram from a representative of the Childrens Aid Society, pointing out that if this subsection were deleted the legislation sought would be destroyed. While it may be puritanical to say that it is an irrebuttable presumption that the child is in danger of having its morals corrupted by reason of improper surroundings, that has nothing to do with the question of guilt or innocence. The guilt or innocence of the accused must be settled by proving in the first place, let us say, habitual drunkenness. That must be proven as a fact, but if you prove drunkenness there is an irrebuttable presumption that such a condition in the home is injurious to the morals of the child. I believe the Senate will now appreciate the fact that it was not an endeavour to determine the guilt and have innocence proven, but rather to determine the conditions that do exist; and having proven that there exist conditions which are detrimental to the interests of the child, that is a matter of irrebuttable presumption which is nothing more or less than what has been in the criminal code for centuries and will continue to be there. In other words, as a matter of law, certain inferences flow from the establishment of certain facts, and the proof of the facts rests with those who assert them, the onus probandi being on those who represent the prosecution; and when they prove the facts, then that is an irrebuttable presumption that the child is in surroundings which are inimical to its moral wellbeing.

Motion agreed to.

RADIO BROADCASTING ACT

PURCHASE OF STATIONS—APPOINTMENTS TO STAFF

The house resumed from Thursday, May 11, consideration in committee of Bill No. 99, to amend The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932—Mr. Bennett—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): May I say to the committee at once that since we were last in session I have had the Civil Service Commission and Mr. Gladstone Murray endeavour to draft an amendment which would meet the situation in every detail, that is, to preserve the rights of the commission on the one hand and on the other to ensure efficiency. I am bound to say that I find to-day that they have not been able to arrive at any form of words which they consider adequate, so I propose,

with the consent of the committee, to add the following words in order to remove all possible doubts as to there being an infringement of the rights of the commission, in view of what was said the other day:

Provided that the contracts of service of such persons shall expire on the 31st day of March, 1934.

This is a temporary provision to ascertain how the act works out and it will only last until 1934; on March 31, the end of this fiscal year, all persons employed under that section will have to be re-employed unless the law is amended under the civil service statute. They will have no position under this statute. What I said the other day has perhaps been extended a bit by some of our friends. When I said I proposed to set up the committee it was not to go over the whole radio question again—I regard that as settled—but rather for the purpose of ascertaining how the working of the statute which is now accepted as law could be improved upon in the light of the experience thus gained. This subsection, with the amendment I propose, would enable to be made only such appointments as will terminate on March 31, 1934, so that the creation of vested rights and interests, I humbly submit, could not arise.

In connection with appointments to the public service, my observation is that there should be a longer period of probation if possible, because I do not regard any system as infallible. It would be unfair to determine who were the best public servants, but I think a period of probation is very desirable, and all such persons, in the light of the experience that had been acquired, would be able to apply for positions and be dealt with in the manner thought best.

In section 14 I propose to add, in view of the criticism made the other evening, a few words which I think will be helpful. The new section 14 would read:

(1) The commission may expend for the purposes of this act the moneys appropriated by parliament for such purposes, together with such sums of money as may be received by the commission from any business carried on by it under this act.

(2) The moneys appropriated by parliament for such purposes shall not exceed the estimated revenue from receiving licences, private commercial broadcasting licences and amateur broadcasting licences:

Provided that if at the end of the fiscal year there is a balance of appropriated moneys unexpended, or if the revenue from the sources mentioned in this subsection exceeds the amount appropriated, parliament may appropriate any such balance and excess in addition to any appropriation provided hereunder.

(3) The commission shall present to the Minister of Finance an annual estimate of the expenditure proposed to be made by it during the fiscal year and the Minister of Finance shall from time to time pay into a chartered bank to the credit of the commission the moneys appropriated by parliament for the purposes of the commission.

From what I have been able to ascertain I think it is highly desirable that there should be a budget prepared by the commission to be submitted to the Minister of Finance in order that the payments made out of appropriations might bear a proper relation to the appropriations made by parliament and the moneys collected from licence fees. I regard this as being purely a temporary effort to bridge existing difficulties in the operation of the commission. I was somewhat astonished at the exent of the condemnation of the commission to which I listened the other evening and I only hope that the committee will accept this as an effort temporarily to meet a situation between now and the end of the fiscal year. My present intention is to ask the same committee, providing the members are all living, which sat before, to deal with this matter and investigate, not the principle because that was settled by the last report which was embodied in this legislation, but the operation of that legislation in the light of the facts as disclosed by the experience of the commission since it has been in office.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the first portion of my right hon. friend's remarks, that he purposes limiting this measure to March, 1934, I would point out that that does not meet our objection, an objection which I think is shared by the public at large, to having all officers, clerks and employees of the radio commission appointed by the commission itself and given such salaries as the commission itself may determine. So far as technical officers, professional employees, artists and the like are concerned, I think it is perfectly reasonable of the government to ask that the commission be given latitude and that they should not be restricted in the selections which they make or possibly in the salaries and payments to these persons.

The CHAIRMAN: I would direct the attention of the hon. member to the fact that clause one has been allowed to stand and we are now on clause two.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought that all clauses were open to discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Prime Minister discussed these matters and I thought I would have the same latitude in replying.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the purpose was to discuss all clauses.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With regard to ordinary employees and clerks and the like, I cannot see any reason why those who come into the radio service should not be appointed in the same manner as those who come into the service of any other commission appointed by the government or even those who come into the public service generally. The Prime Minister has said that it is desirable to have a period of probation but he knows that there is a period of probation with civil service appointments.

Mr. BENNETT: Six months.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Something like six months. During this period those who are not satisfactory may be rejected. I suggest that this section be amended by striking out the words "and other officers, clerks, and employees." The section would then read:

> The commission may employ such technical and professional officers as the commission may deem necessary or desirable, and such persons shall receive such salaries or remuneration as may be fixed by the commission.

I think that would give the commission all the latitude it would need with respect to the classes that are at all likely to require special consideration. My right hon. friend knows that once a person is appointed to the public service he ought to have the right to assume that his appointment is going to remain permanent.

Mr. BENNETT: This is to remove that idea in this particular clause.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It will not remove it. My right hon. friend has stressed, and I do not think it can be stressed too strongly, the necessity of public confidence in this radio commission. In this connection I intend to speak very plainly. Here is a commission which has been appointed by a Conservative government, every individual member of the commission is a Conservative appointee. It is proposed to give to these Conservative appointees the right to make all other appointments under the commission, even down to the clerks, stenographers and the like. They are to be given the right not only to appoint but to determine the salaries to be paid. That will simply serve to create a great Conservative political machine. It cannot be called by any other name. I cannot see how it can be expected that public confidence will be thereby established in the radio commission. If the government wished to take means to destroy confidence in this commission as an impartial body, they could not have gone about it in a more effective way. If the commissioners had been appointed as the result of a conference between the different parties of the house, or if there were on that commission representatives of the different parties, it might be a different matter, but hon. gentlemen opposite will not deny that all the commissioners are well known members of the Conservative party.

Mr. BENNETT: I deny that with respect to Colonel Steel.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: One of them was a former organizer of the party and I submit it is most unfair to give a body of that character the right to make all appointments and to control the whole radio broadcasting situation in Canada. I have seen some of the regulations already put out by the commission and they go the length of stating that the commission can suppress opinions on legislation passed by this parliament. What opportunity under such conditions is any party other than the Conservative party to have where radio broadcasting is concerned? It would be impossible to conceive of a more deliberate partisan act than that of giving to this commission the power to make all appointments. I ask the Prime Minister to consider the eliminating of these minor appointments from the control of the radio commission. He knows as well as I or any other hon. member that in ordinary administrative work there is nothing to distinguish what is to be performed under the radio broadcasting commission from that which is performed under any other commission. There is another reason why the Prime Minister, in particular, might well be disposed to give favourable consideration to this proposal. The Civil Service Commission as it is now and will be constituted is a body made up entirely of appointees of my right hon. friend and not appointees chosen jointly by both sides of the house.

Under the different measures which have been introduced by the government we are having set up in this country a number of what might be described as irresponsible bodies. They are not responsible to anybody. They are called commissions, board of trustees or something of the kind, and they are given all the powers that might be given to governments with respect to the particular field over which they operate. The Conservative government is to appoint trustees for the Canadian National Railways. These trustees

are to have to do with the expenditure of millions of dollars and the employment of hundreds of thousands of persons. They are to be given full control of the entire national railway service of the country. There is not a Liberal or a Cooperative Commonwealth Federation representative upon any of these bodies as they are constituted at the moment or as they are likely to be constituted. This radio broadcasting commission is being made into a sort of Conservative soviet and the same thing is happening with respect to the Civil Service Commission. What is government coming to in the country? Surely the minority is entitled to some consideration even at the hands of a majority such as that possessed by the government and its supporters. I think the government's action is most unfair and I believe it will be strongly resented by the people of this country.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say as I do not want to delay the committee. However, I think it is my duty to support the remarks of the right hon. leader of the opposition. I think, by the amendments that are proposed in this bill, we are giving too wide powers to this commission. The commission has already been working for some time and I think I am expressing the opinion of many, if not the majority of the people of this country when I say that the commission has not lived up to what the people expected of it. I have no confidence in the commission and to give it the new powers that are intended to be given by this bill would make it impossible to secure the results we expected from the creation of a radio commission such as was proposed by the committee that investigated and reported on radio broadcasting. For that reason I am opposed to the bill and shall vote against it.

Mr. SPENCE: I have lived in Toronto for forty-five years. The leader of the Liberal party has stated that this is a partisan commission. May I say to him and to the committee that I have been associated with the Conservative party during all the time I have lived in Toronto; for the last good many years I have been in the inner circle and Mr. Charlesworth was never known as a Conservative in my city. He was associated with an old Liberal family and married into one. He was never in the inner circle of the Conservative party and not regarded as a Conservative. Of course he might have voted Conservative at some time or another. What is the use of casting it up all the time that this is a commission composed of Conservatives, when it is not? As a matter of fact, I was not pleased with the appointment of Mr. Charlesworth because I thought a really good Tory should have been appointed.

Mr. GRAY: Before this bill passes I want to say just a word with respect to clause one which amends the Radio Broadcasting Act and takes away from the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission the matter of appointments. During the debates of Wednesday and Thursday of last week, when the Minister of Marine and the Prime Minister were speaking, they certainly gave to the house and the country the impression that the reason for this change was the recommendation of Mr. Gladstone Murray, director of broadcasting, brought over from England. Certainly the impression given to the house and the country by those hon. gentlemen was that this reputable director brought into Canada at the request of the government had stated that it was necessary to make this change, and therefore the government were falling in line in introducing this legislation.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I desire to correct my hon. friend in that respect. I stated very clearly to the house that since the commission had been in office, they noticed that they were handicapped in the performance of their duties by the existing law and this is why we are coming before the house with these amendments. They were approved by Major Gladstone Murray.

Mr. GRAY: I am speaking with respect to this one matter in particular. I have read my hon. friend's speech and I cannot find that he mentioned this particular item and it is specifically mentioned in the interim report of Mr. Gladstone Murray. As early as November, 1932, the chairman of the radio broadcasting commission wrote to the Civil Service Commission asking for the appointment of a director of publicity and a director of programs. I am not going to take the trouble to read the correspondence, but I shall quote a sentence or two. The chairman states:

> In connection with the organization of the work of the radio broadcasting commission, it is becoming urgently important that the services of a director of publicity be secured as well as a director of programs. I have discussed the matter with the Prime Minister, who assures me that the question is being taken up of an amendment to the act, whereby these and other important key positions on the staff of the commission may be exempted from the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

He then goes on to recommend that Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Weir be appointed at salaries of $6,500 per annum, and I shall have a word to say on that before I sit down. Nothing came of that and the next letter of interest is one of February 22, from the secretary of the Civil Service Commission to Mr. Charlesworth in reply to a letter of the latter again referring to the appointment of Mr. Buchanan. The secretary states in this letter that if they are going to make this a permanent position, they might just as well advertise now for a director of public relations rather than give him a temporary appointment of three months as they were able to do under section 40 of the Civil Service Act. He states quite frankly that the Civil Service Commission have no intention of certifying to such appointment, unless Mr. Charlesworth can give them assurance that the act is to be amended. This was all before Mr. Murray was ever in the country and certainly before he made any report to the government.

Then comes a very significant letter from Mr. Charlesworth to Mr. Foran, secretary of the Civil Service Commission, under date of February 23, 1933, as follows:

> I have yours of February 22 relative to our request for the appointment of Mr. E. C. Buchanan as director of public relations.
>
> I beg to advise you that last evening we received personal assurance from the Prime Minister that an amendment to the Radio Broadcasting Act would be submitted before the close of the session covering this as well as other matters. In accordance with the terms of your letter, I therefore ask that the certificate be issued for Mr. Buchanan as from February 15th.

That, I submit, proves conclusively that it was not Mr. Murray's recommendation that decided the course, but that the government had decided that they would amend the act long before Mr. Murray took any interest whatever in Canadian radio broadcasting.

May I say further that the danger of giving to this commission the power of making these appointments is pointed out fully in this correspondence in which they recommend that Mr. Buchanan—and I am not going into a discussion of his qualifications as a director of public relations—shall be appointed at a salary of $6,500. I am told that as regards directors of publicity in other departments, the salary of the highest paid official is around $4,000. Therefore this government, which under section 40 of the act is allowed, in making temporary appointments, to fix the salary, and which has been generous to its appointees in the way of salaries, did not feel that he was qualified to receive that salary and they fixed one of $5,800 less 10 per cent. That, along with other dangers, is one of the reasons I am opposed to giving to this commission the power of making appointments of this kind.

Before I sit down, may I refer to just one other matter and that is that we now have printed by this commission 108 rules and regulations covering the broadcasting system, and I wish to direct the attention of the committee in particular to rule No. 9, as follows:

> No broadcasting station may broadcast any speech, printed matter, program or advertising matter containing abusive or defamatory statements with regard to individuals or institutions or statements or suggestions contrary to the express purpose of any existing legislation; as for example, the Patent Medicine Act or any regulations promulgated thereunder.

I would like hon. members to take the rules and regulations as printed by the commission and read them one by one. If they do I think they will all agree with me that we are on our way, but where no one knows.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Will the minister give me some information with regard to section 14 of the act? At the present time are the accounts covering the expenditure incurred by the commission paid through the regular machinery of the Department of Marine, that is through their accountant, after they are audited by the departmental auditor and approved by the deputy minister?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I understand the accounts of the radio broadcasting commission are paid through the Finance department.

Sir EUGENE FISET: Then they are not paid through the Department of Marine?

Mr. DURANLEAU: No.

Sir EUGENE FISET: That is a rather peculiar situation. The Department of Marine receives all the money that is paid for licence fees. After that, by law it is compelled to credit that money to the receiver general, so that it forms part and parcel of the consolidated revenue fund. Then the minister is asked to vote a yearly sum of money not to exceed the revenue received from the collection of these fees. Then it becomes a departmental estimate, and I am rather surprised that the accounts submitted for expenses incurred through the radio commission are not paid through the Department of Marine. Is the minister sure that these accounts are paid on the direct approval of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Under the law as it exists at the present time the radio commission has to deal with the minister, and not with the department. It is an independent commission—

Sir EUGENE FISET: I know that.

Mr. DURANLEAU: —and the moneys collected by the Department of Marine from radio licences are deposited with the receiver general. Then when these moneys are released by a vote of the house the bills of the radio commission are paid, and that is controlled by the Finance department and the auditor general.

Sir EUGENE FISET: The minister is sure of that?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: I would like to say a word in support of the hon. member for West Lambton. I wish he had read a few paragraphs further on. It shows that the radio commission have taken power and have issued instructions that: no broadcast shall . . . issue statements or suggestions contrary to the express purpose of any existing legislation. Under that regulation it will be almost impossible for anyone to criticize over the radio at election time the actions of the government because that is legislation, but the government will be able to criticize the actions of the opposition because that is not legislation. Here is another regulation:

> The commission reserves the right to prohibit the broadcasting of any matter until the continuity or record or transcription or both have been submitted to the commission for examination and have been approved by them.

I presume that the commission sits in Montreal or Toronto, and if a man out in British Columbia suddenly has occasion or the urge during election time to express his sentiments over the radio he has to have them all written out—I do not suppose it could be done by wire because it would be too expensive—and he must submit them to the radio commission, and when they approve of his statement he will be allowed to go ahead and broadcast it. There are great possibilities there of discrimination. Then here is rule 93:

> The licensee shall file with the commission weekly in advance copy of the daily program schedule in such form as may be specified by the commission.

It is to be filed weekly in advance, by a man perhaps three thousand miles away. That rule could be used—I do not say that it will be, but the Scripture says, Avoid the appearance of evil—to discriminate against certain associations or bodies or individuals.

Mr. COOTE: What is my hon. friend quoting from?

Mr. NEILL: From the rules and regulations of the Canadian radio broadcasting commission issued on April 15, 1933, P.C. 535. I agree with the hon. member for West Lambton, who invited the members of the house to read these rules, because the more you read them the less you will think of them. I also endorse the remarks made by the leader of the opposition in connection with the proposal to engage the employees of the radio commission for the period of only about nine months until the thirty-first of March next. On the face of it that seems all right, but if the radio commission and the Civil Service Commission cannot in a few days formulate a paragraph that would differentiate between those officials properly coming under the radio commission, such as professional and technical employees, and the ordinary employees who should come under the Civil Service Commission, they will not be able to do it at the end of nine months, and this will be the situation. At the end of nine months what chance will there be of turning these employees out? They will have a wife and eight children by that time and will be a pathetic proposition. Then there will be this further consideration. Unless they are absolute dubs, after nine months' experience of the work, which has to be learned for the first time, when they come before the Civil Service Commission for examination they will have to compete with men who know nothing whatever about the work and the Civil Service Commission will almost invariably give the positions to the men who have had experience. It is almost their duty to do so. One has had experience, and the other not.

In conclusion, I regret very much that I am not in the position of the hon. member for Weyburn, to be able to boast, as he rightly does that he voted against the radio commission. I wish I had voted against it because the way it is developing it is going to be a curse to Canada, a curse to the people, and a curse to the government, a curse in the sense of being a source of perpetual annoyance and trouble. It will be another C.N.R. on a small scale. The minister told us some weeks ago that he was not sure whether he controlled the radio commission or the radio commission controlled him. There seems to be a doubt about it just as we hear the Minister of Railways say, "I cannot answer that question. I am not responsible. It is the railway commission." I regret very much that we adopted this system. Both sides of the house claim to be in favour of public ownership and then we

shirk our responsibilities and turn them over to a commission which has apparently far more power than the government and is responsible neither to God nor man so far as I can see. You will find that its expenses will increase. It will be such a ready source of increasing its revenue that the radio commission will say to the people, "The licence fee is now only two dollars. You surely would not begrudge three dollars now you are getting such beautiful programs." We have not heard the beautiful programs yet, but I agree that the commission must be given time to get into harness. There is, however, going to be perpetual trouble, and the licence fee will be increased, with more and more dissatisfaction on the part of the public. When the public are dissatisfied now they can, or they used to be able to, switch to another program. But now that this radio commission is in force they will sit down and write to the government or to their member expressing their dissatisfaction, and every mother will want the hour of the bedtime story changed to suit little Jimmie's convenience. They will make complaints that they never would make to a private corporation. It is bound to lead to endless trouble, and to judge from the personnel of the commission we are more than asking for trouble.

Mr. POWER: I agree with what has been said by my hon. friend from West Lambton and my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni. I have before me the rules and regulations of the Canadian radio broadcasting commission, National Research Building, Ottawa, April 1, 1933, and at page 17 in part V, dealing with the control of programs, I find that paragraph 90 reads:

No broadcasting station may broadcast any speech, printed matter, program or advertising matter containing abusive or defamatory statements with regard to individuals or institutions—

With that I have no complaint:

—or statements or suggestions contrary to the express purpose of any existing legislation; as for example, the Patent Medicine Act or any regulations promulgated thereunder.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is competent for any one of us to criticize the Patent Medicine act or the Pure Foods act or the Hoof and Mouth Disease act or the Hay and Straw act or any other act, but if we do that, forsooth, Mr. Charlesworth will prevent the station from allowing us to broadcast. I think the slightest consideration on the part of members of this committee will lead them to the conclusion that whoever drafted these regulations was not gifted with sufficient discretion to understand what he was doing. Take paragraph 91, for instance:

The commission reserves the right to prohibit the broadcasting of any matter until the continuity or record or transcription or both have been submitted to the commission for examination and have been approved by them.

Could there be any more strict censorship applied anywhere in the world? No one of my hon. friends opposite could make a speech in favour of the child welfare league, the social service league, the sons of temperance, the daughters of sin, or anything of that kind, without going to the radio broadcasting commission and asking Mr. Charlesworth kindly to peruse the full transcription of the language he was about to broadcast in support of any laudable movement. And here I believe they are infringing upon the ordinary laws of the land. Paragraph 95 is as follows:

Licensees broadcasting sustaining programs originating outside Canada shall, when requested by the commission, give priority to programs originating within Canada.

To that I have no very great objection. But listen to paragraph 96:

The licensees shall, upon the request of the commission, give right-of-way to such programs as in the judgment of the commission are of national interest.

And then:

In such event—

That is, where they give the right of way at the request of the commission.

—neither the licensee nor the commission shall incur any liability for compensation or damages.

That is to say, the licensee may have a contract with certain parties. Along comes the commission and states: "We think that such and such a broadcast is in the national interest; you have to abandon your contract." I ask hon. members of the legal persuasion if we are to confer upon this commission the right to give judgment concerning contracts. It seems to me that had the commission had a little more ordinary common sense they would not have drawn up such rules with regard to broadcasting. In that connection perhaps I shall have to differ from many hon. members on this side of the house by stating that I do not believe Mr. Thomas Maher, against whose appointment I have not a word to say—because he was a good politician and deserved recognition by his party—had anything to do with these regulations. He would have had too much political sense to have spread this sort of thing throughout the country. I do

suggest that perhaps it is the so-called non-partisan member of the commission, a military man with the air of a martinet, who is endeavouring to dragoon the Canadian people into obedience to a commission which should never have been set up.

Mr. GAGNON: I do not wish to quarrel with the hon. member for Quebec South concerning his criticism of the regulations which have just been put into force. As a matter of fact they have not been in operation for more than fifteen days, and so far I have not read a single serious criticism of them.

Mr. YOUNG: You are hearing it now.

Mr. GAGNON: Those regulations will be in operation. As the Prime Minister has said, a special committee will be formed to study the operation of radio broadcasting in Canada, and at that time we will be in a better position to judge whether or not the regulations are in the public interest. May I quote an article which was published in the Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph on April 6, of this year? As the hon. member for Quebec South must know, that newspaper is no longer a Conservative paper, but is Liberal.

Mr. POWER: I am not discussing that matter.

Mr. GAGNON: This article has been written with respect to the radio regulations:

Stand By Radio Regulation

An attempt is being made by American broadcasting interests to persuade the Canadian Radio commission to relax its five per cent advertising rule in connection with programs, by permitting an indefinite additional percentage of indirect or veiled publicity.

The commission should stand firmly by its rule and we believe that it has the necessary backbone to do so. The public doesn't want all the ballyhoo and vapid puffery that has been imposed upon it over the air in the past and would applaud if not merely ninety-five, but the whole one hundred per cent of each program were cultural or recreational.

But apart from this, an inefficient intrusion upon the newspaper's special field of revenue has forced the latter to discontinue its co-operation in the popularizing of radio as a great social asset.

Inveterate listeners-in sometimes complain because the newspaper does not publish programs for their convenience. But this is rather too much to expect when it is recalled that that program is a direct competitor of the newspaper's advertising columns and also includes, in not a few instances, information "pirated" from its news columns.

If and when, radio abandons its economic trespassing upon the newspaper, to which it owed so much in the days of its commercial infancy and to which it has made such poor returns, publishers will doubtless be glad to supply their readers, who are also listeners-in, with day-by-day information as to programs, special features and so forth.

Meanwhile, Canada has rightly determined to keep commercialism under full control and we venture to predict that the day will yet come when the United States will be glad to follow the Canadian example, as it has done before now, in other instances.

I shall not quote from Conservative newspapers, but shall quote expressions of praise from Liberal newspapers such as the Winnipeg Free Press and the Halifax Chronicle. In its edition of April 27, the Winnipeg Free Press contains the following—

Mr. MARCIL: I rise to a point of order. Are we to have inflicted upon us opinions from every newspaper in Canada? Is that regular?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I believe a decision has been given concerning that point.

The CHAIRMAN: An article commenting on the debate before the committee is out of order; I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. CASGRAIN: There was a decision of this house to that effect.

Mr. GAGNON: The articles I should like to read do not reflect upon the present legislation. However, I shall not read the articles, if it is the wish of the committee that I should not. I shall be content with saying that I have here some articles appearing in the Halifax Chronicle and the Winnipeg Free Press. I urge the hon. member for Comox-Alberni to read the Free Press of April 27, and also the St. Thomas Times-Journal, an independent newspaper.

Mr. NEILL: Must I do so?

Mr. GAGNON: Then I have an article from the Winnipeg Tribune and another from the Edmonton Journal, both of which are independent, and express approval of the commission. I beg to differ with the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni concerning programs. He, and the whip of the Liberal party, have stated that since the commission has been functioning no good programs have been broadcast. I may have misunderstood the hon. members, but I believe they said something to that effect.

Mr. NEILL: I said I had not heard them yet.

Mr. GAGNON: It is unfortunate the hon. member has not heard them, because the majority of people in Canada state that for

two months wonderful programs have been broadcast throughout the dominion. I have before me a great number of telegrams and letters which have been sent to the commission commending the programs. I do not know if upon attempting to read them I shall be called to order. At all events I might attempt to quote until objection is taken.

Mr. POWER: May I ask a question? How does it happen that the hon. member has all these telegrams addressed to the commission? Is the hon. member the representative of the commission in the House of Commons?

Mr. GAGNON: I take an interest in the work of the commission. I may be wrong but I thought that before criticizing the commission one member at least should try to acquaint himself with their work. Therefore I asked the commission kindly to give me some of the expressions of opinion they had received with respect to their programs, because I think it essential that hon. members should give the commission a fair deal before trying to discredit it in a most unfair way, as has been the case ever since this bill has been before the house.

Mr. POWER: Too bad the minister did not get that information.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. GAGNON: Certainly.

Mr. MARCIL: If the hon. gentleman is so interested in the commission why does he not suggest to them that copies of their new regulations be sent to every member of the house so that we may be able to see what is being done.

Mr. GAGNON: I do not see any copies of those regulations in the hands of Conservative members of this house; apparently hon. gentlemen opposite have good friends on the commission. I have never read these regulations and my hon. friend from East Essex was obliged to borrow the copy of the hon. member for West Lambton. I do not think the Liberal members of this house are being treated unfairly by the commission, since they have been able to obtain copies. At all events, Mr. Chairman, I think when my hon. friend from Charlevoix-Saguenay said a moment ago that no good programs had been broadcast so far, he made an absolutely unfair, unjust and unfounded criticism of the work of the commission. I have here a letter which was written by the Wentworth Radio Broadcasting Company, Limited, of Hamilton, Ontario.

[Mr. Gagnon.]

Mr. CASGRAIN: To whom is that letter addressed?

Mr. GAGNON: It is addressed to the Canadian radio broadcasting commission, Ottawa, and if my hon. friend wishes he may have a copy.

Mr. CASGRAIN: May I ask how the hon. member came into possession of this letter?

The CHAIRMAN: I should rule that since this is a letter addressed to the Canadian radio commission it should be laid on the table. I understand that the hon. member is about to read a letter addressed to the radio commission; therefore it is a public document, and after the hon. member has read it he must lay it on the table.

Mr. GAGNON: I am going to read it.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that it is a public document of which the house had no knowledge until the hon. member referred to it. Therefore after the hon. member reads it the letter must be deposited with the clerk of the house.

Mr. GAGNON: If that is your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I shall do so with pleasure.

Mr. MARCIL: If any public document is to be submitted in this house it should be laid on the table by the minister in charge of the department and not by a private member.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Surely the hon. gentleman is not in order in bringing the archives of the commission into the chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman has a public document; I think he has a right to read it, but later it must be deposited with the clerk of the house.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is that the original?

Mr. GAGNON: I have here a document; I am not sure whether it is a letter or a telegram, but it is from Moose Jaw under date of April 28, 1933. It is addressed to Mr. Hector Charlesworth and reads as follows:

> Please accept our sincerest congratulations on the French program, which we had the pleasure of handling for the commission at this point last evening.

Mr. CASGRAIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this procedure is regular. Here we have a minister of the crown who says he is in charge of the operations of this new commission and who is supposed to represent that commission in the house.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the point of order?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am coming to it.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman cannot interrupt another hon. member to make a speech; he must state his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is coming to his point of order.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The hon. gentleman is reading some letters apparently addressed to the commission. I think the procedure is not in order; this hon. gentleman is not a member of the commission and he is not in charge of the affairs of the department. I would ask whether the hon. member has the right to have these documents in his possession and to read them in this house. Surely they should have been tabled or read to the house by the minister in charge.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not for me to decide whether the hon. gentleman is rightfully in possession of these documents. He has them in his possession, but I must decide that since these are public documents, prima facie at least, they must be tabled.

Mr. GAGNON: I shall not insist because I do not want to take up too much of the time of the committee, but it seems to me the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay has taken a most amazing position. When I was reading a letter with respect to the broadcasting of a French program the hon. gentleman hastened to stop me, as though I were dealing with something contrary to the public interest. It is well known that the radio might be used in Canada in order to improve the relations existing between the two great races in this country. I may tell my hon. friend that if he is as curious as I have been with regard to the operation of the commission he can go to the chairman or the vice-chairman, who is a well known friend of his, and they will be very pleased to give him all the information available and to show him all the telegrams and letters they have received with regard to the programs broadcast so far. I have only attempted to quote some telegrams and letters in order to show that those who have stated in this house that as yet the commission have not broadcast good programs have been saying something contrary to the truth and not in the public interest.

Mr. POWER: I have not been discussing the question of whether the programs have been good, bad or indifferent; I have not listened to them, so I do not know. I do object to the power placed in the hands of this commission, or to the power assumed by them. What right have these three appointees of hon. gentlemen opposite, however good they may be, to censor every word that may be said over the radio in Canada? What right have they to ask, under any circumstances, that if we wish to address the public we must supply them with a transcription of our remarks before we may speak?

Mr. BENNETT: That is not what the regulations say. Will the hon. gentleman read them?

Mr. POWER: I always bow to the opinion of the right hon. Prime Minister. Paragraph 91 states:

The commission reserves the right—

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. It is reserved but they have not exercised it.

Mr. POWER: Surely the right hon. leader of the government is not trying to make a point there. I object to giving them the right to exercise that power, and the Prime Minister knows that is what I mean. I do not care whether or not they exercise it. I would not give the right hon. gentleman the right to do that if I had power to do so. Unfortunately he has sometimes tried to do it in the house, but there is such a thing as free speech in this country.

Mr. BENNETT: You are the last man to talk.

Mr. POWER: I do not care whether I am the last or the first; I shall talk as long as I like.

Mr. BENNETT: I think you should be the last man to talk.

Mr. POWER: I do not know why I should not talk; If the Prime Minister knows any reason let him get up and say so.

Mr. BENNETT: I am referring to the personal observations made by the hon. gentleman, and I say he should be the last man to discuss them.

Mr. POWER: If, having said so much, the right hon. gentleman wishes to say any more I should be glad to listen to him. There is no reason in the world why I should not stand in my place here and make whatever speeches I wish, provided they are within the the rules of this house. When I make such speeches as I am making to-day, in keeping with the principles which I support and which he himself, I am sure, would support if he were on this side, I resent very much any

implication on the part of the right hon. gentleman to the effect that I have not the right to speak as much as any other member of this house. If he has any reason for suggesting that I have not that right I challenge him now to state it.

Mr. BENNETT: I said, it depends on what the hon. member is talking about, his personal observations. That was what I said.

Mr. POWER: It depends on what I am talking about? I suppose if I am praising the government it is all right.

Mr. BENNETT: When the hon. gentleman drags into the debate personal observations and makes personal attacks, as he has often done, I say he is the last man that should do it—the very last man.

Mr. POWER: So that is the reason? My right hon. friend objects to my protesting against censorship because forsooth on some occasions I have spoken in a manner displeasing to him. Well, that is one of the reasons perhaps that I do object to censorship. If every time I say something that does not please the right hon. gentleman or his friends I am to be prohibited from speaking, I have the right as a citizen of this country to protest, and I do protest and will continue to protest so long as regulations such as these are included among those issued by the commission.

Mr. MacINNIS: When this bill was last before the house I pointed out my objection to the amendment with respect to the removal from the Civil Service Commission of appointments to the radio broadcasting commission. By the radio broadcasting act of 1932, provision was made for appointments to the radio commission through the Civil Service Commission, but now it seems that instead of obtaining their staff through the Civil Service Commission the radio commission simply go to that body and say, "We want this particular individual with such and such qualifications," giving his name and designation and asking the Civil Service Commission to O.K. that particular appointment. That being refused by the Civil Service Commission, they went to the Prime Minister and suggested that he take away from the Civil Service Commission the power of making appointments. This is what I particularly object to, and certainly the amendment will not pass by my vote until that is remedied. All those employees that can be appointed by the Civil Service Commission should be selected by that commission rather than by the radio commission. I do admit that there are certain persons, artists, who might properly be appointed by the radio commission, and such appointments should be left to them. Now the whole question of administration by the commission is under review, and the more we discuss it the more apparent it becomes that there is something radically wrong with the commission. In view of the rules and regulations that have been adopted I think the whole question should be very seriously considered at the present time, and we should determine just how far we will allow this tendency to go. It is just possible that the radio commission will be the first to put into effect the policy of the iron heel which we heard about last year, and we might as well have the fight now as at any other time.

Mr. MORAND: One thing that has been discussed, something that is very serious, should be settled and that is the question whether the commission shall have the right of censorship or not. I am rather surprised that members of this house should suggest that any one, at any time or place, may say just what he pleases over the air. I do not think that such a thing is permitted anywhere; it is not permitted in the United States nor in Great Britain, and surely the House of Commons will not constitute itself a board of censors. The commission must have the right of censorship, and if after a given period their judgment should prove to have been at fault, then certainly parliament would have the right to ask for their dismissal. But, I repeat, they must be given the right of censorship, for I do not see how broadcasting could continue under a system whereby everyone could say over the air whatever he pleased, no matter how offensive. I have only this minute seen the regulations, but section 90 provides:

No broadcasting station may broadcast any speech, printed matter, program or advertising matter containing abusive or defamatory statements with regard to individuals or institutions,—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is right.

Mr. MORAND: Well, how will you stop that without censorship?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Read the rest.

Mr. MORAND:

—or statements or suggestions contrary to the express purpose of any existing legislation; . . .

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is wrong.

Mr. MORAND: I wonder whether my hon. friends have listened during the last two and a half or three years to the patent medicine

quackery put over the radio in contravention of the Patent Medicine Act. People have taken advantage of the fact that they are able to say over the radio what they cannot print legally, and that is why this regulation has been put in. I would point out that similar regulations appear in every broadcasting act I have read, and they are necessary if radio broadcasting is to be properly carried on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend refers to people saying over the radio things they are prohibited by law from saying. I say, make any prohibitions you like, but make them by law and have them enforced. But that is not what that says; that is what it may mean but it is not what it says. Under that section the commission has power to control the political utterances of members of this house. It does not say so but that is the effect.

Mr. MORAND: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the effect of it.

Mr. MARCIL: Would anything in these regulations prevent a member of this house from addressing his constituents? Must a member submit his speech to the commission before he delivers it? I ask that question because we have not seen the regulations. That is the unfortunate part of it, and I would ask my hon. friend, who is well versed in the matter, to answer that question plainly. Is any member of this house allowed to say over the radio what his political views are without first submitting his speech to the members of the commission?

Mr. MORAND: Yes.

Mr. MARCIL: Will the hon. gentleman read any regulation to that effect.

Mr. MORAND: My hon. friend can read the regulations as well as I can.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We haven't got a copy.

Mr. MORAND: There is nothing in the regulations to prevent any man from expressing his political views, but where a man abuses the privilege the commission has a right to demand a submission of his text before he delivers it. That has been done in Great Britain. Lloyd George, I know, was asked to do so, and so were others, able men and equally important. They have been asked for a copy of their speeches whenever it has been thought necessary. It is nothing new.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Does my hon. friend suggest that a man of the standing of Lloyd George would be asked by a commission for a copy of his speech before he delivered it?

Mr. MORAND: He was asked.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If that is true we do not want it in Canada—absolutely not. I think we are handing over to this commission, if that is true, a power they should not have. The idea of asking a man of Lloyd George's standing to submit his speeches to censorship before he delivers them! Or asking the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) or the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail) to submit their political manuscripts, before they make their speeches. Why, it is an outrage. Surely this is a country of free speech, and if we are to have radio broadcasting then every one of us has the right to express his opinions over the air no matter how disagreeable those opinions may be to the rest of us. That is my position, and when my hon. friend says that Lloyd George has to submit the manuscript of his speeches before he delivers them, I say that it is going entirely too far. The idea of submitting the speeches we are going to make to the commission appointed to supervise broadcasting is to me an outrage, that is all.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity of reading these rules and regulations and like many other hon. members I am at a disadvantage in discussing this matter. The hon. members for Quebec South and West Edmonton have referred to these rules and there seems to be some doubt in the minds of hon. members of the committee as to their meaning. They are wondering if they will not during the course of their political career make speeches to their constituents which will infringe the rules and regulations of this commission. Apparently they must first submit a manuscript of any speech to be delivered. It often happens in political meetings that an hon. member is asked to address an audience. He speaks on the spur of the moment and may have no notes at all and I should like to know how the commission would act in a case like that. During the discussion on the estimates for the radio commission I made some remarks and observations in connection with certain speeches which had been made over station CHLP in Montreal. The Minister of Marine took me to task by saying that I was objecting to free speech. The speeches to which I re-

ferred embodied criticisms of the administration of the city of Montreal and the provincial government. I should like to know if these regulations were in force when those speeches were delivered. I am told that the same organization is at the present time having similar speeches broadcast nearly every day. I am as much for free speech as is the Minister of Marine or any hon. member but if we are going to have free speech, let us have it for all. Can the minister tell me if the manuscripts of these particular speeches were submitted to the commission for examination along the lines suggested by these rules? If these rules existed then as they exist at the present time and no action was taken, I think the commission might be accused of being derelict in its duty. I, for one, will not submit to these rules and regulations as I do not consider them to be proper under the circumstances. As the Minister of Marine said the other day, I think every member of every political party has the right to express his own point of view. He should not be forced to submit to a triumvirate which insists upon scrutinizing speeches before delivery. As I said, I have a certain amount of respect for some of the members of the commission but I do not think the commission has delivered the goods. I do not think it has carried out the provisions of the report of the committee which considered this matter before the law was enacted. One of the members of the commission, who is there to-day, was my political opponent. I do not think he would have wanted to submit all the speeches he made against me during the last campaign. If these rules and regulations had been in effect I do not see how he would have been entitled to make the speeches he did make.

I think this commission has been given too much power. It is not in the interest of the country that such rules and regulations should be put into force. Before these rules and regulations were issued they should have been submitted to the members of this house and of the Senate so that the people of Canada could have been made aware of what they contained. This is the first occasion upon which we have had the opportunity of knowing what they contained. I should like to ask the minister if they are printed in the French language and if he can supply all hon. members with a copy both in French and English.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): In order that the atmosphere may be cleared and members may have a definite understanding as to the use that may be made of radio stations, I submit that the Minister of Marine or the Prime Minister should make a declaration to the committee.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, these regulations were submitted by the commission to the council and sent by the council to the Minister of Justice. The Department of Justice made certain amendments to them and sent them back as being in order. The power given to the commission is stated in the act. I was amazed at the attitude taken by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay because there is nothing in these regulations that I know of to compel a member to submit his speech to the commission before it is made. What is stated is that the right is reserved to require submission if occasion necessitates. The reservation of that right is copied largely from the English rules. It is a supervision to be exercised in times of great stress and to deal with provocative discussions over the radio to which many people do not like to listen. All I have to say about this matter can be said in a few sentences.

Does this committee mean to indicate that it desires to destroy this commission? Is there any way in which this business of broadcasting can be carried on except through a department of government or through a commission? If it is to be carried on through a department of government, then the whole condition would change with a change in administration. It would be a political machine from the start. If it is not to be carried on through a department of government, what instrumentality shall be used for the purpose? The answer of this committee and of this statute is—a commission. Therefore, we have negatived the idea that this broadcasting business is to be carried on as a department of government and we have concluded affirmatively that it shall be carried on by a commission as an instrumentality of government. I think the committee must agree to these two propositions. Having concluded that we will set up a commission as an instrumentality of government, we must then proceed to the appointment of the commission. There has been much criticism of the appointments which were made. I confess that I know very little of the chairman's politics. I did not know him personally except for having met him two or three times at public functions. He was highly spoken of by independent persons to whom I went for assistance in this very difficult task of selecting a chairman. It was believed that his wide knowledge of Canada and his experience as a dramatic critic

would entitle him to have some idea of the tastes of Canadian people in broadcast programs and that in the preparation of programs he would have better ability than the average man would have in connection with matters of that kind. At any rate, he was selected as chairman and his appointment was hailed with much acclaim by the press of all classes of political thought. The truth is that I was surprised the other evening to hear the statement made as to his unfitness for the position. I believed when he was appointed he had singular qualifications for that particular post and that he would be able to understand something of the Canadian viewpoint, of Canadian history. The books he has written indicate a strong, virile Canadian sentiment and I believed, as I have said, he would be able to appreciate what the Canadian people would wish to have.

The leader of the opposition speaks of three political appointees of this government. I know nothing of the qualifications of the technical officer and I have never inquired. I know he was highly spoken of in his profession; I believe he was awarded the Military Cross during the war, and though the information is always open to question, technical persons to whom I have applied for it have told me that Colonel Steel occupies a unique position with respect to matters of broadcasting and knowledge of the technique of electricity. I know from a source that has thus far been accurate, that on many occasions he has been offered outside this country positions in connection with the industrial field of the development of radio that would give him much greater compensation than he is now receiving, but he has a very earnest desire to continue along the line he has been pursuing in Canada in connection with the development of electrical appliances and especially in connection with radio broadcasting. I think it is rather unfair to say that in any sense he is a political appointee. He has, so far as I know, never indicated anything of his political beliefs and faith, and I certainly never have had any talks with him about his political views. He is perhaps given to expressing his opinions very tersely; perhaps, in the language of a distinguished man of another age, he does not suffer fools gladly, but that may be a misfortune. At any rate I am bound to say that very great harm is being done by suggesting that this is in any sense a political appointment.

So far as Mr. Maher is concerned I am not going over this afternoon what I stated the other day.

A commission having been appointed to which some hon. gentlemen take exception, the next thing to do is to assist it to discharge its functions. If anyone thinks you can appoint a commission to handle national broadcasting in Canada without tramping on the toes of private interests in this country, he is mistaken. Those who own private stations and those who think they should have control of the industry or business in Canada are all opposed to this commission and its pathway is made increasingly difficult by reason of that fact. Wave lengths have not in the past been treated with just that high regard to international obligations that will have to be observed in the days to come, because as we go forward in this matter, there is a more strict supervision and the international phase of the situation calls for much more careful consideration. I do not desire to repeat this, but the international side of the matter is the one that causes the acute difficulty. On the other side of the line we have 120,000,000 people with the most powerful stations except one in the world and unfortunately the impulse behind the human voice when it goes out into space to vibrate is one that may send it north or south or east or west.

Mr. YOUNG: Fortunately.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman prefers the voices from most other countries to those of his own, but I ask him in this instance to believe me when I say that I do not think it is at all times fortunate that the voices of other countries should drown the voices from this. I mention that merely because it is that difficulty with which those gentlemen have to deal. That is purely the technical side of the matter.

There is also another side to it, that is, the question of the preparation of programs. I think the programs that have been offered to the Canadian people, in view of the fact that this is a new commission, have not been unworthy of some of our traditions. I have not been able to listen in on the radio during the last few months except, I think, on a Sunday, and I remember hearing a very admirable lecture. I was pleased to learn at the end of it, as it touched the early history of the country, it was under the auspices of the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission. We have in Canada a history that lends itself to broadcasting; we have the history of the early pioneers going back four hundred years to the early settlers, the history of the government of this country, of our

commercial expansion and our growth and development constitutionally and otherwise. All these are subjects that might well be treated by the commission and I believe they will be, but it can function only if it is not destroyed, as I said the other evening, by its friends. It has to make regulations. The making of regulations, one would think, to listen to some of the observations made here this afternoon, is a terrible thing. But every hon. member knows he cannot send a telegram using profanity or obscenity.

Mr. YOUNG: There is no censorship there.

Mr. BENNETT: The statute states that if anyone writes such a telegram, the telegraph company will not transmit it. You cannot write any telegram you like and have it sent. So you cannot print any kind of advertisement you might like, because the newspaper will not publish anything the publication of which is not permitted by law. In addition to that you have the censorship that arises by reason of the fact that this is not the printed but the spoken word, and if the spoken word is to be sent on the air regardless of what it may be, you will have an intolerable condition in this country. Children, all kinds of people, would not desire to hear either profanity or sedition or obscenity over the radio. The right of censorship has been exercised by every radio commission I know anything about. The word "censorship" sounds offensive to the average mind because it means the paramount authority of the state is not willing there should be absolute licence on the part of each individual citizen. There can be no civilization without curtailment of individual rights and in this instanee the freedom of the individual is limited by the exercise of censorship, if you call it such, by a commission. The commission drew up these regulations which, as I have said, were sent to the Department of Justice and reported back, after some amendments had been made, as being in proper form; those are the regulations to which reference has been made. The fact that prohibitory power is expressed does not of course indicate it is at all times to be used. To reserve the right to do something means that you have not departed from that right. Upon that you cannot build an argument that a speech must be examined before it is made. It is really an indication that the right is still reserved and has not been parted with to exercise the censoring power.

But I go further. There is not one of us who has not every day to make some sacrifice of his individual freedom. The by-laws of the city of Ottawa, the provisions of the statutes of the provinces and of the dominion, control individual liberty with respect to various matters. A statute which we had before us to-day dealt with the question of habitual drunkenness in a home being an offence against good morals so far as children are concerned. In this case we have a censorship set up, not merely to exercise censorship, but to protect and ensure the success of this enterprise of ours. I use the word "ours". I do not think it is deliberate; I am sure it is not, but the attitude taken in this committee by hon. gentlemen opposite has given great succor and support to those who desire to destroy publicly-owned broadcasting in Canada, and who have taken to themselves the thought that this country regrets that it has nationalized radio. These interests have taken new force and new life because they say that this house which a year ago spoke with unanimity is now bitterly engaged in a discussion the like of which we have hardly had this session, in the character of the language used and the expressions applied to individuals who are outside the pale of the house but who are nevertheless subject to criticism. And criticism too of men who came here at the courteous request of the government to give us the benefit of their experience of the most extensive broadcasting system in the world, that of the British, because although the soviet have more powerful stations than England the British is the most important broadcasting system.

In the course of experience it was found that you could not go to the Civil Service Commission and get the kind of persons required for particular positions on an advertising basis, on a tender basis, so to speak, and the radio commission sought amendments to the statute. The amendments they first sought were far more comprehensive than the ones now before the house, and personally I said that they were too extensive and that I did not care to ask parliament to grant them. I was not so much impressed in the first instance with the necessity of the amendments with respect to the Civil Service Commission until after Mr. Murray had given us the benefit of his views. I do not pretend that Mr. Murray's views are binding upon me in any sense, but he was a Canadian who had much experience and had made for himself a position for his services in connection with which he is being paid, a salary that to some hon. members of this house would seem to be princely; he was of the opinion from his experience that at least in the initial stages of our work, if we are to get the radio commission functioning properly, because we have to appoint provincial representatives,

and advisory committees must be set up in order to assist in carrying out in each of the nine provinces the work of the commission, it was desirable that the commission should be able to employ those servants and employees who could best do the work. I said to the radio commission, and I say to this committee frankly: It is contrary to the spirit of the Civil Service Act. But it was urged upon me that we could not deal with the matter in that way.

Once more reference has been made to the Civil Service Commission as being an organization that reflects the mind of the government. As I said to this committee the other day, we promoted to membership in that commission one of the members of the civil service, and I do not know to-day what his political faith is. I haven't any idea what Mr. Bland's politics are. In fact, I asked one of my secretaries the other day if he knew, and he said he did not, but he said he believed that if he had any views one way or the other they were probably Liberal. That was the answer given to me. But I personally know nothing of Mr. Bland's politics. I recommended that he should be promoted to the position he now holds because I believed that it was the view of the committee of this house that sat last year that he was an exceptionally well qualified man. Certainly in this house it was so stated. All that I know about him is this: Before he was appointed I sent for him and I asked him if he had any recommendations to make about the situation generally. He told me he thought money could be saved. I asked him if he was willing to accept the position on that commission and give it the benefit of his wide experience, and he said he was, and he was promoted accordingly. That is the political side of that appointment. Doctor Roche is still there.

Mr. MARCIL: What about the third member?

Mr. BENNETT: He has not yet been appointed.

Mr. MARCIL: Does not the Prime Minister think it is important that he should be appointed?

Mr. BENNETT: It is important that any vacancy should be filled if there is necessity for it, but there is no crying demand for it and the position is not yet filled because of an earnest endeavour to seek one who may not be charged with being a mere partisan. Doctor Roche and Mr. Bland are the first to realize that they cannot fill all these positions satisfactorily under the existing provisions of the Civil Service Act; but they believe that the provisions of the act are wide enough to exempt these positions from its operations. As the law now stands it reads:

> The commission may employ such technical, professional and other officers, and clerks and employees as may be necessary. Such officers, clerks and employees shall be appointed pursuant to the Civil Service Act.

That is the law as it is to-day. That is found to be unsatisfactory, unequal to the demands made upon it.

I have only one idea about this broadcasting commission, and that is to see it succeed. I know hon. gentlemen think that everyone is thinking in terms of political considerations. With respect to this matter I have not a thought in the world about politics, and I have not had. I explained the other evening the circumstances in connection with the appointment of one member of the radio commission, and I have also indicated this afternoon the position in respect to the other two members. We say that the proper method to pursue to meet the situation is to amend the statute so as to allow the radio commission to make these appointments. I am quite willing to admit that the criticism of that proposal is a criticism that I would make if I were sitting opposite, that the appointments were being put solely in the hands of the radio commission as well as the payment of salaries and matters of that kind, and yet when the advisory tariff board came into being under the late administration, a gentleman was selected for chairman who while he was on the commission was nominated as a candidate of the party in power, and there was no question about that at all, and who had previously been a candidate and been defeated. I am not going to say that human nature in any sense is at all different on one side of the house from the other. We are more or less the same. But the government thinks, in view of the representations made and the experience which the commission has had, it should be enabled to employ such persons as it finds necessary to carry on its business. It is because I and my colleagues in the government desire to protect the Civil Service Act and the principles of it that I suggested this afternoon, after thinking it over, and after these gentlemen had discussed it among themselves, no term of engagement should extend longer than the thirty-first of March next, that they would all expire on that date, so that there will be no question about an opportunity being afforded to make a discriminating effort to determine those persons who should be appointed under the Civil Service Act as distinguished from those to be employed by the radio commission itself.

The leader of the opposition has suggested that we strike out all the words after "officers," leaving in only the technical and professional officers. But it is with respect to the other officers, the director of programs, the director of public relations, if you will, and other such positions, that the commission in England at least, found that they had to have the freest hand in order to deal with the situation as it might arise. But in order that no one might be prejudiced I suggest this limitation of time.

My hon. friends opposite say, "This means that those people who will be employed in the meantime will have a better chance to get the position than someone else." But they would get it then under the provisions of the statute, being the best able, and if they are the best, those are the ones we want in order that the commission may succeed. I say frankly to this committee that it is my profound conviction, so far as a man can dissociate himself from political beliefs in a matter of this kind, that unless we endeavour to make a united effort to save this business as a national asset we are going to see it fail, and if it fails you may say that that will be a reflection on the government, and that is what you want to see happen. But it goes deeper than that. It is a reflection upon the people themselves, on their ability to maintain a public enterprise as a public property. That is what it really is, and that is the reason I make this suggestion. But if there is any other suggestion that this committee can make more adequately to meet this situation, and that will permit this commission to lay the foundations of the structure upon which it hopes to build success, by employing suitable instruments to that end; if there is any suggestion to make other than the one I have made concerning the limitation as to time of appointment, I shall be glad indeed to consider it and if possible to accept it. Because one thing is sure, namely, that the instrumentality we have set up to accomplish our end, namely, the commission—and after all it is the instrumentality of the government—can function only if we give it a chance to function.

I am sorry to say that in view of the protracted discussion over this matter it will be thought abroad, as it is already thought, that we rue our bargain with respect to the radio commission, that we are no longer desirous of maintaining it as a public asset, and that we are convinced that we should hand radio over to private interests. Well, just imagine what private interests have done in connection with other enterprises in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. BENNETT: And just imagine what they would be doing now if they had this in their hands. They would have no restrictions upon whom they would employ, no limitations imposed upon them. They would go forward with licence fees, if we gave them the licence fees, and do their task in that way. We do not get up in this House of Commons and ask, concerning the railway commission: "What induced them to close the crossing on Broad street, Regina?" or, "What was the operating cost concerning the grade separation on Yonge street?" or, "Why did they do thus and so?" We appoint them, and we leave them to do their work and perform their duties. Every time they have requisitioned us for additional assistance, whether it be for engineering—and they have increased those payments frequently—or whether it be for economies here or there, we have yielded to their views, because it is an instrumentality of government which the government itself could not operate as a department of government. The difference between departmental government and government by commission as an instrumentality of government is so clear that it need not again be defined.

We have taken other commissions—the grain commission, for instance. Look at what the grain commission is doing. It is operating through its laboratory in Winnipeg, through its agencies in Fort William, Calgary, Edmonton and Moose Jaw, and is discharging its multifarious duties. Is anybody in this house saying: "Look at the terrible regulations they have passed."

Mr. MALCOLM: They did.

Mr. BENNETT: And properly so, too.

Mr. MALCOLM: Every weighing master was under criticism.

Mr. BENNETT: And properly so, too.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, not properly so, because the committee did not find it.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman realizes that the regulation was beyond the powers of those who enacted it. That is the point. That did happen, and it does happen frequently, and when power is exceeded you have the inevitable criticism and you have an adjustment of the difficulties. But the grain commission is operating all through western Canada—elevators, grading, standards, and everything pertaining to grain. And the value of the grain commission's work to-day lies in the value of its standards and grades abroad, and the confidence the public have in their integrity and the manner in which they discharge their duties. With perhaps

some minor exceptions there have been few criticisms with respect to appointments made to the grain commission. It is true I could name one or two cases where there have been criticisms. One unfortunate gentleman was never able to sit at all—he was dying when he was appointed. But that is not a matter of importance. Let us take the railway commission: True, it has been the harbour of refuge once or twice, and still is. It is true that political considerations affected judgments now and then, but in the main we have set up an instrument which has succeeded.

I go farther: You have the harbour commissions. There you have had great failures and some successes. But so long as you have public opinion responsive to earnest effort you have an opportunity to achieve success. But if in a spirit of carping criticism, without referring to any other fact, you have concluded that what we have to do is to find fault with a body that has not yet launched upon its work—I claim a fair attitude is not being adopted. I carry my mind back to what took place in connection with the old grain commission, and how difficult it was to get it started. I wonder if this committee realizes how great the task was and how violent the criticism was, not in this house but—

Mr. MALCOLM: It made a good commission eventually, though, and made good regulations eventually.

Mr. BENNETT: I say that the commission as a commission, whose findings with respect to grades and matters of that kind have been received throughout the world with confidence, as I said a minute ago has in the main discharged its duties well. I could give striking illustrations, if I so desired, in respect of every one of them in which I believe political considerations governed appointments; I could give illustrations one after the other. But there is no necessity of doing that, because we all know that in the main with respect to these matters the Canadian people are satisfied.

This question of radio is more important than all of them.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, it is more important, because it touches the lives of all. The others touch the lives of some, but this is universal; it diffuses and dispenses news which comes into the homes of the poorest—because we find many poor homes in this country in which there are small radio sets, notwithstanding the fact that they find difficulty in obtaining other things which are almost necessities. They have a desire to hear what is going on in the outside world. While grain might be sold because of its superior quality even if the grades had never been fixed or determined upon—as they were not before, and as they are not in Russia, a country selling her grain in competition with ours—and while railways might be dealt with as they were before there was a railway commission, yet here we have something which shapes, forms and moulds the character of our Canadian people. And to the extent to which a commission realizes its responsibilities, and is able to discharge the functions which by this legislation devolve upon it, it will have discharged its duties as you and I would like to have them discharged. So to shape and mould the whole national outlook of the Canadian people as to make them take an interest and pride in the development of their own organization, in my judgment is at least a consideration. But I am not unmindful of the fact that keeping up with the Joneses has been one of the great difficulties of the present day. And to-day one of the difficulties that we Canadians have to face arises from the fact that we have limited resources and that we think we should have something just as good as if they were unlimited.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

GENTER THICKENER COMPANY

Mr. E. R. E. CHEVRIER (Ottawa) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 102, respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

On section 1—Extension of time for application to revive patent.

Mr. BENNETT: The other evening I asked that this bill stand because I hoped the minister would be able to look into it. I was unable to investigate it myself but I had that done, and the report I received was that because of a mistake made by a firm of solicitors in New York—an entry had been made in a diary to take the proper action to extend the patent, but that was not done—

the solicitors were framing this measure in order to protect their client against their own negligence. I do not know whether that is a correct statement but that is the report I received. In view of the closing sentences of the section, in which the matter is left in the hands of the commissioner of patents after they have established the facts, I know of no reason why the matter should not be left in that position.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I say that the right hon. gentleman is quite right in his understanding of the facts. There was a motion for the return of the fees, and I wonder if there is any chance of that being done. I do not want that motion prejudiced by reason of my not mentioning it at this time.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Finance is not in his place, but I see no reason why the fees should be returned. I distinctly recall that once in the practice of my profession a mistake was made in my office and I had to pay $1,000 to rectify it. I see no reason why this country should make the contribution instead of the solicitors.

Section agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RADIO BROADCASTING ACT

PURCHASE OF STATIONS—APPOINTMENTS TO STAFF

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 99, to amend the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932—Mr. Bennett—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

On section 2—Powers of commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the recess the Prime Minister spoke at some length with regard to this measure, and to two or three statements which my right hon. friend has been making from time to time I should like to take very strong exception, in the hope that he will not repeat them.

The first statement is that anyone on this side of the house is in any way seeking to prejudice public ownership either in the minds of hon. members of this house or of the public generally. May I tell the Prime Minister that it was a Liberal administration that appointed the royal commission that brought in the report on radio broadcasting, recommending that this service be made a government owned and operated utility The Liberal party has taken its stand strongly behind

that proposal, and we are just as anxious as the Prime Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite to see this government owned utility made a success and secure the confidence of the public. Indeed we are wholeheartedly in favour of government ownership and control of radio broadcasting. Any criticisms we may have to make from this side are directed not against public ownership as such but rather in an endeavour to remove those features which may tend to create prejudice against government ownership as it exists under the present radio broadcasting commission. When the right hon. gentleman speaks about private interests getting succor and support from those who are bringing forward criticisms with respect to any features of the present commission, let me say that he is simply drawing a herring across the trail. There can be no question as to the motives behind the criticisms which we have been making from this side.

The Prime Minister said the choice was between having radio broadcasting under a commission or under a government department, and he went on to say that if it were under a government department it would become a political machine. I think the Prime Minister is quite wrong. I do not think he would admit for a moment that the post office, which is a public utility, is a political machine. Though there may be reasons for so regarding it at the present time, I do not think he would admit that his own Department of External Affairs, which is a department of government, is a political machine.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not a business.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But the post office is a business and there is a great deal in connection with the departments of Marine, Fisheries, Public Works, Trade and Commerce and other departments of government that has to do with business. They have not become political machines because of the fact that appointments to the public service are made through the instrumentality of the Civil Service Commission. The absence of this protection is the feature to which we are taking exception in the bill my right hon. friend is now proposing. He is taking the appointments under the radio broadcasting commission out from under the control of the Civil Service Commission, which has been the one body that has saved our government departments so far as appointments to their staffs are concerned from becoming purely political machines. Some degree of censorship will undoubtedly be expected by the country and will

be approved by hon. members, but great care will have to be exercised as to how that censorship is to be enforced, and as to the judgment and discretion with which it is to be exercised. So far as censorship goes, that is the extent of our criticism. As regards the appointment of staffs however the Prime Minister has told the house that there are certain appointments which Mr. Gladstone Murray says should be made by the radio commission itself. Well, no one is contending that the radio commission should have to go to the Civil Service Commission before its members can employ artists or highly technical or professional persons or others necessary to fill the parts essential to any broadcast. All we are asking at the moment is that with respect to the great body of officers, clerks and employees generally, these classes shall be appointed in the same way as others are appointed who are doing similar classes of work in the public service. There is a very strong reason for that with regard to the public service of Canada generally. If we are to leave to different commissions the right to determine what salaries are to be paid for certain classes of work, there will be endless friction between employees in the public service in and under the various departments of government. The Civil Service Commission was established amongst other reasons for the purpose of classifying certain kinds of work and attaching to the different classifications the salaries that seemed to be appropriate.

A few weeks ago we removed from the purview of the Civil Service Commission many appointees on the staffs of the penitentiaries, leaving to the chief of the penitentiaries staff the appointment of persons connected with the institution and the salaries to be attached to those positions. With respect to the railways we took away from parliament the authority to determine the salaries to be paid in different branches of that service, leaving that function to a group of trustees. And with respect to the tariff board, the government has removed from the Civil Service Commission the duty of appointing the staff of that board and of fixing their salaries. In respect of other bodies the same thing has been done, with the reservation in one or two cases that the governor in council must approve the salaries. Here however there is no approval of salaries demanded. We shall soon have throughout the public service as many rates of salaries as there are commissions and bodies of the kind. The Civil Service Commission exists to prevent that sort of thing and to see that throughout the public service those employees performing similar services should receive similar rates of pay.

That is what we ask at the moment with respect to these employees, and I do say that unless that control is preserved by the Civil Service Commission the government will be making a grave mistake and will certainly be converting the radio broadcasting commission into a political machine. I think the Prime Minister himself must feel that what I have suggested by way of amendment is fair. Let me read the amendment I propose to offer to section 1 if my right hon. friend will not see his way to accepting it:

To strike out the words "and other officers, clerks and employees or other" in lines 6 and 7, and to insert the word "and" after the word "technical" in line 6.

The section as amended would then read:

The commission may employ such technical and professional persons as the commission may deem necessary or desirable, and such persons shall receive such salaries or remuneration as may be fixed by the commission.

That makes it clear that so far as all technical and professional persons are concerned —and both these words may be construed in a very broad sense to include artists and persons of special talent—

Mr. BENNETT: The statute in another clause is clear in that respect.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then, so far as these classes are concerned, we are prepared, with the proviso which the Prime Minister says he is prepared to make, of having the provisions of the bill apply only until March of next year, to have such persons appointed by the radio commission. I do not think it would be right, however, especially if it is desired to establish public confidence in the commission, that stenographers, clerks and others of the radio commission staff doing administrative work generally, and work corresponding exactly to what many of them have been doing up to the moment, should be made exceptions of by being separated from that control which the Civil Service Commission exercises over similar classes of employees in the public service.

Mr. YOUNG: When the bill creating the radio commission came before the house last year I objected to it. I did not speak against it, contenting myself with expressing my opposition by vote. I did not speak against it because I was in such a hopeless minority that I realized that any objections I might raise would be laughed at as groundless fears. My objections to the nationalizing of radio were quite simple. I am opposed to any ex-

tension of the activities of government in the realm of business or over the lives or activities of our people. I am opposed to any further building up of bureaucracy which might seek to control all the activities of this country. We are gradually building up such a bureaucracy, and if we continue the time will come when all aspiring people in the country will look to the government or to some political party for advancement in life. That is not in the public interest. Any advantage we might reap—I say might—from public ownership or control of common utilities would be far more than offset by the disadvantage of having people all depending on governments.

I also object to having any commission arranging for me the programs which I shall listen to over the radio. I prefer to choose my own programs. If I cannot tune in on one station I want to be free to tune in on another, and I do not want any commission dictating what it shall be.

I also feared, at the time the bill was introduced, that the licence fee would be raised. It was raised. It was doubled, and I understand it would have been redoubled had the opportunity been favourable. I am told that the commission would like to have raised it still higher, but they thought the time was not opportune because people were hard up; but they are looking forward to the time when they can raise it still higher.

I will not repeat the arguments advanced this afternoon from this side in opposition to censorship. I am thoroughly opposed to it, as were the speakers this afternoon. But in regard to the argument that we must have a national broadcasting system in order to build up a Canadian spirit, because our people were apt to lose their patriotism owing to the influence of foreign programs—

Mr. BENNETT: That was not stated.

Mr. YOUNG: It was not stated in those words, but it has been said that in order to build up a Canadian spirit—we will put it that way—it is necessary to have true Canadian programs. Let us look at the rules and regulations of the broadcasting commission and see what they regard as truly Canadian programs:

> A program of foreign origin which advertises goods manufactured in Canada and names the address in this country where such goods are produced and distributed shall be deemed a Canadian program.

In other words, a program can be produced one hundred per cent in Chicago and so long as it advertises Canadian goods it shall be deemed a Canadian program. If the programs we were getting from abroad were going to make us all Yankees instead of Canadians, I do not see anything in this regulation that will change that. Such programs can still come in provided they advertise Canadian goods. It seems to me that the same hand that was at work devising these rules and regulations was also at work devising the customs rates, and the regulations are designed not to shut out the ballyhoo of the Yankee but rather to prevent us from listening to his advertising. The fear is not that we shall import American ideas but that we shall import some American goods. The greatest objection I have to the commission is in connection with the unethical practices to which they have resorted in order to beat out their competitors. Any merchant who tried to beat out his competitor not by giving better value or better service to his customer but by overturning his competitor's delivery van and spoiling his goods would be considered unethical and be despised and condemned by every right thinking person in the country. That is precisely what this commission has done. When the bill went through last year I thought that if we did not like their programs we would be able to tune in on the American stations as we had done in the past. However, we now find that we cannot tune in on any of those stations. The commission has so arranged the wave lengths as to make this impossible. In my opinion, this is unethical and should be condemned in the strongest terms.

Mr. BENNETT: The suggested amendment of the right hon. the leader of the opposition does not meet the difficulty to which attention has been directed. It is felt that the words "and other officers" should at least remain in to be dealt with by the commission. I am quite content to have the section amended to read as follows:

> The commission may employ such technical, professional and other officers as the commission may deem necessary or desirable, and such persons shall receive such salaries or remuneration as may be fixed by the commission.

There will then be added these words:

> Clerks and all other employees of the commission shall be appointed pursuant to the Civil Service Act.

The only distinct difference between us is as to whether other officers shall be appointed by the commission or by the Civil Service Commission. It was that difficulty that influenced me in suggesting that it should be only for a limited time. There was an inability to settle definitely upon what would constitute other officers. This could not be done without a great deal of study being given to the matter, more than the Civil

Service Commission was in position to give up to this time. May I remind the committee that in dealing with the National Research Council my right hon. friend appointed a head to that body for a period of five or seven years and inaugurated a line of salaries which were out of line with those paid in the civil service. This caused a great deal of heartburning and some differences and difficulties which we are endeavouring to adjust. I quite follow every argument which has been used as to the undesirability of having different salaries paid by different commissions for the same services but there is at once the answer suggested in connection with the National Research Council, namely, that the struggle to get a certain type of qualified persons is such in view of competition that you must pay the going salaries for the workers required. As I say, I desire to meet in every way in my power the suggestions which have been made, but I think the whole purpose would fail if the words "and other officers" were stricken out and these employees made subject to the Civil Service Commission. That commission is not able to deal with that phase of the matter and the radio commission must be in a position to do so if it is to function. I believe that because it is what they tell me positively.

Mr. Murray is very clear about it. I do not desire to quote him again but he has stated that if we are to make this succeed, we should take this course. I should like to endeavour to assist those who are trying to do it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A half loaf is better than none at all and the circumstances being what they are I am quite prepared as a compromise to accept what my right hon. friend has suggested. I wonder if he would accept a suggestion from me which I think would be in accord with the views he has just expressed. I would suggest adding to the section the words "and approved by the governor in council." These words would apply to the salaries to be paid. I suggest this simply because I think the Prime Minister himself sees the wisdom of not having different salaries paid in the public service for similar classes of work. If the salaries to be paid these professional, technical and other officers were required to have the approval of the governor in council, I think there would be a greater probability of uniformity in the salaries paid throughout the public service. I suggest to my right hon. friend the addition of those words to the amendment he himself is proposing.

Mr. BENNETT: Frankly, I was endeavouring to avoid that. I wanted to avoid the government taking responsibility with respect to matters of this kind if the commission was to function as I hoped it would. However, if the right hon. gentleman thinks that the addition of those words will improve it, I am not adverse. The section would then read:

> The commission may employ such technical, professional and other officers as the commission may deem necessary or desirable, and such persons shall receive such salaries or remuneration as may be fixed by the commission subject to the approval of the governor in council.
>
> Clerks and all other employees of the commission shall be appointed pursuant to the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the Prime Minister knows that I am not given to increasing the powers of the governor in council but I believe there are some cases where the governor in Council might exercise a supervision which would be beneficial.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): When this bill was up a few days ago I took a position in connection with this section which I do not see any reason to change. The Department of Marine, as I pointed out at that time, has had for a considerable number of years a very excellent technical staff which has operated the radiotelegraph section. To my knowledge no complaints have ever been levelled at the ability or capacity of those men. They were appointed under the Civil Service Act and I see no reason why these technical men should be placed outside the operations of that act. I have every respect for the opinion of Mr. Gladstone Murray with regard to the technical construction side of radio broadcasting, but I am afraid that he does not understand our problem in connection with civil service matters, and in fact he cannot be expected to understand it. It has taken us years to reach the stage we have in connection with the Civil Service Commission. If the Civil Service Commission is now to be sacrificed and a tremendous political weapon placed in the hands of the radio commission, this committee will be ill advised to pass even the amendment proposed by the Prime Minister. I submit that these men should not be placed outside the operations of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does section two remain just as it is here?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It takes away from parliament the approving of the purchase or lease of stations. It is understood that that will stand only until March, 1934.

Mr. BENNETT: I have not added that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That will be understood?

Mr. BENNETT: I intended to add that clause at the end of the bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Expenditure of moneys.

Mr. BENNETT: I have a new clause to offer to be substituted for this one. This provides that the estimates for expenditures shall be submitted to the Minister of Finance; otherwise the commission might contemplate a budget well over expenditures. I will ask my colleague to move this amendment.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I move that section 3 be amended as follows:

Section 14 of the said act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

14. (1) The commission may expend for the purposes of this act the moneys appropriated by parliament for such purposes, together with such sums of money as may be received by the commission from any business carried on by it under this act.

(2) The moneys appropriated by parliament for such purposes shall not exceed the estimated revenue from receiving licences, private commercial broadcasting licences and amateur broadcasting licences:

Provided that if at the end of the fiscal year there is a balance of appropriated moneys unexpended, or if the revenue from the sources mentioned in this subsection exceeds the amount appropriated, parliament may appropriate any such balance and excess in addition to any appropriation provided hereunder.

(3) The commission shall present to the Minister of Finance annually an estimate of the expenditure proposed to be made by it during the fiscal year and the Minister of Finance shall from time to time pay into a chartered bank to the credit of the commission moneys appropriated by parliament for the purposes of the commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It may be that I am not very quick at apprehending, but I have not yet been able to see justification for the interpretation that I understand the government is placing upon this clause. I understood the Prime Minister to say that the moneys which the commission were receiving were the equivalent of those which they themselves raised in the form of fees.

Mr. BENNETT: Only under this amendment they are not all paid over at once; they are paid over as the commission may require.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that all that the commission may expend?

Mr. BENNETT: No, such moneys as they earn.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The commission receives from parliament an appropriation which, this year, I understand was $1,000,000, and in addition gets all it raises in the way of receipts for the purpose of expenditure.

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. gentleman has hardly put that fairly. First, the commission receives the moneys that have been collected for licence fees. Second, it has in hand such sums as it earns from the conduct of advertising and business and its expenditures are limited to the sums paid for licence fees and receipts by it from its business. The suggested amendment provides that they must budget and the budget must be sent to the Minister of Finance so that he knows the commission is not incurring liabilities beyond those which the receipts from the two sources will meet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I read this clause, it gives to the commission all that the Prime Minister has just said it is entitled to, but in addition there is an appropriation by parliament. I cannot read that language in any other way. Let me read this sentence:

The commission may expend for the purposes of this act the moneys appropriated by parliament for such purposes.

Parliament has appropriated $1,000,000, so that that means the commission may expend $1,000,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Provided licence fees are collected to that extent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The clause continues:

Together with such sums as may be received by the commission from any business carried on by it under this act.

That would be the business the commission carries on. Does that business include licence fees as well?

Mr. BENNETT: No, they do not carry on that business. It is just as the right hon. gentleman said and as the hon. member for Rimouski pointed out this afternoon, up to the moment the Marine department have collected the licence fees and they have been paid into the consolidated fund. Hence an appropriation was necessary to free any part of them for use by the commission. That is the real explanation of the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Parliament is supposed to appropriate for the purposes of the commission the amount raised by licence

fees. The commission will get that amount and in addition such sums as may be received from any business that may be carried on, and nothing more.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Section 3 as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Limitation of appropriation.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the right hon. gentleman will see that this is covered by the new section 14. Therefore section 4 may be deleted.

Section 4 dropped.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is now on section 1.

Mr. BENNETT: Section 1 as amended will read as follows:

1. Section 4 of the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:—

4. The commission may employ such technical, professional and other officers as the commission may deem necessary or desirable, and such persons shall receive such salaries or remuneration as may be fixed by the commission, subject to the approval of the governor in council.

Clerks and all other employees of the commission shall be appointed pursuant to the Civil Service Act.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I move accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 1 as amended agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: The new section 4 will read as follows:

This act shall expire on the ..... day of ..... 1934.

This is only a temporary measure and will expire on a certain date in 1934. March 31 is a little early. As the appropriations are made from fiscal year to fiscal year, the only question is whether there is time to deal with the matter from the opening of parliament to March 31.

Sir EUGENE FISET: In view of the fact that each department is allowed from fifteen days to three weeks after the fiscal year is ended, to spend its estimates, perhaps three weeks after April 1 would be all right.

Mr. BENNETT: The law has been changed since my hon. friend's time. At present there has to be an appropriation accepted by the comptroller of the treasury.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Make it April 30, if my right hon. friend thinks that is better.

Mr. BENNETT: Then the new section 4 will read as follows:

This act shall expire on the 30th day of April, 1934.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I move that new section 4 be inserted accordingly.

Section 4 agreed to.

Bill reported, and amendments read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BENNETT moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On division.

Motion agreed to on division and bill read the third time and passed.

TARIFF BOARD ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of Bill No. 100, to amend the Tariff Board Act.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): There has been a good deal of discussion already on the second reading of this bill, and if there are no others who wish to speak I think we might as well have a division on it at once, as we are opposed to its provisions.

The house divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Halton),
Arthurs,
Barber,
Barrette,
Belec,
Bennett,
Bourgeois,
Bowen,
Boyes,
Burns,
Bury,
Davies,
Dickie,
Dorion,
Duguay,
Duranleau,
Edwards,
Esling,
Fortin,
Fraser (Cariboo),
Gobeil,
Gordon,
Gott,
Hackett,
Kennedy (Winnipeg South Centre),
Larue,
Loucks,
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
MacNicol,
McGillis,
McGregor,
Maloney,
Manion,
Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon),
Morand,
Myers,
Peck,
Pickel,
Plunkett,
Porteous,
Quinn,
Rhodes,
Ryckman,
Senn,
Shaver,
Simpson (Simcoe North),
Simpson (Algoma West),
Smith (Victoria-Carleton),
Spankie,
Spence,
Stanley,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stewart (Lethbridge),
Stirling,
Stitt (Selkirk),
Sullivan,
Sutherland,
Tétreault,
Thompson (Simcoe East),
Turnbull,
Weese,
White (Mount Royal),
Wilson,
Wright.—65.

NAYS

Messrs:

Bourassa,	Macphail, Miss,
Brasset,	McIntosh,
Butcher,	McKenzie (Assiniboia),
Carmichael,	McPhee,
Casgrain,	Mitchell,
Chevrier,	Neill,
Coote,	Parent,
Denis,	Perras,
Dumaine,	Ralston,
Elliott,	Reid,
Factor,	Rhéaume,
Fafard,	Rutherford,
Fiset, Sir Eugène,	Sanderson,
Fraser (Northumberland, O.),	Speakman,
Gardiner,	Thauvette,
Garland (Bow River),	Totzke,
Girouard,	Vallance,
Jean,	Verville,
King, Mackenzie,	Woodsworth,
	Young.—39.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Arsenault,	Fournier,
Baker,	Bertrand,
Baribeau,	Beaubien,
Bell (Hamilton),	Mercier (St. Henri),
Bell (St. Antoine),	Raymond,
Bell (St. John),	Dubois,
Beaubier,	Ahearn,
Beynon,	Euler,
Black (Halifax),	Dubuc,
Bowman,	Hanson (Skeena),
Cahan,	Rinfret,
Cantley,	Cardin,
Casselman,	Howard,
Chaplin,	Lucas,
Charters,	Blair,
Cotnam,	Hurtubise,
Cowan (Port Arthur),	Ilsley,
Cowan (Long Lake),	Irvine,
Dupré,	Ferland,
Embury,	Bothwell,
Ernst,	Spencer,
Gagnon,	Boulanger,
Garland (Carleton),	Goulet,
Geary,	Mercier (Laurier-(Outremont),
Guthrie,	Lapointe,
Hanson (York-Sunbury),	Veniot,
Harris,	Jacobs,
Johnstone,	Donnelly,
Jones,	MacLean,
Laurin,	Fontaine,
Lawson,	Gray,
Lennox,	Pouliot,
MacDonald (CapeBreton),	Urquhart,
Macdonald (Kings),	Kennedy (Peace River),
MacMillan,	Mackenzie (Vancouver),
McDade,	Dupuis,
McGibbon,	Power,
Matthews,	Moore (Ontario),
McLure,	MacInnis,
Mullins,	Howden,
Murphy,	Stewart (Edmonton),
Nicholson,	Bradette,
Perley (Qu'Appelle),	Munn,
Perley, Sir George,	Marcil,
Pettit,	Bouchard,
Price,	Hanbury,
Robinson,	Desrochers,
Rogers,	Heaps,
Ross,	Roberge,
Rowe,	Lacroix,
Ryerson,	Taylor,
Sauvé,	Séguin,
Short,	Heenan,
Smith (Cumberland),	Duff,
Smoke,	Cayley,
Spotton,	Hepburn,
Sproule,	Golding,
Stevens,	Malcolm,
Stinson,	Hall,
Stitt (Nelson),	Weir (Macdonald),
Swanston,	Luchkovich,
Tummon,	St-Père,
Weir (Melfort),	Motherwell,
White (London),	Gershaw,
Willis,	Brown,
Ganong,	Deslauriers.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. McLURE: I was paired with the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. MacInnis). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ROWE: I was paired with the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. LENNOX: I was paired with the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BELL (St. Antoine): I was paired with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Raymond). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SMOKE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Cayley). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GOLDING: I was paired with the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Sproule). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I was paired with the hon. member for North Timiskaming (Mr. Bradette). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. CHARTERS: I was paired with the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Blair). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ROBINSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Desrochers). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I was paired with the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Embury). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. IRVINE: I was paired with the hon. member for Long Lake (Mr. Cowan). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ST-PERE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Hastings (Mr. Tummon). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LUCAS: I was paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. WEIR (Macdonald): I was paired with the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Stitt). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BROWN: I was paired with the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Willis). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR: I was paired with the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Ryerson). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. SPENCER: I was paired with the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I was paired with the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Murphy). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. HEAPS: I was paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Kennedy). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DONNELLY: I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton North-Victoria (Mr. Johnstone). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was paired with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. COWAN (Port Arthur): I was paired with the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. BAKER: I was paired with the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Bertrand). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SHORT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): I was paired with the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Goulet). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. HARRIS: I was paired with the hon. member for Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I was paired with the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Munn). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto South (Mr. Geary). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Seguin). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Ferland). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (N. B.) (Mr. Arsenault). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (N. B.) (Mr. McDade). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

On section 1—Pensions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understood the Prime Minister had an amendment he was going to move.

Mr. BENNETT: It is already in.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it in this bill?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes; there is the provision for sixty-four years.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There was a provision to limit it to the chairman.

Mr. BENNETT: It is so limited.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the section carried?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This bill has been well discussed. Many hon. members have spoken, and the vote which has just been taken must convince the government that this is the most unpopular measure which has been introduced. Nothing further can be done, except to allow it to pass only on division.

Mr. BENNETT: Only to add this to what I have already stated: A judge who had enjoyed a judicial position for two years was asked on February 6, 1933, to vacate his office. Judging from the language used by the right hon. gentleman opposite he is faced with the possibility that in the event of a change in administration he would lose his position. Under those circumstances it is difficult to ask a man to undertake a task. That cannot be fully met; all that can be done is to see that after serving ten years and reaching the age of sixty-four he will be dealt with as indicated, and that he will receive a salary of $15,000. As I pointed out, if by reason of the action of a new administration he loses his position, as has been threatened, then of course his salary is still too small. Great Britain pays twice as much for such services. I am not going to labour the matter. These special provisions are applicable to only one person, and that is the chairman. He is to serve ten years, and must be sixty-four years of age before pension is payable as indicated.

Section agreed to on division.

Section 2 agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed on division.

PRIVILEGE—MR. GORDON

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. My attention has been directed to an article appearing in the Sherbrooke Daily Record of Monday, May 15, 1933. It is captioned, "Our Unfortunate and Much Governed Country," and among other things the editorial states:

> The Minister of Labour at Ottawa has a chauffeur to whom he pays $1,560 a year; supplies for his cars of $489.18; gasoline and oil of $120.48; repairs and renewals of $93.11; sundries, $67.43.

There is not an atom of truth in that statement, and if the order of precedence is to prevail I would suggest that Ananias move back from the fire and give place to the editor of this newspaper.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I remark that this is a well known Conservative newspaper in the province of Quebec.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine) moved the second reading of Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this house will recall that at the beginning of the session an endeavour was made completely to revise and consolidate the Canada Shipping Act, and a bill was introduced in the Senate for that purpose. When that bill was under consideration by the Senate committee on banking and commerce, however, it developed that there might be some question as to Canada's power to enact all the legislation therein contemplated, and after a very full discussion the bill was withdrawn. During the hearing before the committee, however, it was made apparent that some remedial legislation should be enacted in order to protect our Canadian shipowners, and that some amendments should be made to our coasting laws.

The primary object of this bill is to amend our coasting laws in order to put them on a parity with the laws of the United States. Under section 935 of our present act United States bottoms cannot transport goods or passengers directly from one Canadian port to another Canadian port, but the law is evaded by taking goods from a Canadian to a United States port, let us say from Fort William to Buffalo, where a transshipment is made to another United States ship which takes the goods to Montreal. The United States ships do indirectly what is forbidden under section 935 of the Canada Shipping Act.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the minister any information as to the volume of that business?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I will give that information when we get in committee, when I will have all the statistics with regard to this traffic. We are trying now to make our laws exactly the same as those of the United

States; as a matter of fact the wording is about the same. At present section 935 reads as follows:

No goods or passengers shall be carried by water, from one port of Canada to another, except in British ships.

2. If any goods or passengers are so carried, contrary to this part, the master of the ship or vessel so carrying them shall incur a penalty of four hundred dollars; and any goods so carried shall be forfeited, as smuggled.

The amendment suggested in the present bill will read as follows:

No goods shall be transported by water or by land and water, from one place in Canada to another place in Canada, either directly or by way of a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation in any ship other than a British ship.

2. No ship other than a British ship shall transport passengers from one place in Canada to another place in Canada either directly or by way of a foreign port.

And so on. In order to illustrate my point I will read the existing law in the United States, under which foreign vessels are debarred from participation in the United States coasting trade directly or indirectly:

No merchandise shall be transported by water under penalty of forfeiture thereof from one port of the United States to another port of the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

We have been asked by those interested to enact the same law for the protection of Canadian and British bottoms.

Mr. YOUNG: Who are those interested?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Every Canadian should be interested because this is for the protection of our own people.

Mr. YOUNG: Did every Canadian ask for it?

Mr. DURANLEAU: The majority of Canadians are asking for it. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that when this matter was before the Senate committee many people were heard on that very point, and those opposed to this amendment have failed to make a case. They only had a fear that rates might be increased between Fort William or any other port in Canada and Montreal or other Canadian ports. I think it has been made abundantly clear that there is nothing to fear in that respect. We have plenty of Canadian bottoms to transport goods and passengers between Canadian ports either directly or indirectly, so there is no danger of rates being increased. As this house knows, the rates are under the control of the Board of Grain Commissioners. They regulate the rates. Moreover, under section 938 of the act the governor in council has power—

Mr. VALLANCE: Is there not a maximum rate which the grain commission may fix? Is there not protection in it?

Mr. DURANLEAU: There is ample protection in it. In the event of any undue increase in rates owing to lack of competition or for other reasons, the governor in council has power to suspend any clauses of this statute. Section 938 provides that:

The governor in council may from time to time by order in council declare that the "foregoing provisions" of this part shall not, for the period specified in such order in council apply, either throughout Canada or in any specified waters of Canada, to the ships or vessels, or to any specified, ascertained, or ascertainable class or number of the ships or vessels, of any foreign country.

We are therefore protected. Those who had any fears in the matter were reassured; it was proved clearly to them that they were protected in three ways.

Mr. YOUNG: How long has the governor in council had that power?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Since 1923. Those interested in shipping grain or any other commodities are protected in three ways, by fair competition, by the regulations of the grain board, and by section 938 of the statute. I think it is only fair that our Canadian bottoms should enjoy the same protection as American bottoms in our waters.

There are other small amendments. They are not very important but we have taken the opportunity to include them in this bill. First, there is an amendment with respect to authority in the matter of pilotage. So far the authority has been vested in the Minister of Marine, but we have deemed it wise to substitute for the amendment proposed in the bill one providing that the authority vested in the minister in pilotage matters shall be conferred on the deputy minister in the absence of the minister. For the proper administration of the department I think it wise that this amendment should be accepted. Another amendment has reference to the inspection of ship's tackle for the protection of those engaged in the loading and unloading of vessels in Canadian ports. This amendment conforms with the legislation adopted by the League of Nations international labour bureau last year. This provision serves a very useful purpose for the protection of those employed in loading and unloading ships. Every country that signed the agreement will adopt the same legislation. The next amendment provides that everyone shipping goods weighing over 2,240 pounds shall indicate the weight on the package before it is loaded on the ship. As the result of experience this provision has also been adopted by the League of Nations inter-

national labour bureau last year for the protection of navigation and seamen. The next amendment requires that helm orders shall be given in the direct sense on all ships registered in Canada. This provision was adopted by the international convention for the safety of life at sea and was ratified by this house by chapter 49 of the session of 1931. Every country is accepting the regulation in order to have uniformity in the direction of ships. I do not think there is anything else I can add at the moment, but when the bill is in committee any information desired will be given.

Mr. J. L. BOWMAN (Dauphin): I have a few remarks to make with respect to section 935, to which the minister has referred. All members from western Canada are particularly interested in this section because it is possible that if the amendment is put into effect it will have some bearing, directly or indirectly, upon the rates which will be charged on grain passing over the lakes to eastern ports. I am satisfied that all western members have followed with the keenest interest and have read probably more than once the evidence which was submitted to the standing committee of the Senate on banking and commerce with respect to the original bill, letter J. respecting the Canada Shipping Act. The first witnesses who were heard by that committee were those who appeared on behalf of the grain producers of western Canada. The first witness to appear on behalf of such producers was Mr. P. F. Bredt, representing the Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba pool organizations. Mr. Bredt's view with respect to this particular section is set out at page 44 of the evidence, and possibly I might bring the crux of the amendment to the attention of the house by pointing out that if section 935 becomes law it will mean that only grain carried to Buffalo from Fort William or Port Arthur in Canadian vessels can be transferred to the port of Montreal. The contention of those who appeared on behalf of the various producers was that if this section became law the result would be to create more or less of a monopoly for Canadian shippers with respect to the transfer of grain from Buffalo to Montreal. Mr. Bredt sets forth the view of the three western grain pools in a written memorandum which appears on page 44 of the evidence. This reads:

Whereas the suggested amendment to the Canada Shipping Act would prevent transshipment of Canadian grain through Buffalo or other American lake ports except in Canadian vessels, and

Whereas it is essential in the best interests of Canada that no avenue of outlet for our grain should be closed, and

Whereas the passing of this amendment would result in restrictions of trade through inability to take advantage of possible lower ocean freights at Montreal or Quebec on all Canadian grain stored in lake Erie American ports, and

Whereas it would also have the effect of creating a virtual monopoly on freights to Montreal, which might react seriously against us in the world's markets.

Therefore be it resolved that we, as representatives of a large percentage of western Canadian producers, protest strongly against legislation which will in any way interfere with the normal movement of our grain.

Mr. Bredt stated that those were the views of the three pool associations which were said to have handled approximately forty-five per cent of the crop last year. I note that the minister, speaking in this regard, said something to the effect that those who were protesting against this amendment had not put up a very good case. Dealing with this matter, I note that Mr. Bredt states at page 46:

It is very difficult, of course, to state definitely that it would mean an increase in rates.

On page 51, he gives the following answer to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne:

Q. Mr. Bredt, if this act went through do you claim it would increase freight rates?

A. There is a danger as we see it, we may be wrong.

While Mr. Bredt expressed the view of the associations in the manner I have quoted, he still seemed to think that there was a certain amount of doubt. The United Grain Growers also filed a memorandum with the committee. Their president was not before the committee personally but he sent a telegram to the chairman, part of which reads as follows:

The principal interest of this to the Canadian grain trade and to the producers of grain in western Canada, including many thousands of shareholders and customers of United Grain Growers on whose behalf this company feels it necessary to speak lies in connection with the Buffalo route for lake transportation of grain and also in the competition in lake freights which the use of that route has made possible

While we recognize that certain conditions in lake transportation have at times driven lake freights on grain down to levels unremunerative to vessel owners and lower than could be maintained for any great length of time, we must point out that the competition from United States vessels has at times in the past been an important factor in holding down lake freights and we fear dangers to the interests of grain producers if such competition is permanently eliminated.

Mr. Sydney Smith, the president of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, also appeared before the committee and his views are set

forth in the evidence. Mr. Smith stated that he represented the unanimous opinion of the export committee of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and at page 76 he says:

On behalf of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, which I represent, I should like to say that my instructions are that they are not at all interested, nor are the export trade particularly interested in forcing grain on any route. The general idea—if I have not explained it clearly, it is my fault—is that they want the freedom of the export routes that now exist, and they believe that that is in the interest of the producer of western Canada. Although the grain exchange has sometimes been accused of being an institution that mixed everything up in connection with grain, they have at least identified themselves with the producer in this.

On page 65 Mr. Smith states that in his opinion this amendment might create a monopoly, but at page 74, in answer to a question by the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, he makes a rather significant statement. Mr. Meighen's question was:

You are not in the shipping business?

Mr. Smith replied:

I am in the export business. I am not talking of any interests in Buffalo, I am talking of the viewpoint in the west, that we should like these two channels left open. We may be looking at a bogy, but that is what we think.

Mr. Smith is a man of vast experience in the exporting business. I suppose he is one of the greatest, if not the greatest exporter in western Canada. He states that they should like these two channels left open, that they may be looking at a bogy but that is what they think. I might point out that in supporting his contention that a monopoly might be created, Mr. Bredt stated that in July last the lake shippers formed an association known as the Associated Lake Freighters, Limited. Mr. Bredt stated that this association came into being on July 10 and that on July 11 the rates were raised, other increases taking place at periods of a few days until the rates were increased from four and a half cents, I think his statement was, to seven cents. My recollection is that another witness corrected that by stating that the rates had got down to three and a half cents and were increased to six and a half cents. Mr. Bredt supports his contention that a monopoly might result, if the business was handed over wholly to Canadian shippers, from what happened last July.

I should like to refer to certain statements and figures which appear on pages 28 and 29 of the evidence. I do not wish to weary the house by repeating these figures, but I want to draw attention to certain facts in order that when this bill is discussed in committee the minister may be able to give some explanation in respect of the matters to which I refer.

On page 28 of the evidence schedule 1 is set out showing shipments of grain from Fort William and Port Arthur to Canadian and United States ports by Canadian and United States vessels. It covers eleven crop years from 1920-21 to 1930-31. In the first two columns it shows that out of, in round figures, 1,452,000,000 bushels handled through Canadian ports, 1,411,000,000 were handled by Canadian vessels and only a little over 41,000,000 bushels were handled by United States vessels. In other words, the grain that went to Canadian seaports was handled almost entirely by Canadian boats. On the other hand, in the next two columns it is shown that out of 1,464,000,000 bushels of grain which were sent to United States ports, 1,282,000,000 bushels were handled by United States vessels while only about 181,000,000 bushels were handed by Canadian vessels. In other words, the grain which was shipped to United States ports was largely handled by United States ships.

There is a rather interesting schedule following that, schedule 2, which shows the lake shipments from Fort William and Port Arthur by nationality of vessels. In 1927-28, 788 cargoes in Canadian vessels comprised a total of roughly 148,000,000 bushels while 508 cargoes in United States vessels comprised 150,000,000 bushels. In other words, 508 United States vessels carried more than 788 Canadian vessels. This indicates that the Canadian vessels were either old and obsolete or were of less carrying capacity than the United States vessels. The same proportion holds good more or less throughout the remainder of the schedule.

Mr. MANION: Is that not because the Canadian vessels are largely canal boats going through to Montreal?

Mr. BOWMAN: Some of them go all the way from the head of the lakes to Montreal.

Mr. MANION: That is what I mean.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is probably one reason that would account for this. But reading the evidence one certainly was impressed by the fact that a considerable number of the boats belonging to the Canadian shipping interests were obsolete, although the shipping interests emphasized the fact that they had plenty of tonnage to handle the grain under all circumstances.

Schedule 3 shows how the grain was exported during a period of four years, as follows, in round figures:

Crop year—	Exported through Canadian ports bushels	Exported through United States ports bushels
1927-28..	140,000,000	168,000,000
1928-29..	180,000,000	190,000,000
1929-30..	86,000,000	78,000,000
1930-31..	119,000,000	102,000,000

This shows that in the first two years more wheat was shipped through United States than through Canadian ports, but in the latter two years more was shipped through Canadian than through United States ports, although the quantities are very close. I have taken some time to draw these facts to the attention of the committee to show that the routing of grain is of tremendous importance to western Canada. The eastern route is of great importance to Manitoba and the eastern part of Saskatchewan. I presume from about the middle of Saskatchewan west through the province of Alberta the grain is mostly routed through Vancouver.

Mr. VALLANCE: No, all Saskatchewan grain goes east.

Mr. STEVENS: Not all.

Mr. VALLANCE: Most of it.

Mr. BOWMAN: A considerable proportion of it goes east.

Mr. VALLANCE: The dividing line is about twenty miles from the eastern boundary of Alberta.

Mr. BOWMAN: A fraction of a cent of difference in shipping charges often determines the route by which grain will be shipped, and before I, for one, would be prepared to support this bill, I would certainly have to know, if the shipping interests are to be benefited, that it is not to be at the expense of the producers. The minister may be able to show us by the statistics which he has and as a result of the amendments which are contained in this bill, that the effect will be to give an increased volume of business to Canadian vessels, thus helping them, but certainly I would not for a moment be prepared to support this bill if I thought the effect would be, as I said a moment ago, to increase in the slightest degree, by a fraction of a cent, the cost to the grain producers of the west.

Another element which I think should be cleared up, I presume in committee, is the matter of safeguards or control. The minister, in the few introductory remarks which he made, referred to control, and read to the house the provisions of section 938 of the Shipping Act. I regret that I did not have an opportunity of reading carefully the provisions of that section, but I was surprised to hear the minister say that it had been in effect since 1923. I of course accept the minister's statement. But hon. members from the west will remember that, I think in 1924 or 1925, I am not sure of the year, there was some trouble with respect to shipping grain east. An hon. member informs me that it was 1922. If 1922 was the year, probably that would account for the amendment in 1923. At that time United States vessels had to be invited in to break our laws and we had to grant them immunity for so doing, which was a rather paradoxical situation. I should be glad if, when we are in committee, the minister would again read to us the provisions of section 938, so that if that is the case it may be made clear to us, that the governor in council may by order in council suspend the provisions of the bill now before us for consideration.

In the evidence to which I have referred the only questions that were asked of Mr. Bredt with respect to control appear on page 56:

> Right Hon. Arthur Meighen: But with evolution the units get bigger and there has to be control.
>
> Mr. Bredt: That answers the question, then, that we must have a rate control body?

I may say in fairness to Mr. Bredt that he did not express any opinion other than this with respect to the advisability of control.

The minister has referred to the power which at the present time is vested in the Board of Grain Commissioners with respect to control of rates. I have looked up the provisions of the act and I am not so clear in my own mind that the board have sufficient control. While the minister was speaking one member interjected that the act provides for maximum control, which is the case. Section 3 of the Inland Water Freight Rates Act of 1923 provides for the filing with the Board of Grain Commissioners of the tariff of rates to be charged, as well as subsequent changes in that regard. Section 4 of that act provides:

> It shall be the duty of the board to receive and tabulate all such tariffs and rates as may be filed with the board as aforesaid, and moreover, to ascertain by all available means, the rates of freight which prevail or are exacted or required for the carriage of grain from Fort William or Port Arthur to any of the ports or places aforesaid, and to consider and report to the Minister of Trade and Commerce from time to time any facts which may come

to the knowledge of the board and which tend to show that there is a deficiency of cargo space, excessive freight charges or discrimination in the rates with respect to the carriage of grain as aforesaid, and all shipowners and other persons engaged in the grain carrying trade in Canada shall, upon reasonable request, immediately furnish to the board such information as they may possess relating to any of the matters aforesaid, and shall for any wilful refusal or neglect to furnish the same be guilty of an offence against this act and be liable to a penalty recoverable upon summary conviction not exceeding one thousand dollars and not less than two hundred dollars for each such offence.

Section 5, which is the operative part, provides:

When in the opinion of the board the toll, charge or rate which any company, owner or person charges or intends or proposes to charge for the carriage of grain as aforesaid is unreasonable or excessive or amounts to an unjust discrimination against any person, company or class of persons as compared with the tolls or rates for similar traffic between Canadian and United States ports, or between one port and another in either of said countries, the board may prescribe such maximum rates as it may consider reasonable.

The section goes on to provide that the rates so prescribed may be limited in their application to particular seasons of the year.

If there is a possibility of a monopoly being created, or if there is, by reason of the fact that our coastal laws are changed, a possibility of their having the effect which I have previously set out, then it is certainly most important that the government retain complete control so that it may at any time the need arises take action either through the Board of Grain Commissioners or by order in council to keep effective control over the situation. I may say in that connection that Mr. Sydney Smith stated that he did not think it was necessary to have a board but that if the act was left as it was competition would effectively settle the rates. But the fact is that under the old act there did arise in July of last year a situation which those appearing before the board treated as a monopoly, and upon that occasion they appealed to the Board of Grain Commissioners and had a maximum rate fixed. I do not know on how many occasions the Board of Grain Commissioners have acted in that way, but I am rather under the impression that there have been only two. Certainly up to the present the board has not been regarded as a rate fixing body.

I have made these remarks, Mr. Speaker, with a view to drawing to the attention of the house certain facts which in a measure cover the situation. Might I again state that in order for this bill to receive my support it will have to be shown to me quite clearly that there is ample provision for protecting the western producer so that he will not become the victim of any monopoly which may result from the bringing into effect of this amendment; also that there will be effective control, and that if there is to be benefit to those engaged in the carrying of this grain, it shall not be acquired at the expense of the grain grower.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I was under the impression, Mr. Speaker, that there was a time-honoured rule that speakers should be taken alternatively in an important debate, and I cannot recollect in a rather long experience a cabinet member introducing a bill being immediately followed by a speaker on his own side of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Bowman) was the first to rise to his feet and was first seen by the Speaker when the minister sat down. There was no discrimination in the matter.

Mr. NEILL: I see that Bourinot at page 334 says:

In all important debates it is customary for the Speaker to endeavour to give the preference, alternately, to the known supporters and opponents of a measure or question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same rule is followed in this house invariably. But if an hon. member desiring to speak neglects to rise to his feet and another hon. member is on his feet the latter has a right to be heard.

Mr. NEILL: I was on my feet first. I was on my feet too soon, as a matter of fact. However, I am not surprised at all.

We have waited twenty-five years for a measure of this kind, and now a sorry substitute for the reform we desired has been brought down in the very last hours of the session.

I am not rising to deal with the subject matter which entirely engrossed the minister when he introduced the bill and his supporter behind him. I leave that to be dealt with by members on both sides of the house who are far more competent to deal with it than I am, nor shall I follow the hon. member for Dauphin in putting on Hansard a large portion of the records of another house. I would assume that hon. members interested in the subject would have already read that debate. For a few moments I should like to deal with another matter. I wish to enter a protest against this bill which seeks to amend the Canada Shipping Act having to be discussed in committee of the whole house instead of by the special committee appointed for such purposes, namely the committee which deals with marine and fisheries matters.

We have an illustration of the need for such reference to a committee in the fact that this bill, which I suppose contains a dozen sections, has been referred to as regards one section only. But there are a dozen more sections.

The general character of any bill amending the shipping act is largely technical and for that reason it is all the more necessary it should be referred to a committee, because there are very few, if any men, in this house thoroughly versed in shipping terms. I do not know that there are any men in the house thoroughly versed in the technical terms, and moreover there are very few hon. members —I doubt if there are any—directly representative of the shipping interests, more particularly the seamen, the masters, mates and so on. Therefore a very large body of hon. members will be more or less indifferent to a measure of this type, although it has tonight a special interest given to it because of reference which has been made to the grain trade. The presentation of the bill in this way will mean one of two things, either that it will be a long time going through committee of the whole, or it will go through without being properly understood and debated. A very fine illustration of the advisability of sending it to a committee was seen the other day when one of the most contentious bills —not contentious in a party sense; I refer to the pensions bill—was put through the house in two or three hours, because it had been thoroughly discussed and agreed to in committee. That is what should be done in this case. May I give an illustration of one or two of the technical points involved. I wonder how many hon. members understand some of the terms with which we will have to deal. I wonder if the minister himself understands them? Does he know what a cotter pin is? Does he know what mousings are? Does he know what a full line is, or a hatch combing, or a heel block, or a hog lashing? I have picked out only one or two at random. Yet we are supposed to discuss the technical use of these terms.

I refer more particularly of course to the big bill which was introduced earlier in the session in the Senate. It contained over eight hundred sections. I am told it was the biggest bill that had ever been introduced into this parliament, and yet it was solemnly proposed, in the face of protest, to bring it into committee of the whole in this house and have it passed in a way which would make it impossible to get anything like appropriate information or discussion on the matter.

[Mr. Neill.]

Let me quote a sentence or two from letters I have received concerning this bill. In a letter from the Canadian Merchant Service Guild I find the following:

> There is no language which we would care to employ that could adequately express the feelings of the masters and officers on this coast with regard to some of the proposals which are contained in the act. When we say that it is rank discrimination that, in our opinion, is only half expressing the situation.

And later:

> It is the most impracticable piece of legislation that we have heard of and those who are responsible for framing the act can have little or no practical knowledge of the steamship business, particularly as it affects this coast.

Then the Canadian Association of Seamen, Vancouver branch, writes as follows:

> For three weeks we have had a committee working steadily on each clause.

And then they go on to express their opinion about the legislation. The committee worked for three weeks on it, and then they obtained only a vague grasp of it. Then, I should like to make some comments concerning the number of amendments arising from their investigations. The first body I mentioned produced amendments numbering twenty-five. Another body, the All-Canadian Congress, produced twenty-five amendments. Then, the Association of Seamen, which had a committee sitting for three weeks, produced amendments which cover many pages. Their amendments are contained on thirty-five closely typewritten pages. After they had sent them in they had another thought, and sent another couple of pages of closely typewritten foolscap containing further amendments and comments they had made concerning the bill. That is the body which has studied the legislation for three weeks. Does that not give some indication of the necessity for this legislation going before a committee where men sitting around the table could take it into consideration, a place where they would have the advantage of the services of men capable of giving technical explanations? After such treatment they would be in a better position to deal with it.

If I remember correctly, this bill was brought to the house last Saturday. The people on the Pacific coast have not yet heard of it, with the exception of the casual wire which may have been sent out and which could explain only sketchily the nature of the bill which had been introduced. As their representatives in this house we are supposed

to stand up and give competent opinion and advice on a matter with which we are almost entirely unfamiliar. We have not heard from those men whose interests will be affected. Is that the famous British justice that we hear so much about? Is it common sense?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Does the hon. member know that for over a month this bill has been before the Senate?

Mr. NEILL: It was before the Senate, but who in British Columbia knows or wants to know anything about the Senate?

Mr. DURANLEAU: They could read the proceedings of the Senate in the newspapers.

Mr. NEILL: It would be a hard day for us when we had to shape our legislation from newspaper reports, because they cannot be accurate. Besides, did the newspapers wire eight hundred sections? The associations to which I have referred got hold of the big bill, and over forty typewritten pages of proposed changes is the fruit of their research. Those who went through the legislation said it was absurd; they had never seen the like of it. They believed it was the greatest piece of discrimination they had ever seen. But so far as this bill is concerned, I must say that unless it has come to them in their dreams, they have not heard of it. As soon as I got it I mailed it, but I could not wire it. Should we stand here passing something vitally affecting their interests, when they do not know anything about it?

Why was this bill left until the last minute? Why was it not introduced earlier? It has been lying in the minister's office since 1908—I do not blame the minister—but I must say the deputy minister did not have the courage or the enterprise to bring it forward. Then other things developed,—the war, and so on. We have waited all that time. The act was so obsolete that the penalties were described in pounds, shillings and pence, instead of in dollars and cents. It is so obsolete that those who had framed the legislation had never heard of a motor gas boat. During the last two or three years I have begged the minister, time and time again—and I begged the last administration—to bring in a bill and let it stand over for a session thereby giving the people interested an opportunity for discussion.

I shall not take further time of the house. I do hope the government will take notice of what I have said concerning what these people think and want. They are an important body. When the big bill comes down next year it should be sent to a committee. There are some changes I should like to suggest in this bill, I shall refer to one change made by the Senate which in my view is most unfair. It deals with the tackle for the loading and unloading of ships. However I shall speak in committee, and shall give other hon. members who are vitally interested an opportunity to speak now on the motion for second reading.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I rise to oppose the second reading of the bill. As an illustration of legislation calculated to serve special interests, this is about the finest specimen that has come to my attention. I ask the government this question: What was the special hurry in connection with these sections? They constitute only a few out of the very large bill which has to be considered next year. What is the hurry in connection with this bill? The present coastal laws with respect to the great lakes and to the Pacific have remained on our statute books for some time. From time to time they have been altered or amended by order in council and regulation. Now, on the second to the last day of this session, as some of us hope, this bill is suddenly thrust upon us without any opportunity of considering it in a standing committee of the commons. Indeed, in its very make-up there is evidence of the haste with which it was drafted, in spite of the consideration given by the Senate committee. I wonder if hon. members of the committee have taken the trouble to read section 3, which appears on page 1 of the bill. Let me read the first three lines:

> Whenever the minister is so appointed as the pilotage authority his appointment shall, without more, extend to his successors in office—

In the name of goodness what does that mean? I have always understood that the language of seamen was a weird and awful thing, and this may have been drafted by a seaman. I understand that when they are ashore "more" is a popular word with them.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Would my hon. friend permit me to make an observation? In my opening remarks I stated that an amendment would be proposed in connection with this section.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should imagine so; I should be very much surprised if the minister did not move an amendment. I am not criticizing his proposal to amend the section; I am pointing to the evidence of haste and carelessness which appears in the bill before me.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Perhaps I might read the amendment to my hon. friend; I hope he will be satisfied with it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I hope so, but I am not quarreling with the minister on that point.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Why discuss the clause now when it is to be amended?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Because it is a typical illustration of the haste in this matter which, as the minister said, is to give protection to special shipping interests. The minister's own words come back to him; this is to give special privilege to some shipping interests.

Mr. DURANLEAU: To Canadian ship owners.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, but how does the minister know they are Canadian companies? When we are in committee of the whole will he be prepared to lay before the committee the names and nationality of the shareholders and the amount of their holdings in these companies? There are many so called Canadian companies that are by no means Canadian, and I should like further information before I accept the glib reference of the minister to Canadian companies. That is aside from the subject, however; the minister draws these remarks upon himself by his interjections. He has stated that this bill is for the purpose of protecting shipowners, and there is no doubt in my mind that this is the purpose. Equally there is no doubt that this protection will be secured to the disadvantage of the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, that is my conviction. I will tell the Minister of Marine, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens), that it was recognition of the danger of agreements between the two railway companies against the interests of the western grain growers that induced this house to put on the statute books a statutory maximum rate for grain moving over the railways. I say that in this case also, if the government are sincere in their desire to protect the interests of the farmers, they will provide a statutory rate on the great lakes for grain and grain products as they have done on the railways.

There is no doubt whatever that section 935 of the bill before us strengthens the position of the lake shippers' association to which the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Bowman) very properly referred as having taken advantage of their organized position in days gone by, to the disadvantage of the grain growers of western Canada as well as the exporters of grain. Here there are two great interests involved, and it is not going to satisfy the farmers of western Canada to say that the shippers of eastern Canada are to receive a special privilege which enables them to create a monopoly under the guise of legislation, and so take advantage of their position as they did in the past. The hon. member for Dauphin said that representatives of some bodies appearing before the Senate committee feared the possibility of a combine. I say they would have been justified in declaring that it is virtually certain that a combine will be created as soon as this legislation is passed. Indeed, to all intents and purposes there is a monopoly and a combine on the great lakes at the present time. As an illustration of that statement let me remind the committee that last year in spite of steadily declining grain prices to a point which the government must admit to have been far below the cost of production, these lake shippers reorganized their association which apparently had not been operative since the scandal in connection with the previous combine, and at once advanced the rate to 7 cents.

Then this Inland Water Freight Rates Act of 1923 appeared on the scene, but I direct the attention of the government to the fact that here, as in previous cases, no rate fixing power is vested in the Board of Grain Commissioners under the act. Whatever rights they have are ambiguous in the act, and it is questionable whether or not the act is within the competence of this parliament. At any rate, according to all the information I have been able to secure, no decisions have been handed down as such by the Board of Grain Commissioners under the Inland Water Freight Rates Act of 1923, but they brought moral pressure, moral suasion, to bear on the lake shippers. The result has been that in spite of the collapse in grain prices we secured a reduction of only half a cent in the freight rates on the great lakes, a reduction from 7 to 6½ cents.

I can assure the members of the government that the farmers of the west do not look upon that sort of protection as at all adequate. As soon as this body is created the farmers will pay the price to the shareholders of these companies. I submit that instead of going into this thing in this way—I am reminded by a good friend of mine that the promise of some reciprocal trade treaty with the United States looms on the horizon—the government should delay action on this bill. The matter is not so very urgent, so why not delay action until the complete re-

vision takes place next year, and in the meantime the government might exert all its influence in order to secure a cooperative agreement with the United States so as to free shipping on the great lakes and give the farmers healthy competition in regard to rates. Some hon. gentlemen may argue that the farmer does not get the benefit of reduced rates on the great lakes, and I think that is very true. I believe that in the majority of cases when there is a temporary reduction, especially in the shipping season, say a monthly or a weekly reduction, it is the exporter who gets the advantage. I do not think there is any doubt about it; the man who owns the grain at Fort William gets the benefit. I ask hon. gentlemen to notice that the creation of the pools, especially when they established their own agencies at Liverpool, brought into the picture an entirely new factor so that the farmers were enabled to secure the advantages of the reduced rates because of the fact that they were themselves shipping grain and selling it on the Liverpool market.

There is a further point in this connection which should not escape hon. gentlemen; it is that when the rates are pushed up at once the farmer is compelled to carry the load. The increase is deducted from the Fort William price, and this is a factor in determining the level of wheat prices in Winnipeg and throughout the west. So any bill of this kind, which is calculated to create a monopoly unless accompanied by a statutory maximum rate, does not do justice to the farmers of the west, and in my opinion should not be permitted to pass the house.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Garland, Bow River) asked the reason for the hurry with this bill, and suggested that it should be left over until next year. There is at least one very good reason, if not several. It will be recalled that for some time past—and personally I have had the matter in hand for several years—pressure has been brought to bear upon the government to enact some safety legislation with regard to ships' tackle and so forth. But those who were urging this were advised that the revision of the shipping act was coming forward in the near future, and it was suggested that they should wait until that time arrived. This year an attempt was made to introduce a complete revision of the shipping act, but certain very serious constitutional difficulties arising out of the necessity of synchronizing the new revised act with the statute of Westminster and similar shipping acts throughout other parts of the empire made it necessary to postpone the revision. It was thought desirable therefore to bring in this brief bill for the purpose at least of giving effect to this safety appliance provision with regard to ships' tackle. That is one reason, and to my mind a sufficient reason, and I wish to pay due meed of praise to my colleague for bringing this forward and doing a measure of justice to those who are engaged in the hazardous work of loading ships in our various ports. It has been recognized for a long time that such hazardous work called for some definite measures that would reasonably protect the workmen while at their task, and before turning my attention to the controversial clause of the bill I should like to refer briefly to that portion of it.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), in his usual sarcastic manner,—

Mr. NEILL: Thank you.

Mr. STEVENS: —referred to this part of the bill in most scathing terms. I think his remarks were entirely unjustifiable. There is nothing mysterious about the nautical or shipping terms used in the bill; they are ordinary terms which are quite common and are fully understood both by the officials dealing with the matter and by any person who has had any acquaintance with shipping, and most certainly by everyone associated with the work of seamen. But there is no reason why my hon. friend should sneer at the supposed ignorance of members of the government so far as these nautical terms are concerned. The hon. gentleman is not the only man in the house or in the world who has a fairly wide knowledge of many of these things, and I would suggest to him that he would have been serving those whose interests he frequently pretends to have at heart—

Mr. VALLANCE: Order.

Mr. STEVENS: There is nothing out of order in that. I say, he would have been serving much better those whose interests he has at heart had he said a word of commendation to the minister for at least the attempt to bring in these measures providing for safety appliances in the ports. In regard to that feature of the bill I would say this—details of course will be discussed in committee; I am making a very brief reference to the matter here. Provision will be made for an inspector in the ports, to be paid by the government or by the port authorities, to inspect ship's tackle. It is commonly known that frequently stevedoring companies in loading ships will put a more severe strain upon

the tackle than it is properly constructed to bear, and so in the bill it is provided that when any heavy weights are to be loaded, weights such as heavy machinery, huge castings, and things of that kind, the weight if above a specified point must be clearly marked on the article itself, and due care must be taken in the handling of such heavy weights. Furthermore, the inspector is empowered to enter a ship at any time and demand access to its tackle, and any information, any records or matters of that description that may be required by him in the inspection of tackle to see that it is safe shall be provided. He is also empowered to see that any man working around ships at night shall do so by adequate lighting. He is empowered, again, where he learns of a practice which is becoming very common, of having men working in the hold of ships when huge weights are being lowered, in the larger ships from a comparatively great height, to see that the men are not forced to work under conditions such as they have worked under in the past. I know, as I am sure my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni also knows, that particularly on the Pacific coast where large fir logs, huge things weighing tons, are loaded to be shipped to Japan, frequently serious accidents occur and sometimes death because men have been compelled by shall I say rather avaricious bosses to work in dangerous situations. The minister and his staff have provided in this bill very fair and adequate measures for the protection of such men, and I submit that if for no other reason at all the bill should be welcomed by the house. It ought to be having the support to-night of members who are not in the house and who ought to be in their places to support it. There is another provision dealing with pilotage, with which I am not so familiar, but which I understand is desirable in the interests of the pilotage authorities of the country.

Now, for these purposes the bill was justified in its introduction into this house. In the closing clause of the bill will be noted a paragraph which I think is absolutely necessary because of the new conditions which arise out of the passage of the statute of Westminster. I am not presuming now to give any opinion from a legal standpoint, for I am not competent to do so; I merely state the matter as a layman. I understand however that by the passage of the statute of Westminster there are certain provisions of the Canadian act which if disturbed now might be regarded as not in harmony with the statute of Westminster and the old act, and so it was necessary to insert this clause, closing the bill:

> No provision of this act shall be deemed to operate as a repeal within the meaning or pursuant to the provisions of the statute of Westminster, 1931, or otherwise, of any provision of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, of the parliament of Great Britain, or any amendment thereof or addition thereto.

The need for that is that until the Canada Shipping Act is completely revised and brought into complete harmony with the act of Westminster it is imperative that we maintain all rights which shipping interests, sailors, masters and others have under both the Canada Shipping Act and the Merchant Shipping Act, both of which statutes are largely interwoven in their administration in Canada. This is an added reason why the bill should go through now.

May I turn now briefly to the controversial clause of the bill, the amendment to section 935 of the Canada Shipping Act? The hon. member for Bow River a moment ago, with that vigour for which he is so noted, and that eloquence that marks all his utterances, declared that this legislation was designed to create a monopoly in shipping. He said it was designed to serve special interests, the shipping interests, and he also said we had designed the legislation to serve such special interests because we wished to injure the producer. That is summing up very briefly the observations of the hon. gentleman, and I may say that in making these observations he has voiced an opinion which I have heard expressed in the last few days in casual conversation by some who apparently have not given due consideration to the proposals contained in this bill.

I submit in the first place that the bill is not designed for any such purpose; but there is a certain condition obtaining in Canada which has obtained for many years to which it is desirable the Canadian parliament should give consideration. I shall give certain figures in a moment to support my point, but briefly stated it is this: so far as the movement of American grain from American ports to the seaboard is concerned, Canadian ships cannot get any share of that business. Let us put that down clearly as a statement of fact. We are not complaining about it; that is the business of our American neighbours, but under their law Canadian ships cannot share in that or any other business. For the moment, we are dealing largely with grain. On the other hand, Canadian grain or other merchandise

which moves in large quantities from the head of the lakes may be and has been moved quite freely by American vessels. It has moved just as freely and in almost as large quantities as by Canadian vessels. While hon. gentlemen may feel some apprehension should we attempt to divert a larger portion of this particular trade to Canadian bottoms, I submit that it is certainly no crime for the Canadian parliament, this government, myself or anyone else to propose to nurture Canadian shipping interests. It is no greater crime than proposing that we should nurture Canadian interests in any other branch of activity.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The minister says that at the present time Canadian grain can be moved and is being moved practically as freely by American bottoms from Canadian ports to seaboard as in Canadian boats. Could that be done from one Canadian port to another?

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend will bear with me while I make a general argument, I will come back and demonstrate that point in a moment. Let us lay this down as being fair at least: it is the business of parliament to nurture Canadian interests, whatever those interests may be. In this instance we have found that Canadian shipping interests on the great lakes are subject to a discrimination. As I have stated already, they are precluded from sharing in the business from American sources but they must share the Canadian business with American bottoms. Let us examine this briefly. With the permission of the house I shall place on Hansard a table which I shall analyse very briefly. I shall not merely ask to place this upon Hansard, I shall deal with it step by step. For the sake of clarity, I will ask Hansard to place one column of the table in tabulated form upon the record. This table is as follows:

	Bushels
Season 1919	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	115,124,718
Canadian boats to American ports..	1,902,631
American boats to American ports..	8,964,708
	125,992,057
Season 1920	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	76,740,790
Canadian boats to American ports..	12,774,790
American boats to American ports..	52,545,910
	142,061,490
Season 1921	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	131,832,493
Canadian boats to American ports..	7,049,463
American boats to American ports..	91,589,910
	230,471,866
Season 1922	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	135,762,088
Canadian boats to American ports..	14,110,334
American boats to Canadian ports..	383,148
American boats to American ports..	141,695,117
	291,950,687
Season 1923	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	163,381,617
Canadian boats to American ports..	17,071,130
American boats to Canadian ports..	1,220,900
American boats to American ports..	126,476,071
	308,149,718
Season 1924	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	158,966,375
Canadian boats to American ports..	8,856,846
American boats to Canadian ports..	4,241,535
American boats to American ports..	115,478,030
	287,542,786
Season 1925	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	149,184,387
Canadian boats to American ports..	15,605,354
American boats to Canadian ports..	113,810
American boats to American ports..	151,681,062
	316,584,613
Season 1926	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	152,092,805
Canadian boats to American ports..	30,875,062
American boats to Canadian ports..	4,950,400
American boats to American ports..	116,197,993
	304,116,260
Season 1927	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	129,912,426
Canadian boats to American ports..	17,337,075
American boats to Canadian ports..	7,542,345
American boats to American ports..	136,380,527
	291,172,373
Season 1928	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	178,506,400
Canadian boats to American ports..	26,563,669
American boats to Canadian ports..	19,082,143
American boats to American ports..	179,652,127
	403,804,339
Season 1929	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	104,685,100
Canadian boats to American ports..	21,321,267
American boats to American ports..	71,193,058
	197,199,425
Season 1930	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	117,255,555
Canadian boats to American ports..	5,856,884
American boats to American ports..	96,642,483
	219,754,922
Season 1931	
Canadian boats to Canadian ports..	127,580,919
Canadian boats to American ports..	4,611,769
American boats to American ports..	72,421,040
	204,613,728

This shows the clearances from the head of the lakes for the years 1919 to 1931, and I have 1932 on a separate sheet. I will refer hastily to the figures leaving out the odd numerals. I think it will be seen very readily to what degree American boats have shared in our business. In referring to tonnages, I will refer to those for total grains rather than just wheat as it will give a more complete picture.

Mr. YOUNG: Has the minister the rates for those years?

Mr. STEVENS: I will base another argument upon rates. In 1919 there was moved by Canadian boats to Canadian ports, 115,000,000 bushels; by Canadian boats to American ports, 2,000,000 bushels and by American boats to American ports, 9,000,000 bushels. In the next year there was moved by Canadian boats to Canadian ports, 76,000,000 bushels; by Canadian boats to American ports, 12,000,000 bushels and by American boats to American ports, 52,000,000 bushels. In the next year there was moved by Canadian boats to Canadian ports, 131,000,000 bushels; by Canadian boats to American ports, 7,000,000 bushels and by American boats to American ports, 91,000,000 bushels. The figures show the same relation right down the line, but later on they are even more startling. For instance in 1923 the movement by Canadian boats to Canadian ports was 163,000,000 bushels; by Canadian boats to American ports, 17,000,000 bushels; American boats to Canadian ports, 1,000,000 bushels and American boats to American ports, 126,000,000 bushels. Those figures show the competition by American boats in carrying grain from Canadian sources. A very substantial portion of the movement by American boats to American ports is moved back again into Canadian sources. The movement in 1929 by Canadian boats to Canadian ports was 104,000,000 bushels; by Canadian boats to American ports, 21,000,000 bushels and by American boats to American ports, 71,000,000 bushels. In that same year there were 51,000,000 bushels moved back again into Canadian channels, and largely by American boats from Buffalo to Montreal.

Mr. VALLANCE: Has the minister the figures showing how much was carried by American and how much by Canadian boats?

Mr. STEVENS: No, I have not.

Mr. VALLANCE: That is a very important point.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: That is important, but we do know that a very large portion is moved by American bottoms. The firm of Boland and Cornelius of Buffalo handle the majority of this Canadian grain to Montreal. If my hon. friend will follow me he will see that all the way down in this list there is a movement by American boats from Canadian sources to American ports. The figures are 72,000,000 bushels, 96,000,000 bushels, 71,000,000 bushels, 179,000,000 bushels, 116,000,000 bushels, 151,000,000 bushels and so on. We are arguing that a larger proportion of that grain ought to be moved by Canadian boats from Canadian sources to the destination in eastern Canada. So much for that.

Then we come to the grain moved to Buffalo by American boats where it goes into storage. The voyage is ended as far as we are concerned. Buffalo is a sort of kicking-off place; the grain may go to New York, to Baltimore, to Portland, to Boston or to Montreal and, to a lesser degree, to Halifax or Saint John during the winter time. However, that is a movement by rail and does not concern us at this time. The fact is that the shipment ends at Buffalo and becomes a new shipment when it goes on to Montreal. American boats are allowed to go in to pick up this grain and move it to Montreal. This cannot be done under the American law with the conditions reversed.

Mr. YOUNG: Where would such a reverse condition prevail?

Mr. STEVENS: There might be a movement from Duluth to lake ports, although nothing like as large as far as grain is concerned. There might be a considerable movement in other commodities. Grain might be moved from Duluth or Chicago to Port Colborne, to Midland or other ports and from there moved on to Montreal.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): On grain moved from Buffalo to Montreal, could you get the preference?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, if that grain is shipped on a through bill of lading from the head of the lakes, it would get the preference just the same as if it went direct to Montreal.

Mr. YOUNG: I do not think the minister grasped my question. I wanted to know where a condition prevails where United States goods come from a United States port to a Canadian port and then back again into the United States.

Mr. STEVENS: I have already stated from Duluth, for instance, to the bay ports and then back to Buffalo, then shipped down to New York direct by rail, or shipped to Port Colborne, for example, and then by rail or the Erie canal to New York or other United States ports.

Mr. YOUNG: Has the minister any figures in regard to that?

Mr. STEVENS: I have them somewhere, but I cannot lay my hands on them at the moment. The movement of course, is very much smaller on the Canadian side. I have figures somewhere showing the movement runs from about 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 bushels to, I think, 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 in a year. It is not a large movement, but the principle is there just the same that you cannot move United States grain by Canadian vessels to a Canadian port where it is again moved back into United States channels.

Mr. VALLANCE: In the evidence submitted before the Senate committee, was it not proven that very little, if any, of the grain going from Buffalo back to Montreal ever went out in United States bottoms?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. VALLANCE: The evidence says so.

Mr. STEVENS: My information is—and it was very carefully prepared for me—that the major portion of it is moved by United States bottoms.

Mr. VALLANCE: The minister has not the figures?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. VALLANCE: From Buffalo to Montreal?

Mr. STEVENS: From Buffalo to Montreal, and I gave the name of one of the large shipping companies which handles most of it. I think we are clear, however, on that discrepancy between, shall I say the rights of Canadian shipping interests on the lakes as against United States shipping interests.

Mr. BROWN: In order that we may be clear on that point, is the minister prepared to assert that the United States laws would prevent Canadian ships from taking United States grain from Port Colborne back to a United States port?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. BROWN: That is a parallel case.

Mr. STEVENS: No, I say that a Canadian shipper cannot carry United States grain from a United States port to a Canadian port and then by the same or another vessel, either one or the other, carry it from that Canadian port back into a United States port. Furthermore, they cannot do that for either leg of the movement. That is why in this bill, as will be noted, the minister has provided:

> No goods shall be transported by water or by land and water, from one place in Canada to another place in Canada, either directly or by way of a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation in any ship other than a British ship.

That is why that provision is inserted. That brings us into conformity with the United States law in a reverse situation. I have under my hand the United States law which I might read at this point in juxtaposition with the clause I have read from the present bill:

> No merchandise shall be transported by water, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port of the United States to another port of the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

That is the United States law and it will be seen that the legislation we are now enacting is practically the same.

Mr. VALLANCE: At the present time no United States bottom can take Canadian wheat from one Canadian port to another.

Mr. STEVENS: That is true, if the law is strictly applied. I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that because I was overlooking a point. During past years it has been the practice to permit United States vessels to come into Canadian waters to move grain. This will be seen by the following figures. I will take, for instance, a series of years showing the number of bushels carried by United States boats from one Canadian port to another:

Year	Bushels
1924	1,000,000
1925	4,000,000
1926	4,900,000
1927	7,000,000
1928	19,000,000

Mr. LUCAS: Is that from a Canadian port to a Canadian port?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, by United States vessels with the permission of the government of Canada.

Let me make this point clear: It was admitted that some years ago there was possibly a shortage of Canadian tonnage to cope with the full movement of our Canadian wheat, but during the last six or seven years there has been a tremendous accretion to Canadian tonnage for the purpose of taking care of more and more of this business. To-day we

have sufficient Canadian tonnage to handle all our business and also to take care of a substantial portion of that which has been moved by United States vessels to United States ports.

Mr. VALLANCE: Has the minister the information as to the time of year that those volumes of wheat were moved by United States bottoms?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. BROWN: Is that not wheat that was in storage?

Mr. VALLANCE: That is the point.

Mr. STEVENS: Possibly some of it was, but not to the extent of 19,000,000 or 21,000,000 bushels.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I think the minister will remember that every fall there was a row over this very matter and United States bottoms were allowed in.

Mr. STEVENS: That is true.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I know there was a row three or four years ago.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, but the point I made a moment ago must not be lost sight of. It was recognized that there was a shortage of Canadian tonnage and Canadian firms remedied that from year to year by increasing their tonnage and putting more capital into the building of ships until, I think, in the last five years—and some hon. gentlemen who are better informed than I am may correct me—there was developed sufficient tonnage to take care of this business and to-day we have a great surplus of tonnage.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Might I ask one more question purely for the sake of accuracy? As I understand the matter, when this bill becomes law, under the laws of the two countries it will no longer be possible for Canadian grain to go to Buffalo or another United States port and then back to a Canadian port, by any line whatever?

Mr. STEVENS: By Canadian vessels.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: By either. The United States law would prevent its being done by a Canadian vessel. Wheat having once been shipped from a Canadian port to Buffalo could not be reshipped to a Canadian port.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is losing sight of the fact that the United States coastwise law is limited to grain moving from one United States destination to another United States destination. In this instance grain will be moved by Canadian vessels just the same as it has been moved on both legs of the route by Canadian vessels.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not want to interrupt the minister, but I think he realizes that the privilege of moving grain in the fall by United States boats has not been on account of shortage of Canadian tonnage; it has been to provide extra storage at bay ports for winter unloading and shipment by rail.

Mr. STEVENS: In part, yes.

Mr. MALCOLM: Mostly.

Mr. STEVENS: I would not say mostly, because my hon. friend will note in some instances the figures are very large. May I suggest to my hon. friends that I have only forty minutes and we are not in committee. I wish to deal with one or two points which really come under my department and I am afraid I am not making very rapid progress.

Naturally there comes to the minds of hon. members the question of rates; that is, I think, the all-important point. We have before us evidence of the rates, for instance, over a period of years. I am taking the rates for the years 1923 to 1932 and for the months of July, August, September and October. Taking the average of those four months the rates from Fort William to Montreal since 1923 have been as follows:

Year	Rate per bushel cents
1923	10.45
1924	8.40
1925	8.30
1926	8.94
1927	7.80
1928	8.40
1929	8.35
1930	8.05
1931	5.90
1932	5.75

It will be noted that the average rate during that period, with the exception of the last two years, exceeded eight cents a bushel. What I want to place before my hon. friends is this. When we are chided as we were a moment ago by the hon. member for Bow River with not having done any better last year than fixing the maximum rate at 6½ cents, it is not quite fair criticism in the light of the rates that have prevailed during all those years. In other words, there is an element of fairness in all of this, and we thought that last year in preventing the lake shippers from raising their rates above 6½ cents we were giving them not only a fair deal but at the same time a chance to live, which they were not having under the very low rate which had obtained for a month or two. I am certain of this, that the producers of western Canada are not going to ask that they shall continue to be served by rail or boat at a constantly

losing rate. It cannot be done economically; it cannot continue. The evidence I have placed before the committee shows that for a period of ten years the average rate has been upwards of eight cents, and therefore we ought not to be condemned for fixing the maximum rate at 6½ cents. That brings me to the point of control.

My hon. friend from Dauphin and others have asked, is there any effective control? Some slighting remarks were made about the Inland Water Freight Rates Act. I think that was not wisely done. The Inland Water Freight Rates Act, it is true, does not say that the Board of Grain Commissioners shall fix rates at which cargoes shall be moved, in the way that the railway board fixes rates for rail traffic, and there are obvious reasons why that would be undesirable. I think it would be equally inimical to the producers and shippers as well as to others because the board might even fix a rate which was above that which the boats would charge under open competition. There is open competition at the present time. There is not a monopoly on the great lakes; let us get that clear. Many boats are handling grain to-day below the maximum rate fixed. The maximum rate was fixed here about two weeks ago when the matter was referred to me by the chairman of the Board of Grain Commissioners. The board under the act brought the matter to my attention as a matter of routine and a maximum rate was fixed from the head of the lakes to Montreal, Sorel and Quebec of 6½ cents, which is looked upon as a fair and equitable rate. Somebody has said that it was unwise to fix maximum rates, suggesting there was something bad about it. Why, Mr. Speaker, the fixation of a maximum rate, leaving it open for competition to give a rate below the maximum, is obviously better than having a rate fixed by some board of commissioners as has been suggested.

Mr. VALLANCE: Only to the exporter.

Mr. STEVENS: To the producer too.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister be good enough to bring down to the committee tomorrow morning a copy of the order fixing the maximum rate?

Mr. STEVENS: I will have that order brought down. Let me now turn to the Inland Water Freight Rates Act. I may say that I criticized this act pretty severely at the time it was passed. My hon. friend (Mr. Stewart, Edmonton) will remember when the late Mr. Low was minister, standing right where I am now standing, when he passed this act.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I will say you criticized it.

Mr. STEVENS: And it had a rather bad effect, I believe. Certainly we did criticize the act. The act has been in force. It has seldom been used, it is true, but it has been held there, as it were, over the shippers, and my hon. friends who are somewhat perturbed in the interests of the producers of the west could have invoked this act at any time, but they have not done so—not that I criticize them for that, but they did not invoke the act when the rates were ten and nine and eight cents. But we are putting it into force. We are exercising federal authority. The act says that every shipper shall immediately after entering into a charter party file with the board the terms of his charter party. That is the first clause. The next clause provides, and I think this clause has value and merit in it:

> It shall be the duty of the board to receive and tabulate all such tariffs.

That is the first duty. The next duty is this, that if the board on examination of the rates find that there is any deficiency of cargo space—I pause there for the purpose of emphasizing a very important point. If there is a deficiency of cargo space as there was in the years that I mentioned a moment ago, the particulars of which are under my hand, then what is done is to invoke the powers under the shipping act and suspend the coastwise laws. The clause was read by the Minister of Marine, but I shall read it again. It is section 938 of the Canada Shipping Act:

> The governor in council may, from time to time, by order in council declare that the foregoing provisions of this part—

That is the provisions that we are dealing with in this bill, namely sections 935 and other sections:

> —shall not, for the period specified in such order in council apply, either throughout Canada or in any specified waters of Canada, to the ships or vessels, or to any specified, ascertained or ascertainable class or number of the ships or vessels, of any foreign country.

That is, the governor in council may admit foreign tonnage into our waters if it is found under this act that there is a shortage of cargo space, and that has been done in almost every year, or in many years at least, during the last ten or twelve or thirteen years. Not only is it to be done in that case, but should there be any monopoly, should there be any challenge of the right of the government or of the Board of Grain Commissioners under this act to fix a maximum rate, this would then be applied. It has been the practice of governments to do it. It was done many times in the past, repeatedly done, and it is there for us to do it.

Should that not be considered sufficient, we have a regulation or a clause in the Customs Act, clause 298, which provides:

The governor in council may, from time to time, make regulations for declaring what shall be coasting trade or inland navigation respectively, and how the same shall be regulated in any case or class of cases, and may declare any trade or voyage on the seas, rivers, lakes or waters within or adjacent to Canada, whether to or from any place within or without Canada, or whether such seas, rivers, lakes or waters are or are not geographically, or for the purpose of other acts or laws, inland waters, to be a coasting trade or a coasting voyage within the meaning of this act and of such regulations, any may also, from time to time, by regulation, dispense, on any condition which he sees fit to impose, with such of the requirements of this act as he deems it inexpedient to enforce with regard to vessels engaged in any such trade or with respect to any case or class of cases.

In other words, under the Customs Act the governor in council has power to admit foreign vessels into the coastwise trade, both at sea, inland and elsewhere. So I submit to the committee that there is ample protection against a possible monopoly or against a violation of the principles of this bill.

I have taken more time than I expected, Mr. Speaker, largely because I have tried to answer questions at this stage instead of in committee. Let me conclude with just one or two observations.

Will the shipping interests, someone asks, benefit at the expense of the producer? I submit that that will not be the case. Certainly if I thought for a moment it would, I would never support this bill. I do say that we are entitled to take cognizance of the fact that our 100,000,000 bushels a year is carried in foreign vessels, and we have no opportunity of a like access to the American market. We are entitled to take cognizance of that fact, and to provide regulations which will safeguard Canadian shipping interests. It is not intended, however, that these shipping interests shall take advantage of such a privilege, to the detriment of the producer or shipper. As I have said, ample power is given to us, under the Inland Water Freight Rates Act, in the shipping act and in the Customs Act, to provide against any such encroachments on the rights of shippers, or any danger of a monopoly. Furthermore, such powers have been frequently exercised, and are recognized as common practice in this country.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): The minister was frank enough to say, as I understood him, that the purpose of the bill was to give protection to Canadian ship owners. Then he went on to say that he thought in this regard Canadian legislation—

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the hon. member would be content to call it eleven o'clock, if he intends to make a speech.

Mr. COOTE: I should be very happy if Mr. Speaker would call it eleven o'clock.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 17, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CONFERRING OF TITLES

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont):

Do the recent decorations granted in the Order of St. Michael and St. George, and in the Order of St. Gregory the Great, mean that Canadians holding titles in any order may now accept promotions in the same order as long as such promotions do not carry any rank or title?

Mr. BENNETT:

1. The promotion of the Right Honourable Sir George Halsey Perley, K.C.M.G., to be an ordinary member of the first class or Knights Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, was made in conformity with established constitutional practice, it being the considered view of His Majesty's government in Canada that the motion, with respect to honours, adopted on the 22nd day of May, 1919, by a majority vote of the members of the Commons House only of the thirteenth parliament (which was dissolved on the 4th day of October, 1921) is not binding upon His Majesty or His Majesty's government in Canada or the seventeenth parliament of Canada.

2. The government has no official knowledge of promotions in or appointments to the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

SENATE VACANCY

Mr. LAVERGNE:

1. Is there a Senate vacancy in the La Salle division?
2. If so, since what date?
3. Will the government fill the said vacancy in the near future?

Mr. BENNETT:

1. Yes.
2. January 23, 1933.

3. An appointment will be made in due course.

CARLETON, QUE., POST OFFICE

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What was the revenue of the Carleton post office, county of Bonaventure, for last year?

2. Does the appointment of the new postmaster remain with the department or the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. SAUVE:

1. $1,307.88.

2. With the department.

GOLD DEPOSITS

Mr. DORION:

1. What was the value of all gold deposited in the vaults of Canada's various chartered banks and in the vault of the Department of Finance, at March 31, 1923, and at March 31, 1933?

2. What was the value of gold deposits known to be held throughout Canada, at March 31, 1923, and at March 31, 1933?

3. What was the total amount of notes issued by chartered banks or by the federal government in circulation throughout Canada, at March 31, 1923, and at March 31, 1933?

4. What was the value of silver and copper currency in circulation throughout Canada, at March 31, 1923, and at March 31, 1933?

Mr. RHODES:

1.

	March 31, 1923	March 31, 1933
Gold held by Minister of Finance	$128,740,130	$ 71,815,753
*Current gold and subsidiary coin held—		
Chartered banks in Canada	58,394,063	38,583,752
Gold deposited by banks in central gold reserves	9,502,533	9,181,732

2. No record in Department of Finance other than as to amounts referred to in answer to 1.

	March 31, 1923	March 31, 1933
3. Dominion notes in circulation	$242,657,765†	$180,926,882†
Bank notes in circulation	173,258,362	130,135,230
	$415,916,127	$311,062,112
4. Silver coin	$ 26,574,145	$ 28,051,477
Nickel coin	55,460	1,896,527
Bronze coin	1,962,863	2,553,883
	$ 28,592,468	$ 32,501,887

*Gold not reported separately in bank returns.

†Includes Dominion notes held by banks and in central gold reserves amounting to $215,797,880 (1923) and $151,911,399 (1933).

SAINTE-ANNE DE BEAUPRE POSTMASTERSHIP

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the government aware that the postmaster at Sainte-Anne de Beaupre and his son are actively engaged in municipal politics?

2. Have they asked permission of the Post Office Department to do so?

3. Has the Post Office Department granted them permission to participate in municipal elections in the village of Sainte-Anne de Beaupre?

4. If so, when and by whom was such request made, and by whom was it granted?

Mr. SAUVE:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

FEDERATION OF LABOUR CLUBS

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Who authorized the Federation of Labour Clubs of Montreal to use the drill hall on Craig street, at Montreal, for their meeting on April 30, 1933?

2. Was an application made to the authorities of the Department of National Defence to secure the use of said drill hall on this occasion?

3. If so by whom was such application made?

4. Was the application made in writing or orally?

5. What sum did the Federation of Labour Clubs of Montreal pay for the use of said hall for the purposes of such meeting?

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. Department of National Defence.

2. Yes.

3. Mr. J. A. Chalifoux, General President, Federation of Labour Clubs of the province of Quebec.

4. In writing.

5. $10.

STORNAWAY, QUE., MAIL DELIVERY

Mr. BOULANGER:

1. Does Mr. Ernest Bourque still hold the contract for rural mail delivery at Stornaway, province of Quebec?

2. If not, who has the contract now?

3. Was the present contract awarded after calling for public tenders and to the lowest tenderer?

4. Who were the tenderers and what was the amount of the respective tenders?

Mr. SAUVE:

1. No.

2. Adolphe Bolduc.

3. Yes.

4. Adolphe Bolduc, Stornaway, $800 per annum; Eugene Poisson, Stornaway, $800 per annum; Willie MacArthur, Stornaway, $840 per annum; Arthur Breton, Stornaway, $900 per annum; Hormisdas Pepin, Stornaway, $900 per annum; Milton Macleod, Springhill, $900 per annum; Odias Breton, Stornaway, $935 per annum; Archelas Breton, Stornaway, $945 per annum; Adolphe Bolduc, Stornaway, $973 per annum.

PENSION TRIBUNAL

Mr. DUFF:

1. Did the government pay or will they pay the personal expenses of the following members of the pension tribunal to Ottawa since April 15, 1933, namely: Colonel Cyrus Peck, Colonel N. H. McLeod, Colonel Gagnon, Colonel Thos. Morrison, Colonel C. C. Thompson, Mr. J. I. Grover?

2. (a) How long has each of these members of the pension tribunal been at Ottawa during the past month; (b) what governmental or tribunal duties have they performed daily since their arrival here?

3. How many tribunals are sitting in Ottawa at the present time and how many claims have each of these members heard since their arrival in Ottawa?

Mr. RHODES:

1. Colonel Morrison and Major Thompson, having their headquarters in Ottawa, do not draw travelling expenses. The expenses of the other members referred to are under review.

2. (a) Colonel Morrison, April 10 to date of inquiry, May 9; Colonel Peck, April 12 to date of inquiry, May 9; Colonel McLeod, May 6 to date of inquiry, May 9; Colonel Gagnon, March 30 to April 26; Major Thompson, March 30 to April 26; Mr. Grover, April 27 to May 5.

(b) The tribunal has been engaged on its regular work, namely the hearing of claims and giving of decisions; also the review of files and giving of decisions on claims previously heard on which decisions were outstanding, and has sat on the following days during the month preceding May 9: April 10, 12, inclusive; April 18, 21, inclusive; April 24, 28, inclusive; May 1, 5, inclusive; May 8, 9, inclusive.

The tribunal did not sit on Good Friday, Easter Monday, nor on Saturdays or Sundays.

3. One tribunal in session since March 30. Claims heard by: Colonel Morrison, Nil; Colonel Peck, 48; Colonel McLeod, 9; Colonel Gagnon, 47; Major Thompson, 24; Mr. Grover, 12.

Seventy cases, in all, were heard.

In addition, decisions were made on claims heard previously, as follows:

Colonel Peck, 5; Colonel McLeod, 6; Colonel Gagnon, 10; Major Thompson, 8; Mr. Grover, 4. Total 33.

MOTION FOR PAPERS

JOLIETTE TERMINAL

Mr. FERLAND:

For a copy of all telegrams, letters and other documents exchanged since August, 1930, between the Minister of Railways, any official of his department, or between any other federal department and any official of such department, and any other individuals, public bodies, companies or associations, including the railway administration, respecting the repair shops of the Canadian National Railways at Joliette, the Joliette terminal, the contract relating to these shops and this terminal, and all other matters connected therewith since August, 1930.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Cartier): Might I ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the defeat of the government measure in the Senate respecting judges, it is his intention to place the resignation of the government in the hands of His Excellency.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I have no such intention, nor did I ever suggest it should be so except on joint resolution.

BEAUHARNOIS POWER PROJECT

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER OF POSITION OF DOMINION GOVERNMENT IN RELATION TO THE ENTERPRISE

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I think it fitting that I should make some reference to the Beauharnois undertaking in view of statements made a few days ago which I have since had an opportunity to look through. I shall be as brief as possible, but I desire to correct some misapprehensions that are apparently in the minds of hon. gentlemen diagonally opposite and opposite and to my right. I think nothing better illustrates the soundness of the old maxim that it is very unwise to endeavour to lock the stable after the horse has been stolen, or the truth that is embodied in the couplet with which most of the house is familiar:

> Not heaven itself upon the past hath power:
> What has been has been.

Nothing better illustrates the truth of these statements than the position of Beauharnois, and when hon. gentlemen suggest, as they did in this house, that the federal government of the country should engage in the power business and should expropriate the power enterprise at Beauharnois, they overlooked two essential facts. The first is that the province of Quebec leased the power, not the Dominion government; and it leased the power believing that it had the legal right so to do. The ex-Minister of Justice referred to the fact that a similar attitude of mind was expressed by the government of Ontario in connection with the power development carried on at Niagara and other points on the St. Lawrence river. The second point to which I direct attention is that contracts were made between Beauharnois undertaking and two customers, namely, the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company, which contracts are outstanding and are valid contracts according to the law of the country in which they were made.

If this house will bear in mind these two facts it will at once realize and recognize the extent to which this government was unable to deal with the problems to which attention has been directed. Reference has been made to the fact that on more than one occasion I have directed attention to the circumstances connected with the alienation of natural resources by the governments of this country. What the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) overlooked, in quoting again the statement I made originally, was that the crown is not the crown in right of the dominion only but is also the crown in right of each of the provinces. Only last year the privy council, in a very important case, decided that while the crown was one and indivisible, nevertheless there was a crown in right of the provinces and a crown in right of the dominion.

If it will be borne in mind that the power rights with respect to the St. Lawrence are claimed by the crown in right of the province of Quebec and not by the crown in right of the dominion, so far as this particular case is concerned, my observations with respect to the regret that the government must experience because the crown has parted with its rights will have full force and effect. Bear in mind, therefore, that as a result of the investigation in this house, the government took the only appropriate action which it could take under its constitutional limitations. It declared certain works to be for the benefit of Canada, it rescinded and repealed an order in council under which certain claims were made and it passed a statute by which no further alienations, so far as the government was concerned, of its rights in the St. Lawrence river to give additional water to the enterprise, would be valid without the consent, not of the executive but of this parliament.

I shall not traverse the ground which has been covered with respect to these contracts and to the legislation enacted by this parliament after the report was made by the investigating committee. I shall content myself with referring to the statements which were made in the house in 1932 as to what we conceived our duty to be with respect to the enterprise itself. Before I do that perhaps I should direct attention to the fact that the contract with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated, to which I referred, contained a provision by which the Beauharnois company undertook not to compete with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated in the distribution of power on the island of Montreal or within the radius of so many miles from the Place d'Armes square. So far as distribution of power was concerned, the company had contracted itself out of the right to sell power in that particular area which is the most populous and the largest power consuming area in a particular community in the country.

I said that the purpose of the government as declared in this house was fourfold, and I shall quote from a statement which I made in this house in 1932, as follows:

The government by every means in its power will endeavour to do the following: (a) secure

continuance of the enterprise; (b) secure the rights of those who bona fide have put their money in that enterprise; (c) secure proper control and management; (d) take such other steps as may be necessary when terms and conditions are fixed as will ensure the greatest possible benefit to this dominion as a whole by reason of the undertaking now being declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Those were the four ends the government had in view. First, as to the continuance of the enterprise, it was found that the $30,000,000 which had been given to the company by investors throughout Canada was not sufficient to enable the company to continue its operations and, further, that the company could not secure additional money by making sale of its first mortgage bonds. Therefore, the government undertook to be responsible for any ultimate loss that might be made by the bankers in the advances which were given to the enterprise, on the condition that the enterprise should convey the canal itself to the crown in the right of the dominion so that if the St. Lawrence seaway undertaking was carried out this would be part of and available for the purposes of the seaway. The cost was represented by something in the neighbourhood of the sum which the government ultimately became responsible for in the event of the banks not realizing on their security, namely, between $15,000,000 and $16,000,000. In pursuance of that undertaking the enterprise was carried forward so that on the first day of October last power was delivered to the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated, thereby making possible the continuance of the corporation as such. Had the work not been placed in operation by the first day of October, the contracts would have fallen and in these days I am not sure but that both the hydro and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power would have been glad if the power had not been made available. The power was made available on the first day of October through the efforts taken by the administration.

Attention was directed to the fact that shortly after the house rose when we first had to deal with this matter the Premier of Quebec suggested that we should turn over the undertaking to the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated and relieve ourselves from any further responsibility in the premises. I said then that although the undertaking had been launched for the purpose of being a competitor of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power, I could quite understand the attitude of the Premier of Quebec who did not believe that government should be involved in matters of this kind. Nevertheless I represented that we could not agree to do this for the simple reason that that great corporation was not interested in seeing this corporation succeed, having regard to the then existing conditions. In view of what had transpired in this parliament, we felt that it was our duty to see that no action which took place here should prevent the enterprise from being in position to deliver power on the first day of October last, and we took the steps which I have indicated.

Having done that and having seen that the enterprise was in a position to deliver power, the further question arose as to what should be the attitude of the government. I endeavoured to make it perfectly clear that I could not recommend to this house the creation of a federal power commission to operate in a province a policy which was the exact negation of that of the government of that province. The policy of the government of Quebec is to regulate by appropriate authority the development of power by private enterprise. That is its considered policy and from that policy it has indicated that it has no intention of departing. To create a federal power commission which would take possession, by expropriation or other appropriate proceedings, of the property of a private enterprise, whether it be Beauharnois or any other company, was something that we did not care to contemplate and we therefore declined to consider that proposal.

The company having defaulted in its bonds, the appropriate remedies provided by the trust deed under which $30,000,000 had been advanced became operative and a meeting of the holders of these securities was held. The government divested itself of any responsibility in connection with those investors as to how they should enforce the securities upon which they had made their advances. They appointed a committee and that committee made a report, which was to the effect that a certain scheme of reorganization should be adopted. I was asked whether the position of the government would be the same if other plans were made with other enterprises or other individuals for the purpose of giving effect to the reorganization and I answered in the affirmative; the government had no interest as to individuals nor any communication directly or indirectly with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power. The committee of the bondholders carried forward their negotiations and as a result of such negotiations the reorganization was arranged as proposed to the bondholders. Stone and Webster did see me and they asked that we should guarantee

securities, which I declined to do; and I declined to guarantee securities for the reorganizing committee. As a result of all the efforts that were made, a committee of the security holders put forward a plan at a meeting of all the $30,000,000 bondholders for the purpose of enabling them to say aye or nay to the proposals thus made, and the government left itself in a position where the same provisions that existed with respect to that plan would exist with respect to any plan that was put forward for the reorganization of the enterprise. The plan carried and the matter is ended so far as the government is concerned.

There is just one other observation which I desire to make. This house has listened to attacks against power monopoly in the province of Quebec. This house has no concern about what that province does within its constitutional limitations. It is, within the ambit of its jurisdiction, as complete and authoritative a legislative body as is this parliament within its own, and I decline to be drawn into any controversy as to the wisdom or unwisdom of what Quebec may do within its legislative jurisdiction with respect to power or otherwise. I have endeavoured at all times, at least in my public life, to make clear that I regard the rights of provinces and provincial legislatures as being quite as important to maintain as are the rights and privileges of this parliament within their respective fields of legislative action. In this instance the province of Quebec, for reasons that may seem good to it but with respect to which I as a member of the Dominion parliament have no business to concern myself, has made the determination that it will proceed by private capital to develop its power resources and that it will create, as it has, a tribunal for the purpose of regulating and determining rates. All I can say is that any contest that may take place between the users of power and the corporation supplying it, for the purpose of securing a reduction in rates is a matter beyond the control of this parliament; it rests solely and entirely within the control and jurisdiction of the legislature of Quebec and the people who elect that legislature. As to the wisdom of their plans, I have nothing whatever to say.

That being so, there is only one further question that I think should be dealt with, and that is the export of power. With respect to the export of power from Canada to the United States, those who are interested will find that in 1925 the legislature of Quebec passed a statute, the preamble of which is as concise and powerful an indictment of any policy that will permit the export of power as it is possible to conceive can be put into words. No stronger indictment as to the evil consequences that will flow from permitting the export of power to the United States can be found than will be found in that statute. But the province of Quebec has not the jurisdiction over the export of any commodity from this dominion. That rests within the jurisdiction of the dominion, and this parliament passed a statute which provides for licences being given before power or gas is exported from our country. There are outstanding certain export licences with respect to what is called surplus peak power, off peak power, if you will, at Niagara. I am not at the moment concerned about those, because they were granted many years ago and they have been continued even unto this day. But with respect to the granting of licences to export power, it is the considered judgment of this government as at present advised that we shall not grant any such licences. I say that for two reasons: first, that it has been the settled policy of this country to maintain that view; it has been the view of successive governments, although there was put forward here some years ago a proposal which was negatived largely through the efforts of my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens). But the second view, which after all is the powerful and prevailing one in my judgment, is the one indicated a few days ago by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) and expressed in terms, to which I need not again refer, by my colleague the leader of the Senate. Those words are as appropriate to-day as they were when they were uttered. We cannot afford to export power and create community life in another country with industrial activities and then, when the requirements of our own country call for cutting off the licence for export, contemplate that situation without having regard to a statement made by a president of the United States that such action on our part would practically be considered an unfriendly act. Under those circumstances I make the statement I have made this morning for the purpose of relieving any doubt there may be in the minds of any hon. member that the government has in contemplation the granting of licences for the export of power. I shall not trouble the house further and I offer an apology for dealing at such length with this matter this morning, but I desire to summarize the position in a few short sentences.

We came into this matter, the Beauharnois power development, in consequence of statements that were made in the house that

brought about an investigation by a committee selected by the House of Commons. That investigation resulted in certain recommendations being made to which this government gave effect. There was mentioned the other day one matter that I do not think was investigated by the committee and with respect to which it may be necessary for the government to make further inquiry; that is, the Jacques Cartier Investment Corporation or something of that sort, I am not just sure of the name, as regards which certain allegations were made in consequence of which we have made and will continue to make certain inquiries.

At the time there were outstanding contracts for about 400,000 horsepower with the Hydro Electric Commission of Ontario and the Montreal Light, Heat and Power. There were restrictions upon the activities of the corporation in the selling and distribution of power. The corporation was a provincial one. The government gave it such assistance as was necessary to enable it to secure from the banks the funds required to start the enterprise, and within the time limit of the contracts, the enterprise began to function and supply power. Next, the government furnished every facility possible to enable those who had paid their $30,000,000 into the enterprise to meet together and determine what action they should take, whether by foreclosure that would vest all the shares of the company in them, or by reorganization. They determined upon a plan of reorganization which involved certain assistance being given in the way of extending the time within which to carry out their undertakings and sell their securities, which we made available to any company or persons who desired to participate in the enterprise.

Lastly, the government has incurred no further responsibility nor does it financially or otherwise in connection with this purely provincial matter, and we shall do everything in our power to see that the arrangements that have been made with the government are carried into effect, for in consequence of the contracts outstanding the government had no control over rates in any way, shape or form.

The observations which I made after the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) had spoken are very pertinent now, and they were then but for one fact, that I was not then aware that the enterprise had made its agreements which precluded any possibility of action being taken by this administration with respect to the price at which power was being sold or could be sold, or for that matter, I suppose, taken by the late administration after the order in council had been passed.

I have nothing further to add except to say that every possible oportunity was afforded to those who owned the enterprise to do with it as they pleased, but that the government in pursuance of the policy adopted by this house practically unanimously afforded an equal opportunity to all who might be concerned to assert their rights and to deal with the situation amongst themselves as shareholders as they thought desirable.

As to my own view, I regretted and I still regret that it was possible for the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated to place itself in the position it did with respect to this enterprise, but that is a matter over which I had no control and over which this government has no control, but which arises by reason of the fact that the contract which was made with this Beauharnois enterprise by the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Consolidated is a contract that limited and limits I think for a period of seventy years—a lifetime contract—the right of the Beauharnois Corporation to distribute power practically within the whole island of Montreal. That we could not deal with because we had no power to destroy a contract validly made according to the laws of the province of Quebec between the two companies. Under those circumstances, with the full facts before us, we took the only steps that could be taken to afford to those who had put their money in an opportunity for a breathing space in which to reorganize their enterprise and to take such steps as they thought desirable for the protection of their investment and the undertaking which has been built by reason of their investment being made.

Mr. EULER: May I direct just one question to the Prime Minister? Has the government freed itself of its liability with regard to its guarantees to the bank of some fifteen or sixteen million dollars' worth of expenditures?

Mr. BENNETT: I said that we had not freed ourselves of the ultimate responsibility if there was a loss on the sale of the securities, but that is not a contingency that we look upon as being one of any seriousness.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the Prime Minister permit another question? He has stated that it is the definite policy of the government that there shall be no licences granted for export. I should like to ask whether it is also the policy of the government that there should be no further permits for the diversion of water from the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BENNETT: Possibly the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was not in his place when I said that we had already provided by statute that although the province of Quebec had granted a licence for further quantities of water we would not authorize a diversion from the St. Lawrence except by the authority of this parliament.

REPAYMENT OF LOANS TO BANKS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) made inquiry with respect to the payment of an issue of $40,000,000 of two year treasury notes which matured in New York on December 1 of last year. He wished to know, first, in what funds they were payable, and secondly, how much it had cost in Canadian funds to meet the obligation. The answer to the first part of his inquiry is that they were paid in United States funds, and the answer to the second part is that they were paid out of the proceeds of an issue of one-year treasury notes which were placed in New York. The complete answer to his question will, of course, depend upon the rate of exchange at the time when the obligation is ultimately liquidated. It follows that if Canadian funds were at a parity at that time the amount of Canadian funds then required would be $40,000,000.

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): That does not quite explain it, but I suppose we can figure it out. It is all right.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

The house resumed from Tuesday, May 16, consideration of the motion of Hon. Mr. Duranleau for the second reading of Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Mr. G. G. COOTE (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, in any remarks I have to make on the bill which is now before the house I intend to deal only with section 11, which relates to the coastal shipping of Canada. I think the minister frankly admitted last night that the bill was principally for the protection of ship owners, so we are justified in dealing with the bill from that standpoint. From a perusal of the evidence it is clear who is asking for this bill. It is the shipbuilders and the shipping companies, and I think they are chiefly under one concern, Canada Steamships Limited. They are both shippers and shipbuilders. They own the Midland Shipbuilding Company of Midland and the Davie Shipbuilding Company of Levis. Prominent amongst the witnesses before the Senate committee I noticed the names of Mr. Enderby and Mr. Wolvin, who figured so prominently in the association or combine that was responsible for raising grain rates on the great lakes in 1922, and which finally resulted in the appointment of a royal commission to investigate grain rates on the great lakes. As a result of that investigation two bills were introduced in the session of 1923, one placing these grain rates under the jurisdiction of the board of grain commissioners, and the other giving the governor in council power to suspend the coastal shipping laws at any time.

I noticed that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) last night, in the very able speech which he made on the second reading of this bill, said that it was the duty of parliament to promote the interests of the various industries in Canada, and he apparently was speaking of the ship-owning industry. I think the ship-owning industry are very well able to take care of themselves, judging by their action of last year.

Mr. STEVENS: May I interrupt my hon. friend? It is certainly not correct for him to state that I represent the ship owners. I do not represent anyone of that character or any business interest in this house.

Mr. COOTE: Let me assure the minister I did not say he represented them at all.

Mr. STEVENS: You said that exactly.

Mr. COOTE: No; Hansard will show I did not say that. I did not intend to say it, and if accidentally I did say it I shall quite gladly withdraw it. I said that his remarks last night were directed in defence of or in support of the interests of the ship owners.

Mr. STEVENS: No. Mr. Speaker, I must ask my hon. friend not to state it in that way, because it is not right. One can make an argument pro or con, but it does not necessarily follow that he represents the interests of any particular industries or particular class.

Mr. COOTE: I shall gladly accept the statement of the minister and withdraw anything to which he may object. But I wish to make it plain that I think the ship owners are much better able to take care of their own interests than are the producers. I am very much concerned about the interests of the producers. I believe they are the ones who need protection. Mr. Enderby, when before the committee, was quite frank. He admitted the principal reason for the section of the bill to which we are objecting is to give protection to Canadian shippers. The principal function of the Canadian fleet is the movement of the Canadian crop across the great lakes.

I should like to make it plain that I do not believe there is any protection for the growers of grain. They have to meet the competition of the world, and I do not see why the ship owners of Canada cannot meet the competition of the United States fleet. They did it successfully in 1932. They have a shippers' association or combine. To all intents and purposes, I believe it is a combine. This bill I think will give to that shipping combine a monopoly of the business of transporting grain. Apparently they want this business for themselves so that they can levy a toll. It might be of interest to the house to see how successful they were last year without the legislation which is now being introduced. I shall quote briefly from the evidence given by Mr. Bredt before the Senate committee. He said:

On July 10, last year the rate from the head of the lakes to Montreal was four and a half cents. The Associated Lake Freights Limited was organized on July 11, and on that date the rates were raised a quarter of a cent to four and three-quarter cents. I wish to enlarge upon that. We consider that there is no competition on the lakes so far as Canadian vessels are concerned, but that they are in a combine. For your information I want to give the following figures which support this contention. On July 28 the rate was raised to five cents; on August 16 to five and one-quarter cents; on August 21 to five and a half cents; on August 26, to five and three-quarter cents; on September 1 to six cents; on September 11 to six and a quarter cents, and so on, to October 1, when it was seven cents.

I believe that is all the quotation I need to read. I think there is complete proof there that the grain shippers' association was successful in raising rates, and that is really the purpose for which it was formed,—to raise rates on the great lakes. This bill can provide no possible advantage to the grain grower. His greatest safeguard is the competition offered by the American shippers. At page 15 Mr. Enderby was asked this question:

Do you agree with Mr. Smith that the cost of the ship has no relation to the rate that it is able to obtain?

Mr. Enderby's answer was:

None whatever. The cost is set by the competitive route or the competitive steamer on the same route.

Now that the business is to be left to the Canadian shippers I do not think there is going to be any competition. At page 18 he states:

It is the through rate that governs.

And, Mr. Speaker, these through rates will now be in their own hands. This bill will cancel competitive rates. The grain may go to Buffalo in an American boat, but only a combine boat can move grain from Buffalo to Montreal. I have shown already how they can raise the rates. I should like to point out here that one disadvantage we will suffer arises from the fact that it will be impossible to store grain at Buffalo, as formerly, and we will not be able to ship that grain to any point desired. Buffalo has been one of the cheapest points at which to store grain for the winter. I think this is about the very worst time which could have been chosen to place any more barriers or handicaps in the way of our producers or grain exporters. Buffalo is strategically placed. It has large storage facilities, and from there grain can be shipped either through an American or Canadian port. But once this legislation becomes law Buffalo will cease to be of much use to us as a grain storage point. Any grain that goes to Buffalo from now on must go out through American ports.

The financial position of the shipping companies has been stressed. I should like to stress the financial position of the producers. They are selling at from thirty to forty cents a bushel wheat which costs all the way from seventy cents to one dollar a bushel to produce. It has been sold as low as twenty-five cents. I suggest that this is a poor time to increase the toll for the benefit of the shipping combine. It seems to me there is no doubt of the fact that this bill will have the effect of increasing the toll or the freight rate on farmers' grain. There is only one place from which that increase can be paid, and that is from the share which the producer will receive. The competition in the wheat market is keen at the present time. It was pointed out by Mr. Smith, who gave evidence on behalf of the grain exporters, that the exporters have to send their grain forward to eastern Canada and have it ready to ship out whenever they can get an order. We are not going to be able to take advantage of the storage facilities offered at Buffalo, and we will not have the choice of two routes through which we could get the grain out to the various importing countries.

Instead of restricting, the government should do everything it can to make available to us all the different routes possible. The minister said that the rate would be set by the board of grain commissioners. He said last night that the rate was fixed last September by order of the board. That may be so, but certainly I cannot draw that inference from the report of the board of grain commissioners for 1932. They say that under the Inland Water Freight Rates Act the board is charged

with the duty of prescribing maximum lake rates on grain when, in its opinion, these rates become excessive or discriminative as compared with rates charged for similar traffic between Canadian and United States ports. The paragraph in the report continues:

In the early part of the shipping season of 1932, lake rates fell to what were considered to be unremunerative levels and in July, the Associated Lake Freighters Limited was formed. In July an advance in rates on grain carried between Port Arthur-Fort William and other Canadian ports occurred.

That was immediately after the formation of the association.

Further advances occurred at intervals until on October 1, the rate of seven cents per bushel on wheat was put into effect between Fort William and Montreal. At this point, the board intervened and on representations being made to the Associated Lake Freighters Limited, the maximum rate was reduced to six and a half cents per bushel on wheat and continued at this rate for the balance of the season.

I think the inference from that paragraph is not that the board issued any order, but that they reasoned or remonstrated with the shippers' combine. Current gossip in Winnipeg was to the effect that the board had threatened the combine that if they did not lower their rate, an investigation under the Combines Investigation Act might become necessary. I suppose the shippers' association, rather than have that investigation, decided to lower the rate one half cent. We know from experience how long it takes to get an investigation started under the Combines Investigation Act, and I am very much afraid that once this legislation is passed, some fall when there is a lot of grain to be moved the shippers' combine will put up the rate and will perhaps submit to an investigation under the Combines Investigation Act rather than reduce rates, and in the meantime make a nice killing for themselves out of the increased rates on grain.

Mr. STEVENS: May I interrupt the hon. member? Yesterday he asked me if there had been an order, I had not time to send it over then, I will do so now. There was an order actually passed by the board of grain commissioners on the 5th of May of this year. There is no necessity to wait for an investigation.

Mr. COOTE: I understood the minister last night—I may have been mistaken—to say that the order had been passed last year as a result of investigation by the board. Certainly the reduction last year in the rate from 7 cents to 6½ cents was not caused by any order issued by the board. I do not think section 5 of the Inland Water Freight Rates Act of 1923 gives sufficient power to the board. It says:

When in the opinion of the board the toll, charge or rate which any company, owner or person charges or intends or proposes to charge for the carriage of grain as aforesaid is unreasonable or excessive,—

How are you going to decide whether that rate is unreasonable or excessive? There is a fine point for the lawyers to argue about and carry from one court to another and perhaps to the privy council.

—or amounts to an unjust discrimination against any person, company or class of persons as compared with the tolls or rates for similar traffic between Canadian and United States ports, or between one port and another in either of the said countries, . . .

I think in the past most grain shippers are of the opinion that the American rates followed the Canadian rates and were just a little lower, they appear to take whatever rates the Canadians set or perhaps give a little lower rate. The last year or two there has been very little comparable traffic, not enough for the board to base a decision on. How much grain have the Americans moved to Buffalo for export overseas? Their export trade had practically ceased. If we are going to depend on that legislation we are leaning on a very weak reed. Some lawyers state that it is open to question whether the board really have this power, whether this act is really intra vires of this parliament. I of course would not wish to express any opinion on that. But Buffalo has consistently enjoyed a cheaper rate than Port Colborne, and that certainly is proof to me that once this act is passed we are going to have to pay a little higher rates on our grain.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Will my hon. friend permit a question? What is his answer to clause 938 of the Canada Shipping Act? Does he not think there is sufficient protection for our grain shippers in case of monopoly? It gives power to the governor in council at any time to suspend the operation of any provision of this part of the statute.

Mr. COOTE: I am glad that is in, but we know from past experience that sometimes it takes about three months after rates are raised to get the governor in council to act. I think it naturally will take a little time.

Mr. MANION: It could be done overnight.

Mr. COOTE: I would like to make it clear about rates to Buffalo being cheaper than to Port Colborne. This is from the evidence of Mr. Smith:

I mean this, senator, that the Canadian boats usually get a higher rate to the bay ports and

to Port Colborne than the American boats get to Buffalo, and therefore the Canadian boats are not willing to run to Buffalo at a lower rate if they can get a higher rate to Port Colborne and the bay ports. My experience has been that Canadian boats have not wished to take grain to Buffalo to any great extent.

Once this legislation is passed I think practically all the grain will go to Canadian ports and they will get the better rate. Someone will have to pay it.

Might I point out that this legislation which the minister mentions was introduced in 1923. Mr. Robb, the Minister of Trade and Commerce at that time I think was not very much impressed with it himself, that is he was not very sure that the board had all the powers it should have, or rather that their power to control rates would be very effective as far as the producer was concerned. He said:

> The importance of this measure does not consist in the fixing of a maximum rate; we find the importance of it, the teeth of it, in the gathering of the information, the tabulating of it, the publication of that information, and the publication from day to day, during the season, of the space that has been booked and the space that is available for shippers. That is where we find the very teeth of this measure;—

I do not think they are very effective teeth myself.

> —and it is in that respect that it is opposed. It is opposed not because there happens to be in it a clause that gives the board the right, if they deem it wise, to fix a maximum rate, but because the measure provides machinery upon which the government can act intelligently and arrive at a decision that will justify the suspension of the coastal laws.

So really the only effective protection we have is the power of the governor in council to suspend the coastal shipping law. For my part I would not have this coastal shipping law apply. That is, I would not want to prevent American ships coming in and carrying grain to Buffalo, and again carrying it to Montreal if necessary.

Mr. BOWMAN: They can now as a matter of fact carry grain to Buffalo.

Mr. COOTE: Quite so. But I say again carrying it to Montreal. Any Canadian shipper who ships grain to Buffalo now has to take a chance on getting his price by shipping it through American channels.

Mr. BOWMAN: Not at all, because an American ship can carry it from Buffalo to Montreal.

Mr. COOTE: Well, that is a point that has to be made clear to me. It has got to go by boat owned by this combine, because all the Canadian ships are in the combine.

[Mr. Coote.]

Mr. MANION: What combine?

Mr. COOTE: The Lake Shippers' Association, I think it is called.

Mr. MANION: Not much of a combine, because they compete with each other. I can give the hon. member some figures on coal which will show they are far from a combine.

Mr. COOTE: I hope the minister will give some figures on wheat also. I think we are going too far in this idea of nationalism when we cannot move goods from one Canadian port to another in anything but a Canadian boat. I suppose soon we will not be allowed to travel from one part of Canada to another unless we stay in Canada.

Mr. NICHOLSON: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Is it any more unreasonable that we should provide that protection for Canadian ships than the United States government provides for American ships? A Canadian vessel cannot engage in trade from one American port to another.

Mr. COOTE: There is a distinction to be drawn on that point, but I will ask this of the minister and also of the hon. member for East Algoma: Will they agree to place on the Canadian statute books some other laws in conformity with laws dealing with similar matters that are now in force in the United States? I will give an instance. There is a law in the United States which allows an American citizen who is abroad to buy $100 worth of merchandise and take it back free of duty. Will he support the placing on our statute books of a similar law to allow Canadian tourists to bring back from the United States $100 worth of merchandise free of duty? If his argument applies in the one case it should apply in the other. If I go to the United States and one of my automobile tires happens to play out and I buy one there, when I get to the line I have to pay duty on that tire before I can get back home. The United States law allows an American to buy a motor car, if he likes, in Canada, either new or secondhand, and take it back with him at 25 per cent duty; our government will not allow a man to bring in a secondhand automobile at any rate of duty. Does the hon. member think we should change our law in that respect to correspond with the law in the United States?

With regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for East Algoma, may I ask this question. Because the United States has a coastal shipping law which prevents a Canadian boat from hauling grain from one

American port to another American port, why should we have exactly the same law here? The conditions are not the same, because Buffalo happens to be an American port. Any exporter from the western states can send grain from Duluth to Buffalo and later send it on from Buffalo to Montreal if he wishes, or he can send it from Buffalo to New York. He can send it by the Erie canal. But the Canadians will not have that privilege. I understand the hon. member for Dauphin to say that we can send it on if we send it in a Canadian ship.

Mr. BOWMAN: Send it in an American ship.

Mr. COOTE: Not from Buffalo to Montreal, if it has been brought down in an American ship.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is a different proposition. We have no transfer points in Canada to compare with Buffalo. It is true we have a transfer elevator at Port Colborne with a capacity of 4,000,000 bushels.

Mr. MANION: And there are the bay ports.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, but they do not compare with Buffalo at all; Buffalo is strategically located, and there is no point in Canada that compares with it fairly.

I regret very much that this bill, if it must be passed, did not come down earlier in the session and go before a select committee of the house. Before it is passed Canada Steamship Lines, which is the biggest company in the association, should be investigated. We should investigate the capitalization of that concern; we should investigate its earnings in past years. The minister said last night that the rates they charged this year, although they did raise them to 7 cents, were not as high as in former years. Well, they should not be as high. Why did we spend $150,000,000 on the new Welland canal? Was it not in order that there might be lower rates on grain as well as other freight? In my opinion the rate of 7 cents, considering the price of grain and having regard to the fact that everything in Canada was supposed to have been reduced, was excessive.

Mr. STEVENS: 6½ cents, not 7.

Mr. COOTE: They raised it to 7 cents and it was brought back to 6½ only under pressure from the board. It seems to me that the shipowners have a good deal of nerve to come forward at this time and ask for this legislation. I do not wish to delay the house, but I do insist that this is the very worst time the government could have chosen to bring down legislation of this kind. The Prime Minister was in Washington lately and discussed with the president of the United States the possibility of securing better trade relations, and in this connection I may quote from an article that appeared in the Montreal Star of Saturday, May 13. This article appears under the heading:

> United States considers protest against change in shipping laws. . . . Measure would reduce shipment of grain in American vessels.

It is dated Washington, May 13, and reads in part:

> Acting in response to the vehement pleas of Buffalo and United States lake shipping interests, the State department is considering making a protest to the Canadian government against the pending amendment to the dominion shipping laws aimed to reduce the shipment of Canadian grain down the lake in United States ships to Buffalo for transfer there to dominion vessels for export overseas through Canadian ports. Following representations made at the State department on Thursday afternoon by Congressman Andrews of New York, informal discussion of the problem was carried on between department officials and Hume Wrong, charge d'affaires of the Canadian legation.

I repeat therefore that this is the very worst time to introduce such legislation as this. It is very apt to be regarded by the public in the United States as a sort of retaliatory measure, and while I am not concerned about United States shipping, we do have to depend upon it sometimes to get some relief in rates. We suspend the coastal shipping laws and invite these ships to come in and carry our grain at lower rates.

This whole bill suggests pressure from the shippers' combine, or if that word is objectionable I will say association. I do not think the house should deliver our producers into the hands of the association. In my opinion the legislation we have to control rates is not effective enough, and I must protest as vigorously as I can against legislation of this kind. I would ask the government to put it off another year and let us have a thorough investigation of the whole matter by a committee of the House of Commons. So far as I am concerned I will not consent to being governed in this case by the work of a committee of the Senate. So far as I can see from a perusal of the evidence given before the Senate committee, there did not appear to be any members of the Senate acting as representatives of the producers. The representatives of the shipping interests were not questioned by anyone representing the producers. I want to see these men brought before a House of Commons committee and we should be given an opportunity to obtain a good deal more

information in regard to this whole question before we pass this legislation, even though it may be held in abeyance in the meantime and may come into force only by proclamation of the governor in council. I do not think we should adopt this legislation, and for my part I cannot allow it to pass without recording my vote against it.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member made the statement that grain loaded in Buffalo must go through American ports. Surely he did not intend to convey that impression to the house.

Mr. COOTE: That, I said, was the impression which I got from reading the bill, and if it is not correct I hope the point will be made clear. Section 935 reads:

> No goods shall be transported by water or by land and water, from one place in Canada to another place in Canada, either directly or by way of a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation in any ship other than a British ship.

It says, for any part of the transportation.

Mr. DURANLEAU: There is no objection to that.

Mr. COOTE: I understand my hon. friend from Dauphin to say that if grain goes from Fort William to Buffalo in an American ship it can then go on from Buffalo to Montreal in a Canadian ship.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. COOTE: Well, that is the point I want to have made clear.

Mr. MANION: If it goes to Buffalo in a Canadian ship it can go on to Montreal in a Canadian ship—a British ship.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): But you cannot retain the identity of the grain and tell which came out of the Canadian vessel.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): In the course of his remarks on this subject my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Coote) said that the bill was asked for by the shipping combine or the Lake Shippers' Association. Personally, I have no brief for the Lake Shippers' Association or the shipping combine either, but I have a brief to some extent at least for the many thousands of Canadian working men who are engaged in the shipping business at the head of the lakes or at ports in Canada or the United States for that matter. For fifty years we have been spending enormous sums of money on harbours, lake ports, wharves, and various facilities for shipping. We are spending annually large sums for lighthouse services, pilotage service and all this sort of thing for the purpose of making inland shipping safe and providing ample facilities by which traffic from the west can be moved to the east in the easiest and cheapest manner possible. Now, the question here arises: Whom are we doing this for? Judging from the statements of my hon. friend and others in relation to this matter, notwithstanding that we have spent all this money on the services I have mentioned, we are to turn over the whole business to United States shipping and United States working men, while in every port, from Fort William to Montreal, there are hundreds of Canadians who have been trained in the lake service—captains, engineers, firemen, dockhands and so on idle while American ships are carrying the traffic.

Mr. COOTE: Would my hon. friend permit an interruption for the sake of accuracy? He said that we had suggested that all this business would be turned over to American shipping interests. I ask him to withdraw that statement as no one has suggested any such thing.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I hesitate to withdraw that statement. If my hon. friend did not mean that and I am doing him an injustice, I will withdraw it, but that is really what has been advocated. Anyone who knows anything about the conditions on the great lakes and the St. Lawrence knows that if present conditions continue, Canadian shipping will be driven off the lakes. The circumstances are such that it is impossible for them to compete. In the first place, American ships are provided with return cargoes not available to Canadian ships.

Mr. YOUNG: Why? Because the government will not let them take back coal.

Mr. NICHOLSON: No, they cannot take back coal or anything else that goes to an American port. That is why. The proof of this statement can be found in the records. If my hon. friend will go back to 1920 he will find out what took place when American shipping was in control, not only with regard to rates on coal but with regard to rates on grain. The rates in 1932 were the lowest that have prevailed since 1920. I am virtually certain that lower rates have never prevailed.

In speaking of the competition provided by American ships my hon. friend stated that the rates are controlled by this competition. Let us see how it works out. When Canadian shipping on the great lakes had a capacity of 165,000,000 bushels, the average rate was 10·78 cents. When the capacity of Canadian shipping had been increased to

287,000,000 bushels, the rate was reduced to 5·07 cents. I should like to give my hon. friend one illustration of the position in which Canadian shipping will be placed should the monopoly and control be given to United States shipping, as will be the case unless the provisions of this bill are made applicable. During one of the years when the United States ships were in complete control and the rate on grain was 11·64 cents instead of 5·07 cents, I came into direct connection with some United States shippers.

Mr. SPENCER: May I ask what year that was?

Mr. NICHOLSON: The year 1920. One of the firms which had been busily engaged in the transport of grain from the head of the lakes through Buffalo and on to Montreal entered into a contract with a Canadian shipper to carry some 3,000 tons of freight from one lake port to another. This contract was entered into during the fall of the year, the goods to be carried in the following summer. In the meantime the rates rose, and what happened? The American company put themselves into liquidation. They sold their ships to the clerks in their own office and raised rates just 150 per cent on the Canadian commodity that was to be carried. That is the position in which hon. friends want to put Canadian shippers; they want to drive Canadian ships off the lakes. My hon. friend as well as the hon. member for Weyburn has inquired why Canadian ships could not compete. I should like to show them the tonnage that Canadian ships cannot handle. During a period of ten years there was an average tonnage of 45,000,000 tons in the form of coal, ore and stone handled on the great lakes by American ships. Not one single ounce of this tonnage could be carried by Canadian ships. Let us see what has happened with regard to grain. The hon. member who has just left the chamber stated that the American ships carried a very small percentage of Canadian grain. For the ten year period ending 1932, American ships carried on an average 126,000,000 bushels of grain from Canadian ports to United States ports, while Canadian ships carried on an average 11,000,000 bushels. The position has become so accentuated that Canadian seamen and Canadian workingmen are idle while American ships are carrying Canadian trade and Canadian ships are not able to participate in American trade.

I am not anxious that there should be any difficulties or controversies between the two countries. If hon. gentlemen can make an arrangement by which Canadian shipping will be permitted to participate in the coastwise trade of the United States on the great lakes and the St. Lawrence river, I would be in favour of withdrawing this bill. Is it fair that this country to the south of us with its large volume of trade should have its shipping tied up in a castiron box and reserved for its own people while Canadian shipping companies are forced to meet competition which is absolutely impossible. I do not think there is an hon. member in the house who will suggest that the rates in effect last June and July were such as made it possible for a shipping company to continue to operate and pay the Canadian workingman a wage upon which he could live.

There is another point to be considered. Facilities have been provided at the head of the lakes, at Collingwood, Midland, and other points for the repairing of ships. Large sums of money have been invested and large numbers of Canadian workingmen are dependent upon this industry. You never hear of a United States ship coming across to one of these shipyards and giving employment to Canadian workingmen. But it is suggested that the Canadian ships which do make use of these facilities should be driven off the lakes. Such a procedure would force the closing up of these shipyards and throw Canadian workmen out of employment and Canadian investments into the discard.

The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion) gave some evidence to show that there is no combine existing. I personally know that there is no such thing as a combine. It may be true that the Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, own the largest tonnage on the lakes but—

Mr. MANION: They compete with other boats.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Certainly, they compete. There are other companies which operate ships. I know two captains who live in Sault Ste. Marie. They have sailed the lakes all their lives and they formed a small company and purchased three ships. They are operating them from the head of the lakes to Port Colborne and Montreal and they compete with everybody in order to get traffic for their vessels. Is it a crime that Canadians should do that sort of thing? Is it a crime that Canadian workingmen should desire to work in their own country when they are not allowed to compete in the country alongside of us? Have we reached the stage where the only person who is to be considered as being entitled to the rights of Canadian citizenship is the man who grows wheat on the western

prairies? That has been indicated by the discussion which has taken place.

The question of the protection of the producer has been raised, but an attempt is being made to penalize the producer. After all, who is the producer of wheat? Wheat is grown on the western prairies but it would not be worth anything if a market could not be found. Where is this market to be found? It will be found at the place where there is someone who wants to buy the wheat and in the main that is in Europe. How are you going to get it there? The railroad man who operates the wheat train from the fields of the west to the head of the lakes is just as much a producer of wheat as is the man who drives the plough over the prairies. The sea captain, the engineer, the deck hand and the other men who go out in all kinds of weather and risk their lives to carry that grain across the lakes and down the river are just as much producers and just as much entitled to be protected by this parliament as is the man who actually works on the farm, the so-called producer of the grain itself. Instead of this bill being introduced too early, I say that the men interested, the men who have been lying idle in the ports of this country waiting for the possibility of getting an odd job here and there on a Canadian ship, have waited too long and this bill should be put through and made effective during the present shipping season.

I do not wish to delay the house by giving further figures as to what has taken place. But during the period when the United States had control of the situation, that is during the war and the early period after it, Canadian wheat producers had to pay the highest rates they have ever paid, and the reduction has been from 11·64 cents in 1920 to 5·09 cents solely because of the competition that is provided by Canadians who put their ships on the great lakes.

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, the aim of this bill is to give to Canadian ships a monopoly of the carrying of Canadian grain on the great lakes. The minister himself put the situation last night in the statement that "Canadian boats should carry Canadian grain." The effect of this bill, if it becomes law, will be to deprive Canadian grain of the use of Buffalo as a transfer or a storage point. To understand the full effect of that on the transportation of grain, one must have in mind the picture of the whole grain transportation business. When the first trainload of wheat leaves the west for the head of the lakes, those who ship it have no idea where it will ultimately land. When that wheat arrives at the terminals, those who own it do not know where it is going to go; it may be sold in any one of a dozen different countries. But one thing they do know is that that wheat must be kept moving; they know there are millions and hundreds of millions of bushels to follow. They know if it is delayed in the terminals they will fill up, and if they do, the railway yards will be congested, the blockade will go right out to the farms and the wheat will not move. The whole strategy in moving wheat consists in constantly moving it eastward, but always moving it to a point from which it may be shipped out in the greatest number of directions. That point is Buffalo. It is the most strategically located point in Canada or the United States for the transfer and storage of grain. From that city you can ship down the St. Lawrence and out through Canadian ports or you can ship down the barge canal or by rail to New York, Boston, Portland or several other United States ports. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, for a moment to picture yourself as an exporter of grain. You discover on a certain morning that you can sell some wheat in Liverpool, some in Bordeaux, Antwerp, Rotterdam or Hamburg. What do you do? The first thing is to see what ocean space you can get. You discover that coming into the port of Montreal is a ship that will load for Liverpool; coming into the port of Portland is a ship that will load, we will say, for Hamburg; coming into the port of Boston there is one that will load for Antwerp and coming into the port of New York is one that will load for Rotterdam and another that will load for Bordeaux. On every one of those ships you can get space. What do you do? If you have your grain at Buffalo you secure the space and you sell the grain. If your grain is at any other point than Buffalo you will not be able to deliver at all those ports and you will lose the sale. If you could not get your grain on to any ship loading for Antwerp or Amsterdam or Rotterdam or Hamburg or any other port, you would not be able to make the sale and the result would be that you would sell less grain. If this legislation takes effect, Canadian grain will not be able to go to Buffalo and use that as a transfer or a storage point.

Mr. STEVENS: That is not the case at all.

Mr. YOUNG: My hon. friend says that that is not the case. By that he means that Canadian boats can carry grain to Buffalo and Canadian boats can take it from Buffalo down the St. Lawrence.

Mr. MANION: Yes, or United States boats can carry it to Buffalo.

Mr. YOUNG: And carry it out through United States ports?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, to Rotterdam or any other place.

Mr. YOUNG: The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) points out that Canadian boats will not take grain to Buffalo because they can get higher rates for taking it to Canadian ports. That precludes the grain from going down the St. Lawrence. In addition to that, the conference agreements passed last fall make it impossible for Canadian grain going through Buffalo to receive the preference.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member is again absolutely wrong, not within a thousand miles of what is right.

Mr. YOUNG: Canadian grain going out through United States ports does not receive the preference.

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly it does.

Mr. MANION: If it is consigned clear through to Britain.

Mr. YOUNG: But I say that it is not consigned clear through. The shipper has to keep his grain moving; he does not know when he loads it on to the boat at the head of the lakes, where it is going. When it is consigned to Buffalo, it is not consigned clear through.

Mr. MANION: Often it is.

Mr. YOUNG: He wants to be able, when he ships it to Buffalo, to consign it wherever he can make a sale.

Mr. STEVENS: Most of it is consigned through.

Mr. YOUNG: No, it is not. This legislation will deprive us of the use of Buffalo as a transfer and to a large degree as a storage point.

Mr. SPENCE: The hon. member knows better.

Mr. YOUNG: I know what I say. The minister says that Canadian boats will carry it to Buffalo. The hon. member for Macleod says that they will not because they can get higher rates to Canadian ports. The member for Macleod is right. The average rate from the head of the lakes to bay ports, or to Sarnia or Goderich, last year was 2·08 cents per bushel, while the average rate to Buffalo, a much longer haul, was 1·577 cents per bushel, or nearly half a cent a bushel lower than the rate to bay ports. Close the port of Buffalo to our wheat; shut United States boats out from the handling of it and that spread will widen; the rates on the lakes to Canadian ports will increase. Who will pay the difference? Everybody knows the price the farmer receives for his wheat is the Liverpool price less the cost of shipping it there. Every cent, every fraction of a cent you add to the cost of putting the wheat on to the Liverpool market is just that much subtracted from the price the farmer receives. What right has anyone to say to the farmer: You must give one cent a bushel more to a shipping man, any more than anyone has the right to say to the shipping man: You must put your hand into your pocket and give a cent a bushel to the farmer. No government has the right to do that. The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) said that Canadian boats could not compete with United States boats; they would be driven off the lakes.

Mr. NICHOLSON: They can compete on fair terms.

Mr. YOUNG: He said that United States boats carried some 45,000,000 tons of coal, ore and stone which the Canadian boats could not carry and I thought he said that was carried as return cargoes. It is not; it goes in the same direction as the wheat does.

Mr. NICHOLSON: The coal is a return cargo.

Mr. YOUNG: Why do our Canadian boats not bring coal back? The government does not allow them.

Mr. STEVENS: Because we favour the purchasing of coal from your own riding and a dozen others in the west. That is why.

Mr. YOUNG: Because you have adopted a certain coal policy.

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly. Purchasing coal from your own backyard.

Mr. YOUNG: And you have said to the boats on the great lakes: "When you take a cargo down, we will not allow you to bring a cargo back. The money you make on the one trip will have to pay for your trip both ways." That is the net result of your policy.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would he favour the abandonment of the subventions and support to Alberta and Saskatchewan coal moving

eastward in favour of encouraging the purchase of American coal from Port Arthur?

Mr. YOUNG: If my hon. friend had been in the house when the question of subventions was up he would know that I am strongly opposed to these coal subventions from start to finish.

Mr. STEVENS: Then the hon. member would prefer to use American coal in Winnipeg to his own coal.

Mr. YOUNG: I would buy the coal where I can buy to best advantage, and you can trust me to do it. I do not want the government to tell me where to buy it.

The American boats have more business at home and they only enter Canadian trade when the rates are high. When the rates are low the Canadian boats have the trade to themselves. The American boats when they come into the trade are the controlling factor in the rates. Their competition keeps the rates from going out of sight. It has been said that the rates will be regulated. We know that last year the board of grain commissioners fixed the maximum rate at 6½ cents a bushel, and we are told that there is a further provision that gives the governor-in-council power to intervene and set the rates at any time they think the rates are too high. But what has been our experience in the past? Whenever the rates have gone up it takes so long to get action through either channel that the mischief has already been done before action is taken. I give every credit to the board of grain commissioners for the action they took last fall in fixing a maximum rate, but this fact remains that before they fixed it a great deal of the mischief had been done, and as for intervening by order in council that is slower still.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is wrong again. The board of grain commissioners intervened before the proclaimed rate went into effect.

Mr. YOUNG: When did the seven cent rate go into effect?

Mr. STEVENS: That did not go into effect. It was announced, but the board of grain commissioners stepped in and the rate was fixed at 6½ cents.

Mr. YOUNG: I will accept that.

Mr. BOWMAN: And it was fixed without any complaint.

Mr. YOUNG: From whom?

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. BOWAN: Without any complaint being lodged with the board of grain commissioners.

Mr. YOUNG: There was considerable complaint in the west, but perhaps no formal complaint, and that may be the weakness of the system. If you wait for someone to make a formal complaint a good deal of the mischief can be done. There was complaint in the west when the rates were increased and when the price of grain was at the lowest point almost in history.

In the United States in 1880 the freight rate on wheat from Chicago to New York was 20 cents a bushel. Under free competition, open market conditions, that rate gradually worked down till at the turn of the century it was only 10 cents a bushel. Then it worked back and forth within a range of two cents a bushel until rate control became effective in the United States. Prior to 1906 their attempt to control rates had been spasmodic and ineffective. With the passing of the Hepburn Act in 1906, rate control became a reality, and then the decline in freight rates ceased. The rates moved back and forth within a range of two cents until 1916 when the rate shot up to 20 cents a bushel. That was the result of control, and now the rates are controlled by the interstate commerce commission, and the rate is 18 cents a bushel, as compared with 10 cents before effective control came into force, and 20 cents away back in 1880. They are almost back to where they were forty years ago in the matter of freight rate. That is the result of attempting to control rates in the United States.

I ask this question: On what basis are you going to control rates? Will you regulate them on a cost plus basis? Will you say that the carrier of the grain on the lakes must have all his operating expenses, his depreciation, insurance and everything else, plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. MANION: He has not been getting that for many years.

Mr. YOUNG: You are talking of controlling rates. Will you regulate them at a figure that will give the ship owner a profit? I ask, then, what right have you to guarantee him a profit more than anybody else? Besides, when you attempt to control rates the controlling body is not in a position and never can be in a position to know when the boats are efficiently managed, or whether the capital structure of the company represents a lot of obsolete and scrap vessels that went out of service long ago. I understand that to-

day one of the reasons why Canadian boats cannot compete is that they have a lot of old-fashioned, out of date boats.

The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) spoke last night of a statutory rate. I do not agree with that. I do not think we should have a statutory rate. It is too rigid. The proper control of rates is free, open competition. I have here a book on the American Transport System by Harold Moulton and associates in which this matter of freight rates is discussed, and he has this to say:

> Wherever there is free economic competition it will decide the rate question, and it should be permitted to do so freely.

Free, open competition, yes, not trying to close the market and letting a combine get all the traffic. The American boat now comes into the picture whenever rates are high enough. This is attempting to remove that competition. It is done at the instance of the Associated Lake Freighters mentioned by the minister the other night. Who are these Associated Lake Freighters? I may tell the minister that when we go into committee we will want to know something of that company and its charter. The statement has been made that there is no combine. I say that there is, and we know there is, and we know who is at the head of it. We know the methods to which he resorted to get shipping companies into it, and the fees per bushel he charged for his services. We know that when the combine was organized, rates began to increase and then the board of grain commissioners stepped in and set a maximum rate. When this legislation becomes effective that combine is going to ask that control of rates be taken from the board of grain commissioners and given to the board of railway commissioners, because they did not like the action taken last fall by the board of grain commissioners.

The legislation was drafted in fear of retaliation by the United States. I believe that it would have been brought in before but there was always the fear that the United States might hit back. At last some clever person, the government leader in the Senate I believe, hit upon the device of taking the very words out of the American act and putting them into the Canadian act, arguing that surely the Americans cannot now retaliate against what we are doing, that they cannot resent these very words in our act which are taken from their own act. But the cases are not quite parallel. There is small temptation for Canadian boats to go into United States ports to carry grain to Canadian ports, and then go back to American ports, because the ports are not favourably located. The cases are not parallel at all. It may have seemed very clever for the government leader in the Senate to devise this way of drafting the section so that the Americans would not retaliate. I say it may have been a clever trick of a clever man, but I have no faith in clever tricks of clever men as a basis of national prosperity. In trying to build the prosperity of a country you must take the broader and the longer view. Those tactics might be all right for a man running a pawn shop, but they will not do in international relations. The Americans will find a way to retaliate. What will they do to our boats on the Pacific coast running from Seattle to Vancouver and Skagway? Will they not find a way to retaliate? I think they will. To assume that simply by taking these words out of their act and putting them in ours we have outwitted them is not to give them credit for being as clever as we are, and I think we might be disappointed.

What about the tariff truce of which we have heard so much lately? A tariff truce has been arranged among the different countries. We are going to get together with the idea of promoting world trade. Is this proper preparation for it? I am not sure of the terms of the truce, and I do not know whether this legislation is a breach of it or not—certainly I do know it is a breach of the spirit of it. It is protection, pure and simple. What about the talk of reciprocity? We are going to have a reciprocity treaty with the United States—perhaps. Is this good preparation for it? In what frame of mind will the Americans be when they see this legislation on our books? What will they say when we seek more favourable trade relations? What about the seaway treaty? Will the United States enter into a seaway contract if we say we will not allow any American ships through our ports? They do not know what we may do next. Two years ago—nearly three years ago—our Prime Minister went abroad to do wonderful things for trade within the empire. He went to the Imperial conference at London. At that time he failed. A year ago he had another opportunity when the Imperial economic conference met here in Ottawa. We know the results of that.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: Very tangible results.

Mr. BENNETT: Look at the trade returns.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Look at the pockets of the people.

Mr. YOUNG: Now he has another opportunity. He is going to another conference to try to promote world trade. But before he goes he is making a similar preparation,—a preparation similar to that which he made before he went to the Imperial conference in London. Before he went to London he passed legislation which made the conference abortive. Before the conference at Ottawa last year legislation was placed upon our statute books which made it impossible to effect profitable trade arrangements with Great Britain. Now he is going to another conference, but before going he is introducing another measure which will have the effect of giving a monopoly of shipping on Canadian lakes to Canadians.

Mr. ROBINSON: You want to create a monopoly for American ships.

Mr. YOUNG: No, I am asking only for free competition. That is all we ask. Let the grain be carried by whomsoever can carry it cheapest and most efficiently. There seems to be no limit to the ingenuity displayed by this government in devising ways and means of stifling Canadian trade.

Mr. STEVENS: Oh, oh.

Mr. YOUNG: And the strange part of it is that they do it all with the very best of intentions. They think that by this measure they are going to help us. They think they can build up Canadian shipping in this way. No country in the world has been able to build up its shipping industry by means of navigation acts or protective tariffs.

Mr. BENNETT: Has the hon. member been reading what the British Shipping Federation has been saying lately about competition?

Mr. YOUNG: No.

Mr. BENNETT: If he had he would not now be making such observations about what he calls free competition.

Mr. YOUNG: I am making them, anyway.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: Everybody out of step but my boy.

Mr. YOUNG: No country ever succeeded in building up its shipping by navigation acts such as these. Norway tried it once. Centuries before Columbus discovered America the Scandinavians established colonies on this continent, with which they carried on a profitable shipping business. But what happened? They passed certain navigation acts which had in view the very purpose behind this bill, namely, to confine shipping to their own nationals. What were the results? They destroyed their colonies—destroyed them completely. England tried to build up her trade in the same way.

Mr. STEVENS: She did.

Mr. YOUNG: Let us see what she did. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries she passed her navigation laws. Here is the result:

> Sir Joseph Child in 1690 enumerated fifteen lines of foreign trade which we had lost either wholly or partly through the working of the navigation acts, while the Dutch broadly gained what we had lost.

Then on the next page:

> But when we note at the same time that the tonnage of the mercantile marine, estimated on the annual clearances, had risen only from 444,000 in 1714, to 471,000 in 1760, we realize the utter failure of the navigation acts to fulfil their avowed purpose. In the same period the foreign tonnage entering English ports had increased more than fourfold, to say nothing of the smuggling mostly done in foreign bottoms.

In other words, the navigation acts, which England had passed for the sole purpose of protecting her shipping and giving to British ships a monopoly of the shipping trade, in forty-six years increased British shipping by three-quarters of one per cent, while foreign shipping into British ports increased by four hundred per cent. How much success did they have? How much success did their navigation laws reveal? I have much more that I could read, but I shall not take the time.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: You might as well read it.

Mr. YOUNG: All right, I will.

Mr. STEVENS: Read some more, it is really most pleasant reading.

Mr. YOUNG: I know it is pleasant for my hon. friend.

Mr. ROBINSON: And it happened only about four or five hundred years ago.

Mr. YOUNG: The article is too long to read, but the substance of it is this: France tried to build up her shipping in the same way, and failed; Venice tried it, and failed; Genoa tried it and failed; the United States tried it and failed. We are trying it and we are going to fail, because you cannot build up a shipping industry in that way. Shipping is the last industry in the world which will

stand a protective tariff. It is the one industry above all others which must have free, open competition. Something was said a few moments ago by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland)—

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. member permit a question? He has just stated that this measure provides a protective tariff for shipping. There is no protection for shipping, in so far as the great British shipping world is concerned. They all have access to our waters, it is not limited to Canadian ships. The whole British shipping world, the largest entity in the whole shipping industry of the world, has access.

Mr. YOUNG: This, then, is levelled at the ships of one particular country? Is that right? Do I understand that?

Mr. STEVENS: No. All foreign shipping is included.

Mr. YOUNG: All foreign shipping is included,—but it is aimed at the ships of one particular country.

Mr. STEVENS: No it is not.

Mr. YOUNG: It is. Last night the minister said that it is the business of parliament to nurture Canadian interests. To nurture them means to feed them. Where will he get the wherewithal to feed them? Is it the business of parliament to take from one man that which he produces and feed it to another? I say it is not. It is the business of parliament to see that every Canadian gets fair play. He is entitled to the thing and he should get the thing that he produces himself.

Mr. STEVENS: Hear, hear.

Mr. YOUNG: I cannot support this bill in any shape or form. If it is passed it will result in a monopoly of the trade on the great lakes. That trade will be delivered over into the hands of only Canadians. It will result in higher freight rates. It will result in difficulties in selling our wheat at a time when one of the greatest problems with which we are confronted is that of selling wheat. Because, as I said before, when the grain cannot be shipped from the most satisfactory point, it very often happens that we miss the sale of a consignment. In every way we look at it this bill is unsatisfactory. I do not see how any hon. members from the west can support it. I see that the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Loucks) is in his seat. Will he stand up and vote for this bill; will he vote for a bill which will increase the freight rates on grain carried on the lakes?

Mr. LOUCKS: I will answer my hon. friend. Yes, I will vote for this bill. I think if the hon. member had heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce last night he must be satisfied that the grain growers in the west have every protection.

Mr. YOUNG: I heard what he said. It will be a very sorry day for the hon. member when his people hear about his statement.

Mr. LOUCKS: I have no worry at all.

Mr. YOUNG: What about the other members from the west? I do not see how they can vote for this bill. It is class legislation, and is designed to protect a certain class of people doing a certain business on the lakes, people who will be able to put their hands into the pockets of the western farmers, take money out of them and put it into their own pockets. Who is there who will guarantee him a price for his wheat? Nobody does and nobody can. Why then should he be compelled to guarantee profits to anyone else?

Mr. STEVENS: No one suggests it.

On motion of Mr. Kennedy (Peace River) the debate was adjourned.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON READJUSTMENT OF REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF COMMONS

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house we may perhaps intervene in this debate for the purpose of reverting to the order of presenting reports of standing and select committees. It is quite unusual, and can only be done with the consent of the house.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): What is the purpose?

Mr. BENNETT: For the purpose of receiving the report of the select committee dealing wth redistribution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before giving any consent on that point may I ask the Prime Minister what is the intention of the government with respect to the report, once it is brought in? Is it intended to go right on with the bill immediately?

Mr. BENNETT: We could not go on until this order of business is disposed of. The purpose of dealing with it at the present moment is that the bill may be distributed. It was suggested after a conference yesterday, that we name two of the older members —and I am suggesting that Sir George Perley and Mr. Duranleau should be the two from

this side,—to confer with members who might be named by the leader of the opposition to see if such difficulties as exist in connection with the schedule to the bill can be disposed of. There are not a large number.

This house might then adjourn until three o'clock to-morrow, for the Minister of Marine is in charge of the bill now before the house, and if he continued with that he would not have the opportunity to confer. The Postmaster General, as is known, is attending a conference that, under an agreement, I think, was arranged to meet here, I fancy before we came into office. That has to be dealt with. Under these circumstances if the report is presented the consideration of it would go upon the order paper for the next sitting, the bill would be distributed and if it be acceptable to the house, we could adjourn until three o'clock to-morrow to enable this conference to take place.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Under the rules of the house it would not be possible to proceed with the bill in any event until it had been placed upon the order paper.

Mr. BENNETT: Not without consent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That would have to be given first. I would not feel that we were justified in giving consent until we have had an opportunity of at least looking over the schedules. In the circumstances it would appear to be desirable for the house to adjourn at one o'clock until to-morrow afternoon and in the interval have the conference to which the Prime Minister has referred.

The Prime Minister has mentioned the names of the gentlemen whom he would select. I would name Mr. Lapointe and Mr. Stewart (Edmonton) who are to my immediate right and left, to represent the official opposition. If that is agreeable, I would agree to the suggestion to revert to the order so as to permit the report to be introduced.

Mr. BENNETT: Then by consent, I move, —I would associate with me the right hon. gentleman as seconder—that we revert to the order of presenting reports of standing and select committees.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, my right hon. friend has placed his faith in majorities, I think he had better hold thereto.

Mr. BENNETT: I would still be in a majority. Seconded, then, by Mr. Stevens.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. H. A. STEWART (Minister of Public Works) presented the second and final report of the special committee as follows:

Your special committee to whom was referred Bill No. 2, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, with instructions to prepare schedules to contain and describe the several electoral divisions entitled to return members to this house and to report the same, now present their second and final report:—

Your committee have prepared the descriptions and the return of members for the several electoral divisions which are set forth in the schedules hereto appended in respect of the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island and the Yukon territory.

The report of your committee is unanimous in so far as the same relates to Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Manitoba and the Yukon territory, and, although not unanimous as to the other provinces, represents a very substantial measure of agreement with respect thereto.

Accordingly the committee beg leave to report the said bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I make a suggestion; I have not seen the bill—

Mr. BENNETT: It will be distributed immediately.

Mr. LAPOINTE: —but I would like to know the population of the new constituencies as determined and fixed by the bill. Would it be possible to have a list of those new constituencies with the population of each new riding described in the schedule so that we may be able to discuss the matter intelligently?

Mr. BENNETT: The bill is printed and will be distributed now. The information the committee had before it will certainly be available to this select four who will try to deal with the problem. I should ask the chairman to make available all the information and maps that the committee had before it, which I believe indicate in approximate figures the population of the new ridings.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what I want.

Mr. GARDINER: If I may be permitted a word on this matter I also might instance that this is a rather unusual procedure. The proposal is that this house adjourn at one o'clock until three o'clock to-morrow in order that some of the older heads of this house, named by the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, may confer together to iron out some of the difficulties that have arisen in the committee dealing with redistribution. It is rather unfortunate that this has

to be done, but inasmuch as it has to be done, I think the suggestion is a very good one. But I think it is unfortunate that the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition should have agreed on the older heads of this house, because the longer a person remains in this house the more partisan he becomes, consequently the possibility of them accomplishing anything is not very great. The Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition have unfortunately forgotten that there is another section in this house that is as much interested in redistribution as the Conservative party and the Liberal party. If I may be bold enough to make a suggestion it would be that it would be advisable to have a younger head working with the older heads, and he would probably be the balance of power that would accomplish something. Therefore I suggest that we add to that committee Mr. Speakman of Red Deer to represent this corner of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, this informal discussion which by consent is being carried on may be all to the advantage of parliament. What we desire to do is to arrive at some fair redistribution of the seats in this dominion that will do violence to the rights of no man. That is the effort. Whether or not it can be accomplished depends largely upon the good will, as the right hon. gentleman opposite said yesterday, of those who comprise this house, having respect always to the fact that the anomalies of the past sometimes have to be undone. That does always create difficulty. Shifting population is always a factor. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) suggests that one member from that corner of the house might be of assistance on this committee. This small committee has no authority to bind anything. It will endeavour to speak for a party organization to ensure that the arrangements it makes may become effective; that is the position as I understand it. If the hon. member from Acadia, who has a fair mind, believes he can assist in the manner indicated, speaking for myself I shall be glad if he will sit in with the other members of the committee for the purpose of making any suggestions that might lead to that end. Would that be acceptable to my right hon. friend?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As far as the official opposition is concerned I would be most heartily in accord with having the leader of the Progressive party sit in with the other gentlemen for that purpose. The whole aim, as I understand it, is to arrive at what would be recognized as fair and just as the result of persuasion and argument rather than of any other power or influence.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so. Then it is understood that between now and to-morrow the small committee representing the parties, Sir George Perley; the Minister of Marine, Mr. Duranleau; the former Minister of Justice, the Hon. Mr. Lapointe; the former Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Mr. Stewart (Edmonton); and Mr. Gardiner, the hon. member for Acadia, shall meet together to see whether some suggestions can be made to obviate the necessity for prolonged and acrimonious discussion with respect to these matters.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does the hon. member for Acadia feel equal to the task of representing the younger heads?

Mr. GARDINER: As my hon. friend will remember, I did not suggest that in the first place; I suggested the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman).

Mr. BENNETT: We will take the leader of the party.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the house do now adjourn until to-morrow afternoon at three o'clock, but perhaps someone will move the adjournment of the debate first.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to and the debate adjourned.

Mr. BENNETT: I now move that the house adjourn.

Mr. BOULANGER: I object to the motion for the adjournment of the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is not debatable.

Mr. BOULANGER: Well, I object. There are many items on the order paper which might be taken up—items in which private members are interested.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is not debatable. Does the hon. member desire to have a vote?

Mr. BOULANGER: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion will say aye.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Mr. SPEAKER: All those opposed to the motion will say nay.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my opinion the ayes have it. The motion is carried, and the house stands adjourned until to-morrow afternoon at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 1.05 p.m.

Thursday, May 18, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Mr. G. D. STANLEY (East Calgary) (for Mr. Matthews) presented the sixth report of the select standing committee on banking and commerce, as follows:

The select standing committee on banking and commerce begs leave to present the following as a sixth report:

On Monday, February 6, 1933, the following order of reference issued from the house, viz.:

Ordered,—That the following proposed resolution be referred to the select standing committee on banking and commerce:—

Whereas the question of public and private indebtedness has become one of our greatest and most perplexing problems, enhanced during the past years by the extremely low price level of all primary commodities, through which this indebtedness must be in large part met, and the effect of which has been to double and treble the actual burden of these liabilities; and,

Whereas this fact has been recognized in respect of certain international obligations, and has become a practical issue in respect of the public obligations of many countries; and,

Whereas no such recognition has as yet been given to the heavy private indebtedness within this country, although these, together with the high interest rates which prevail, constitute just as heavy and impossible a burden to the individual, as do national and international obligations to the countries concerned; and,

Whereas this situation is one of the greatest factors in the present economic depression, and is one of the greatest barriers to the financial recovery of agriculture and industry, and as such, deserves and commands the immediate attention of this parliament;

Therefore be it resolved,—That, in the opinion of this house, the government should give serious and immediate attention to the question of debts and interest rates within this country, and the possibility of their reduction, either by way of direct action, or by the submission of the entire problem to the select standing committee on banking and commerce, in order that the subject may be fully inquired into, and if possible, some solution found.

Attest.

Arthur Beauchesne,
Clerk of the House.

In view of the general terms in which the resolution is expressed, the sponsor was asked to prepare a memorandum indicating more specifically the ground he would suggest the committee endeavour to cover. This was done, and the memorandum may be found on page 3A of the printed evidence.

The committee accepted the task set before it, but to obtain the information outlined to the committee by the proposer of the resolution, was an undertaking that in part was incapable of fulfilment. For example, a comprehensive answer to the question asking for a general classification of the wealth level of all lenders of money would require a complete census of the wealth of private individuals as well as of corporations. Such a census, in the view of the committee, could not accurately be taken.

While the dominion statistician was able to supply from existing records a large amount of relevant statistics, additional data are needed which can only be obtained by special inquiries for which a period of time covering some weeks or even months will be necessary. In view of these facts, this report must necessarily be limited in scope and is not intended to be a complete review of the subjects contained in the reference.

Nevertheless, studies of the material gathered to date reveal tendencies upon which certain conclusions may be based. These are developed in the paragraphs which follow:

1. Public Debt—Dominion of Canada

(a) Debt outstanding—

The total of unmatured funded debt of the dominion on March 31, 1933, was $2,715,910,607. From this amount should be deducted sinking funds of $66,001,724, leaving the net funded debt at $2,649,908,883.

(b) Interest rates—

Interest payable on this total was $127,239,499, or an average rate of 4·68 per cent. On specific bond issues the rate varies from 2½ per cent on the loan of $4,888,186 made in London in 1897, due in 1947, to 5½ per cent payable on victory loans maturing in 1933, 1934 and 1937.

Evidence presented to the committee indicates a downward tendency in interest rates in recent years. The yield on typical Dominion government bonds used by the Bureau of Statistics in their index of long term interest rates, which was as high as 5½ per cent in 1922, was down to a rate of 4½ per cent in 1933. This cheapening of the cost of money is reflected in the current interest rates, which have been paid on various classes of debts. The average rate of interest paid on Dominion government funded debt was 5·20 per cent in 1922, and in 1932 was 4·97 per cent. The current rate, due to the effect of conversion loans, is 4·68 per cent.

Since the committee began its sittings, the rate of interest on savings deposits in banks has been reduced from 3 per cent to 2½ per

cent, in loan and trust companies from 4 per cent to 3½ per cent, in the post office from 3 per cent to 2½ per cent, and in the province of Ontario savings office from 3 per cent to 2½ per cent.

(c) Sinking funds—

Sinking funds are applicable only to sterling bonds issued in London, of a par value of $254,000,000. The amount presently held in the sinking fund represents about one-quarter of the outstanding principal of the issues to which the sinking fund applies. With respect to other issues, retirements have been made from yearly surpluses from time to time, but no definite program of debt retirement has been laid down in the past.

Recommendations re Public Debt

1. The committee highly recomends the conversion of outstanding obligations from a higher to a lower rate of interest when the state of the money market warrants it. The conversion loan of 1931 is an example of the benefits of this practice, as shown by the following table:

Conversion Loan, 1931

Description of Loan Converted	Amount Converted	Interest Old	Rate New	Maturity of Conversion Issue	Annual Saving in Interest
	$	per cent	per cent		$
Second War Loan, 1916-31	38,625,700	5	4½	1956	193,128
Renewal Loan, 1922-32	37,523,200	5½	4½	1957	375,232
Victory Loan, 1918-33	276,688,100	5½	4½	1958	2,766,881
Vicory Loan, 1919-34	285,772,300	5½	4½	1959	2,857,723
Total	638,609,300				6,192,964

The annual saving of interest is shown to be $6,192,964.

In pointing out that bonds maturing within a short time should be converted to lower rates of interest as soon as it can be done, the committee calls attention to the possibilities as shown in the following figures:

There are outstanding victory loans maturing in 1933 and bearing 5½ per cent interest.. .. .. $169,971,850
Victory loans maturing in 1934 and bearing 5½ per cent interest.. .. 226,138,350

The conversion of these 5½ per cent securities presently falling due affords an opportunity of further reducing the burden of fixed charges. If they were converted to a 4½ per cent coupon the saving per annum in interest would be $3,961,102. If the rate of interest were 4 per cent, the saving would be $5,941,653.

The committee expresses the hope that a coupon rate not exceeding 4 per cent may be used. Any discount on the sale of the bonds could be absorbed by amortization.

2. A general amortization or debt retirement plan should be put into effect as soon as finances permit, and the annual payment to effect this end should be budgeted for each year. The adoption of this plan would ensure an orderly retirement of the existing debt within a definite period.

The committee particularly draws attention to the fact that after the heavy refundings that will be necessary up to and including 1937, there follows a period of twenty years in which the maturities in any one year are not so large as to involve major borrowing operations.

3. Future long term bond issues should either (a) have sinking fund provisions; or (b) have their maturity dates arranged, in so far as practicable, to conform with the suggested plan of annual debt retirement.

In good times, when revenues are buoyant and no bonds maturing, the pressure for increased capital expenditure throughout the country is almost irresistible. When maturities are coming due, the Minister of Finance must provide for them. Hence the desirability of regularity of maturities.

4. Long term issues should, when possible, have callable provisions so that in times of low interest rates advantage may be taken to re-finance.

If and when these recommendations are adopted, the whole debt structure of the Dominion of Canada will be on a retirement basis that will tend to safeguard and indeed improve the credit of the country.

The committee is of opinion that an emphasis on the integrity of our national obligations will re-affirm to our own people and to the world that in trustworthiness and quality we stand for the honour of our bargains, whether convenient or not.

The following table summarizes the situation as regards public debt in the dominion, its provinces and municipalities, and the funded debt of corporations:

Public Debt of Canada, its Provinces and Municipalities, Funded Debt of Corporations, together with Interest Payments
(Latest Available Figures)

—	Amount	Interest	Average Rate
	$	$	per cent
Net debt of Canada March 31st, 1933 (preliminary) (1)	2,599,089,000	121,637,365	4·68
Bonds guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada as to principal and interest, and interest only March 31st, 1933 (2)	996,148,354	45,356,904	4·55
Gross direct liabilities of provinces, fiscal years ending in 1932 (3)	1,363,382,464	62,715,593	4·6
Indirect liabilities of provinces, fiscal years ending in 1932 (4)	215,977,011	9,071,034	4·2
Grand total direct liabilities of all Canadian municipalities Dec. 31st, 1931 (5)	1,584,000,000	77,616,000	4·9
Corporations—			
Railways (6)	919,000,000	40,897,000	4·45
Other corporations (7)	1,178,000,000	64,672,000	5·49
	8,855,596,829	421,965,896	4·77

(1) Funded debt was $2,715,910,607 with interest charges of $127,239,499.

The net debt figure is used in preference to that for gross debt ($2,990,315,000) because certain items in the gross debt are offset by active assets ($391,226,000), which are in large part cash assets and interest bearing assets. Among the active assets are loans to provinces which should appear among provincial debts. If they were included in Dominion government debt also there would be duplication. Net debt figures are used in preference to funded debt because the latter would include money raised and put into active assets, such as loans to provinces.

(2) Bonds guaranteed by the dominion. Of these, interest only is guaranteed on principal amounting to $216,000,000. Principal and interest are guaranteed for the remaining $780,148,354.

(3) The largest item in provincial public debt is the bonded debt which totals $1,148,451,597. In addition there were treasury bills amounting to $103,707,602, bank loans, savings deposits, etc.

(4) Indirect liabilities of the provinces include guarantees of railway, hydro-electric, municipal obligations, etc.

(5) This figure includes the total liabilities of all municipalities in six provinces and the bonded debt of the others (the total liabilities not being available). The amount given is, therefore, the lowest at which the aggregate direct liabilities of Canadian municipalities can be placed.

(6) Only the unguaranteed portion of Canadian National bonded indebtedness is included here, the guaranteed debt being included in the second item of the table.

(7) Other corporations include industrial, financial, merchandising, etc., in fact, all except public and railways.

II. Municipal Debt

The gross debenture debt of municipalities numbering over 4,200, by provinces, as at December 31, 1931, was as follows:

Province	Bonded Debt
Alberta	$ 78,679,570
British Columbia	129,913,890
Manitoba	116,864,937
Ontario	499,002,074
Nova Scotia	31,386,025
New Brunswick	21,477,521
Prince Edward Island (a)	1,863,211
Quebec	362,132,334
Saskatchewan	47,488,595
Total	$1,288,808,157

(a) 1930.

Other liabilities, consisting of temporary loans and overdrafts on banks, accounts payable and miscellaneous floating liabilities, amount to $295,223,318.

Interest payments on municipal bonded debt average 4·9 per cent, or on the total shown in the table above, $63,151,599.

III. Private Debt

While the figures for public debt can be obtained with approximately completeness, those for private indebtedness can only partially cover the field. Figures for bank loans are a matter of monthly record, and were submitted to the committee.

Concerning mortgages, definite information is obtainable for only a portion of the field. In the census of 1931, a question regarding mortgages was included in the farm schedule. As a result of this investigation it was ascertained that out of a total of 654,297 owned and partly owned farms in the dominion, 244,201 were mortgaged to the extent of $677,564,100. It should be pointed out that these figures refer only to the debt secured by a mortgage or by an equivalent legal instrument on lands and buildings. Details may be found in the evidence. These figures apply also only to "owned" farms. It is estimated that urban mortgages held by corporate lenders amount to about $765,000,000.

No attempt has been made to compile information on debts of private individuals which may have been contracted in various ways, because of lack of available data.

IV. Bank Interest

Rates of bank interest and discount are not available by provinces but average rates for the dominion as a whole are known. Average interest rates on loans, including call loans, show declines from 1930 to 1932.

Maximum and minimum average interest and discount rates charged by all banks on loans or advances in Canada during the years 1930, 1931 and 1932.

	Average Interest		Average Discount	
	Maximum*	Minimum*	Maximum*	Minimum*
	per cent	per cent	per cent	per cent
1930	6·43	6·29	6·99	6·86
1931	6·39	6·05	6·80	6·66
1932	6·18	6·03	6·81	6·67

N.B.—These average rates include call loan transactions on which for some years past the prevalent interest rate had been 6 per cent.

*Each bank reports quarterly its maximum and minimum rates. The averages shown above are the averages of four quarterly periods and of all banks.

V. Mortgage Rates of Interest

Considerable data were secured by the Dominion bureau of statistics from the Dominion Mortgage and Investment Association, and from some individual mortgage companies relating to interest charged on mortgages. Average rates were obtained from 57 companies, which show current rates ranging from 6 per cent to 8 per cent in all provinces except Quebec, where slightly lower rates were reported. One large company furnished records showing that the average rate on new rural and urban mortgages for the Dominion declined from 8·35 per cent in 1921 to 6·84 per cent in 1931. On renewals the rate fell from 8·17 per cent in 1921 to 6·90 per cent in 1931.

In general, it may be concluded in the cases of the figures supplied that mortgage rates have declined throughout the dominion in recent years on both new mortgages and renewals.

Nevertheless, these conclusions should only be taken as tentative, because they are based on returns from corporate lenders only. No data are available yet from private lenders or from mortgagors themselves. Statistical enquiries should be instituted to secure information from these sources to round out the case presented by the mortgage companies.

VI. Supplementary Information Required

On several other subjects which came to the attention of the committee, partial information was furnished by the Dominion bureau of statistics, but it is felt that the data thus far brought together are insufficient upon which to base definite conclusions, and that an all-round enlargement in the bureau's organization of financial statistics should be instituted. In particular, in addition to the supplementary information required on mortgage rates (which has already been mentioned) the committee recommends that the Dominion bureau of statistics be authorized to obtain the following:

Data on fees and charges to which mortgagors are subjected when taking out new mortgages or renewing old ones. Very meagre information is available on this subject, but enquiries are already under way in the bureau of statistics.

Data on the cost of money to loaning bodies are required so as to get some idea of the spread between actual costs and loaning rates. Only partial information is now available.

Data on arrears of interest payments and on the amount of principal and interest written off by mortgage companies.

VII. Jurisdiction of Parliament

The following questions respecting the jurisdiction of parliament to legislate on the subject of interest and loans were submitted to the Deputy Minister of Justice, the Deputy Minister of Finance, and the attorneys-general of the various provinces (pp. ix and x):

"1. Has the Dominion parliament the power to fix a maximum rate of interest which may be charged on loans, et cetera, granted by corporations created by Dominion statute or letters patent where such corporations were

(a) previously incorporated;

(b) to be incorporated?

2. Has the Dominion parliament any power to prescribe the maximum rate of interest chargeable on loans generally made by

(a) persons,

(b) corporates created by statute or letters patent other than Dominion?

3. Has the Dominion parliament the power

(a) to fix;

(b) to alter

rates of interest in respect of bills of exchange and promissory notes?

4. (a) Has the Dominion parliament power to enforce reduction of principal of debt in respect of loans made

i. by corporations incorporated under jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament;

ii. by corporations incorporated under other jurisdictions;

iii. by individuals?

(b) If necessary for the determination of the above questions, is any differentiation to be made between loans

i. secured upon real property;

ii. secured upon personal property;

iii. without security?"

Answers to these questions were made by the Department of Justice and the attorneys-general of Nova Scotia, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and Quebec. These answers appear in the minutes of proceedings and evidence as follows:

Department of Justice, pp. 43 to 48;
A.-G. of Nova Scotia, p. 49;
A.-G. of British Columbia, pp. 65-66;
A.-G. of New Brunswick, p. 187;
A.-G. of Manitoba, pp. 188 to 190;
A.-G. of Quebec, pp. 198-206.

The answers may be summarized as follows:

Questions 1 (a) and (b)—all answers were in the affirmative.

Questions 2 (a) and (b)—all answers were in the affirmative. The A.-G. of British Columbia, however, said that:

"so far as corporations other than federal are concerned, the dominion perhaps could not interfere with a contract made with a foreign company outside Canada though the party liable for the interest might reside within Canada."

Questions 3 (a) and (b)—all answers were in the affirmative.

Questions 4 (a), i, ii, iii—all answers, with the exception of that of Manitoba, were in the negative, the Department of Justice excepting, however, bank loans. The A.-G. of Manitoba said that it was difficult to give a satisfactory answer but stated that in the case of legislation arising out of what might be termed a national emergency, or legislation which could be classed as relating to banking, incorporation of banks, the issue of paper money, bills of exchange and promissory notes, bankruptcy and insolvency, the answer would be in the affirmative. He further stated that in the case of a debtor who resides in one province and the creditor outside the said province, the legislature of the province of the debtor could not validly legislate in derogation of a civil right existing and enforceable outside the province.

Questions 4 (b), i, ii, iii—all answers, except in the case of Manitoba, were in the negative. The A.-G. of Manitoba did not answer this question expressly, but it would appear by implication that his answer would have been in the negative.

General

It is hardly necessary to point out that obligations, both public and private, undertaken when the general price level was much higher, present a serious problem under economic conditions presently prevailing. This is particularly true of Canada, in which within a comparatively short period, heavy obligations have been assumed for capital investments in plant, equipment and transportation facilities connected with the development of our natural resources and the expansion of the productive capacity of the country.

In so far as public debts are concerned, we believe that the most desirable course to be pursued lies in the direction of means that may be taken to cheapen money, and other measures, including international cooperation, designed to lay the foundation for a rise in the general price level and a restoration of world confidence and trade.

Within the country, the balancing of governmental budgets and the conversion of maturing debts at lower interest rates will be a constructive influence. Measures which will tend to relieve the burden of fixed public debts will of course also operate with similar effect in the field of private debts.

The committee believes that the reduction in interest rates on bank deposits recently achieved with the cooperation of the government is a constructive step, and, it is to be hoped, a forerunner of more important action which Canada may be enabled to take in the international sphere as a participant in the World Economic and Monetary Conference.

A printed copy of the evidence taken is tabled with this report.

[Mr. Stanley.]

Mr. STANLEY moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Would it not be as well if we first had an opportunity of reading this report?

Mr. DONNELLY: This report has been submitted to the house and we do not know what it is. It should stand for twenty-four hours until we know what it contains.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion to adopt the report is perfectly in order but the house can take what action it wishes.

Mr. IRVINE: We do not know what we are being asked to adopt by this motion. The subject submitted to this committee for its study and examination was a very important one and before we finally endorse the report we should know what it contains.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: A motion of this kind requires the unanimous consent of the house. As exception has been taken, the motion can stand until members have had a chance of reading this report in votes and proceedings.

Mr. SPEAKER: The report will be published in votes and proceedings of to-morrow. If hon. members desire the motion to stand, it will stand.

Motion stands.

DISCOUNT AND LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. T. H. STINSON (Victoria) moved:

That standing order 104 be suspended in relation to Bill No. 110, an act to incorporate The Discount and Loan Corporation of Canada and that the said bill be placed upon the order paper for consideration this day in committee of the whole house.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The rules of the house do not provide for the discussion of private bills on Thursdays. I submit that this matter should be considered at the next sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Objection having been taken, the motion cannot be proceeded with.

Motion stands.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND FARM RELIEF

Hon. W. A. GORDON (Minister of Labour): I beg to lay on the table a number of orders in council passed pursuant to the relief legislation.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—GASPE, QUE.

Mr. BRASSET:

1. Is the government aware that Rodrick Eden, of Gaspe village, recently appointed collector of customs at Gaspe, is unable to either speak or write French?
2. Is the government aware that the same Rodrick Eden has a contract to carry the mail from Gaspe to the Wakeham post office?

Mr. CAHAN:

1. The district inspector of customs and excise reports that Mr. Eden possesses a sufficient knowledge of French to satisfactorily perform the duties of collector.
2. Yes.

WINDSOR, ONT.—FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. CHEVRIER:

When will the Minister of Public Works place on and in the federal building recently erected on Ouellette street, in the city of Windsor, Ontario, sign-plates bearing French inscriptions, corresponding to the sign-plates bearing English inscriptions affixed on and in the said building?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Representations with regard to sign-plates bearing French inscriptions being placed on and in the new public building at Windsor, Ontario, will be given due consideration at the proper time.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

ARTHUR G. SLAGHT, K.C.

Mr. STANLEY:

What amount was paid by the government of Canada to Arthur G. Slaght, K.C., from and including the year 1926 to and including the year 1930?

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT STEAMSHIP CITADELLE

Mr. GARDINER:

1. For what purpose was the Canadian government steamship Citadelle built?
2. Upon whose representations or requests was this boat constructed?
3. What type of boat was requested?
4. Who prepared the plans and under whose instructions were they prepared?
5. Were the parties responsible for the representations or requests consulted and their approval of the plans secured before this construction was commenced?
6. How were tenders called?
7. Who tendered and for what price?
8. Who was the successful tenderer?
9. What was the price?
10. What moneys have been paid to them to date?
11. Were there any extras? If so, what were they and what did they cost?
12. Was any work done for private interests in the port of Quebec last fall?
13. If so, for whom and what amount was paid by these private interests for the services rendered by this boat?
14. Upon whose request was this boat transferred to the port of Saint John last fall and for what purpose?
15. While at Saint John was any work done for private interests?
16. If so, for whom, what payments were made by these private interests and to whom were the moneys paid?
17. Upon whose request was the boat brought back to the port of Quebec this spring, 1933?
18. For what purpose was it brought back?
19. Has the Department of Marine or the government made any arrangements, tacit or otherwise, to do work for private interests in the port of Quebec?
20. If so, what are they—viz—for whom and what consideration?
21. Has the government gone into the towing business?
22. If so, for what reason?

MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

On the orders of the day.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. the acting leader of the house (Sir George Perley) whether Canada has received the disarmament message of President Roosevelt. The newspapers give a list of fifty-four nations to which this message has been sent and the name of Canada does not appear in this list. I should like to know whether Canada has received that message.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: The President's communication, as my hon. friend will have seen by the press, was sent to the heads of all the different governments of the world. In our case, as one of the constituent parts of the British commonwealth of nations, this communication was sent to His Majesty the King, and a copy of the same has been transmitted to the Governor General for the consideration of the government of Canada.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was not sent to the Imperial government?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: No.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was sent to His Majesty?

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: It was sent to His Majesty on behalf of all parts of the British commonwealth; a copy of it has been sent by the King to His Excellency, the Governor General, and it has been transmitted to the government of Canada for its consideration.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CHEVRIER—MR. GOBEIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. R. E. CHEVRIER (Ottawa): I rise to a question of privilege, not so much one that affects the honour of any hon. member of this house, but one that may be referred to under standing order 41 in reference to decorum in debate. I want to quote the words of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) as reported in Hansard on page 5057. It is quite true that these words are not addressed to any other hon. member, but in speaking of a certain article that appeared in a newspaper, the hon. member for Compton on a question of privilege used the words that the representative of the newspaper—

—is not only a dirty individual, but a dirty, crooked liar.

Under the rules of the house this is one of the most unparliamentary expressions that could be used. Your Honour has been pleased on other occasions, indeed, only within the last few months, to rule in matters of this kind. Let me refer to Hansard at page 3630, where an hon. member made certain remarks about another newspaper correspondent. Your Honour was pleased to rule, as reported on page 3728, that the hon. member had attacked the reporter, of course not a member of this house, and Your Honour was pleased to say further:

I therefore direct the Editor of the Debates to expunge from the record—

So and so—the paragraphs in question. At a later date there was another ruling which Your Honour was pleased to make and which will appear in Hansard at page 4908 where the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett), anxious to maintain the high reputation and character of this house, was pleased to say:

If a member can talk that way about a man who cannot defend himself on the floor of this house, about his whiskers, then all I can say is that this parliament has reached a low level.

Another decision which Your Honour was pleased to give as to striking out from the record a similar expression. It is quite true that May states:

If a member should say nothing disrespectful to the house or the chair, or personally opprobrious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the house he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals.

Let me submit that in the use of those words—

Or injurious to the character of individuals.

[Sir George Perley.]

—one cannot dissociate the feelings or character of a member of the house, and I for one, who have the highest regard for the traditions of parliament, for its rules and precedents which you have with so much dignity so far upheld, resent extremely that words of that kind should be used with reference to a man who cannot defend himself upon the floor of the house. It would be very difficult, if such words may be used, to find a line of demarcation as to how far one can go in describing people outside. An hon member is well within his rights to say in a few words what he thinks of anyone, but I ask that some decency be maintained in the use of expressions. I therefore request you, sir, in view of the precedents you have established in the decisions you have given to rule that the words complained of be stricken from the record.

Mr. SAMUEL GOBEIL (Compton): May I answer?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is in order for the hon. member to speak on the matter.

Mr. GOBEIL: I was in any case going to rise on a question of privilege. I am going to speak on a question of privilege and at the same time answer the hon. member. Will that be in order? I must say first that the last part of my remarks in Hansard accusing this man of being "not only a dirty individual, but a dirty, crooked liar," is not exactly what I said. What I did say and what I have since corrected in Hansard is "a dirty public liar."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GOBEIL: I quite agree that if I had said "a dirty, crooked liar," his degree of crookedness might have been debatable, but I said "a dirty public liar." On the question of privilege, in view of an article that appeared yesterday signed by Mr. Emile Benoist, which, in my opinion and I am sure in the opinion of the house, is very injurious to myself and also absolutely false, may I be permitted to give a little more detail in regard to what I said the day before yesterday? On that occasion I complained of the title of the article and also of the article as a whole which I said was a tissue of lies. What the corespondent of Le Devoir said was that as a rural member I was insisting that more seats should be given to the island of Montreal. The intention of the writer is quite obvious. Knowing that I represented a rural riding, his intention was obviously to give my constituents and, indeed, all the rural citizens

of Quebec the impression that I, as a rural member, had insisted that more seats be given to the island of Montreal, to the detriment of the rural parts of my province.

In this article of yesterday, Mr. Benoist makes the accusation that I have spoken to that effect and almost suggests that I should prove that that was not what I said.

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) is rising to a point of order. I will hear him.

Mr. POULIOT: No hon. member can discuss or complain of an article in a newspaper unless he lays that newspaper on the table of the house. That has not been done yet, and therefore, until it is done, the hon. member is not in order in speaking to his question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Temiscouata is premature in his objection.

Mr. GOBEIL: The writer being present at that meeting of the redistribution committee knew perfectly well when he wrote the article that the proceedings of the committee were not taken down in writing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member proceed to tell the house what he complains of in the article? There is no necessity for a long debate.

Mr. GOBEIL: I complain first of the heading of the article which says that Mr. Gobeil as a rural member wants a larger number of urban seats, a statement which is amplified in the article. What I was going to say was that the writer knew when he wrote the article that the proceedings of that committee were not taken down in writing, and surely my word as a sworn member of that committee and as a sworn member of this house should be as good as that of the writer. I denied in this house the day before yesterday that what was said in that article was correct. I said that it was not only incorrect but altogether false. I will go further. I have taken the trouble to look at practically all of the newspapers that I could find in the reading room of this house—

Mr. CASGRAIN: I rise to a point of order. A question of privilege has been raised by the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier) regarding certain words that have been used. I submit that the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) is not in order in quoting another article which has no reference at all to the first one, or in making a speech on redistribution a subject which has been especially entrusted to a special committee of this house.

Mr. POULIOT: And the redistribution bill itself is before the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Compton is dealing with the question of privilege raised by the senior member for Ottawa as well as with another matter at the same time in order to shorten the proceedings.

Mr. GOBEIL: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that I had looked at practically all the Liberal papers published in the province of Quebec and also the Conservative papers that I could find in the reading room and not one of them has words such as are used by this writer, and of which I complain. What I said before the committee was that projects had been submitted conceding two more seats to the island of Montreal, three more seats and four more seats, and I said that Mr. Dorion and myself were quite agreeable to working on a plan that would give three more seats, and it was agreed upon.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Compton complains that he has been misrepresented as to his actions before a certain committee of this house. He has made his complaint.

In regard to the question raised by the senior member for Ottawa, the precedents he quoted are in themselves an effective answer to his application that I take some action, as according to said precedents, when words are spoken, no matter what they may be, concerning people outside the house, there is no recourse. In the instance referred to in which I as Speaker ordered certain statements expunged from Hansard and as to which there was objection from the right hon. leader of the opposition, in all of these cases reference had been made to members of this house. The references were not solely to people outside the house. I say that under the rules and precedents of parliamentary procedure the Speaker has no right to order the words complained of by the hon. member for Ottawa expunged. If reference had been made to hon. members of this house the Speaker could deal with them, but there is nothing to prevent this house taking whatever action it may choose, or see fit or be well advised to

take, concerning the statements made by the hon. member for Compton in this house or by any other hon. member. It is entirely a matter for the house to deal with, and can be done by motion.

Mr. GOBEIL: May I say—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has sufficiently addressed the house on the subject. His position has been made quite clear.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Mr. Speaker, if I am in order, with the greatest possible respect I would point out to you that when an hon. member had made use of a certain expression at page 2535 of Hansard and you had considered the matter you were pleased to direct, "I am of the opinion that the remark is not directed to the hon. member for Regina." If it was not directed to the hon. member for Regina it was directed to no other hon. member, but Your Honour ruled at a subsequent date that the words should be expunged from the record. Another remark practically of the same nature was made by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) with reference to parliamentary correspondents, and Your Honour then ruled that the words were unparliamentary and that they should be stricken out of the record, and that was done. I have the greatest respect for Your Honour and I have no quarrel with your decision, and the citations I made were simply for the purpose of showing that the decorum of the house is a matter in your hands which I think should be regarded as a sacred trust.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny): In my opinion these are not questions of privilege but questions of personal explanation. An hon. member of this house before the orders of the day were called complained about a newspaper article on what he said was a question of privilege, but it is not a question of privilege; it is a question of personal explanation. When an hon. member of this house is attacked by a newspaper the rule is very clear. He has no other recourse but to have the writer of the article or the editor of that newspaper brought before the bar of the house. That recourse is open to the hon. member, but I think that these are not questions of privilege and should not be raised as questions of privilege.

Mr. GOBEIL: Leaving my personality altogether aside I wish to submit, Mr. Speaker, that as a member of the redistribution committee I did my duty to the best of my ability. That may not amount to very much, but that is all I can offer, and I submit that I should not be subjected to all the slanders and falsehoods of that dirty individual.

[Mr Speaker.]

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: I can only say this: I wish it were in the power of the Speaker to protect hon. members from any annoyance, but as I pointed out in reply to the hon. member for Ottawa, if he wishes to deal with the matter, then as the Deputy Speaker has already pointed out, the editor or the reporter can be ordered to appear before the bar of the house. That is entirely a matter within the power of the house itself, and is not subject to be ordered by the Speaker. The whole matter has to be dealt with by the house, and I say to the hon. member for Compton that if he wishes to go further, it should be done by motion.

Before this incident is closed, I do not want hon. members to take it that I approve of the language that has been complained of. It is quite within the power and the best judgment of every member of the house to refrain from using such language as will give offence. It is quite proper to engage in debate and severely criticize the policies and even the personal actions of members, without indulging in language of which the house should be ashamed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You had better repent.

JUDGE RUTHERFORD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a petition was presented to the government asking that Judge Rutherford be restored to the air. I should like to know if the minister intends to take any action.

An hon. MEMBER: He has just spoken.

Mr. YOUNG: The minister does not answer. I should like to know if he intends to take any action.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): I believe the statement I made some time ago about Judge Rutherford was quite clear, namely that the air had not been denied to him, but that the commission wanted the discs upon which the speeches of that gentleman were reported submitted to them before they were put on the air. That is all.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

The house resumed from Wednesday, May 17, consideration of the motion of hon. Mr. Duranleau for the second reading of Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have read this bill, and I believe the intent behind it is contained in section 935.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will hon. members please be quiet. It is impossible for the hon. member to make himself heard.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): That section reads as follows:

> No goods shall be transported by water or by land and water, from one place in Canada to another place in Canada, either directly or by way of a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation in any ship other than a British ship.

I suggest that that section is rather badly drawn. One phase of it is amusing, because I do not see how one could transport goods in a ship by land. As I see, it, Mr. Speaker, the issue is between the Canadian lake shippers and the western farmers. There has been injected into the debate the suggestion that the issue was between Canadian and American lake shippers. That does constitute an issue, but it is second only to the main one. There is also the suggestion that a question arises between western farmers and labour engaged on Canadian boats on the great lakes. That also is an issue, but does not interfere with the main point.

Personally, under ordinary circumstances, I have no objection to the government trying to bring about conditions which will bring a reasonable return to men engaged in shipping or in any other occupation. But I submit that until the time arrives when the farmers of western Canada are receiving at least a living wage from the sale of their grain it is absolutely unfair to put through any regulation or law which will mean that the producers who are selling at less than cost of production—and in this statement I am taking government statistics—shall be asked to sacrifice something more to help some other people engaged in a legitimate business, simply because those other people are suffering a loss. It is that phase of the matter to which I object. If through the financial or economic policy of Canada we were able to raise the level of wheat prices to the place where they would make a reasonable return to the farmers, and provided we had reasonable control of rates on the great lakes, I would not take any objections. That this is an issue between the grower of wheat who must pay the rates and the shipping interests, is made very plain in the evidence submitted to the Senate committee.

I do not wish to read much of it, but I think I am in order to read some because the bill has not gone before a committee of the house where evidence could be taken. The question has been raised as to whether or not there is a combine. I do not know whether it is possible to term as a combine the arrangement existing among Canadian ships on the great lakes. That was not admitted in 1923, despite the fact that the committee investigating found that there was virtually a combine. But that this legislation is asked for in order to make it easier for Canadian steamship lines operating on the great lakes generally to increase prices is admitted in the evidence, and I shall read just enough to establish that point. The evidence of Mr. Enderby of the Canada Steamship Lines as found at page 54, is as follows:

> The Chairman: You say there is nothing that savours of a combine in that circumstance?
>
> Hon. Mr. Dandurand: Was there any agreement?
>
> Mr. Enderby: There was an agreement between the Canadian vessel owners to endeavour to get the rate up to where they could get their living expenses out of it.
>
> Hon. Mr. McRae: That accounts for the advances.
>
> Mr. Enderby: Yes. Even at six and a half cents there is no money in the rate for any Canadian steamship company, or any American steamship company. When steamers have to lay around at the discharge port for four, five, ten or fifteen days, there is no money in a six and a half cent rate.

So I think that establishes quite clearly the intent of the owners of the Canadian steamship lines. Immediately you eliminate one competitive factor you make it easier for the combine, or for the agreement to increase rates, to operate. It does not matter whether that factor is some interference with the western rate on grain or whether it is the elimination of American vessels in connection with the hauling of any portion of it. May I say that some of the gentlemen who took part in the committee investigation were men who had at least some part in the combine formed in 1923. Therefore I do not think there is any question about the fact that there has been an attempt on the part of the owners of the Canadian steamship lines to eliminate competition in connection with the movement of some portion of the grain which has to be moved from the head of the lakes to Buffalo, in order that they may secure a higher rate. Until the time comes when we have a knowledge of the cost and conditions

of the steamship business, and a commission set up that could gain that knowledge, I do not think it will be fair simply to give this additional right to Canadian steamship lines when it is perfectly clear that the money must come from the farmers of western Canada who to-day are selling grain at very little over sixty per cent of the cost of production.

We might as well recognize that a little while ago wheat was at its lowest price for 250 years, and to-day it is a long way from being up to a reasonable price. There has been a tendency in past debates in connection with matters affecting the shipment of grain on the great lakes to suggest that we were playing into the hands of the Americans, and also that the port of Buffalo was not of any real value to the producers of western grain. I think the best thing that has been written in connection with the transportation of grain from western Canada to the markets of the world was written by one of the board of grain commissioners, Doctor MacGibbon. Members who have known Doctor MacGibbon and his record know that he is a very careful and thorough student. He pointed out, in his book published in 1932, the significance of the port of Buffalo in the Canadian grain trade. That port has been necessary for Canadian grain shipments because of peculiar natural conditions. One factor that tended to raise grain rates in 1923, and which the people who were accused of forming a combine and charging exorbitant rates gave as a reason why they were compelled to charge those rates, was congestion in the ports, which prevented them from delivering the grain and getting back for return cargoes. There never are any more than enough elevators, ships, canal space and loading and unloading facilities to take care of the rush in the fall due to a big crop in western Canada. If you eliminate Buffalo or handicap it in any way you bring about in some seasons at least a condition of congestion that will hurt the western farmers. The sale of wheat in the worlds market is highly competitive. It has been pointed out time and time again that Canada is in a rather difficult position; the wheat fields are far from the seaboard, and in the late fall the great lakes freeze up. Therefore in the fall the great effort is to get the grain off the prairies and down as far as possible along the great lakes so that it is in a strategic position for delivery to Europe and elsewhere during the winter. Hauling wheat by rail from western Canada to the east is not economical, the natural route from western Canada to the east for grain is the great lakes. Doctor MacGibbon in his book says that in the fall it is absolutely necessary, in some seasons at least, to have all the ships that can be massed to handle the crop in order to prevent congestion at the head of the lakes. At page 246 of his book we have the following:

> When a new Canadian crop is ready for shipment, especially if it be a large one, the Canadian lake freighters as well as the American lake freighters not engaged in the ore trade, are fully employed in moving the crop from the head of the lake. Indeed it becomes necessary to use to the limit all the ports available, in order that the elevators at the head of navigation may be kept clear, and as much as possible of the crop be shipped east from Port Arthur and Fort William before the close of navigation. Traffic conditions in the great lakes, in the fall season, therefore, tend to cause grain to flow through the port of Buffalo.

Mr. BOWMAN: Would the hon. member mind telling us at what time that book was published?

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): In January, 1932.

It has been said that we ought to use Canadian ports. I am all in favour of using Canadian ports, but Canadian traffic routes and Canadian ports have not the facilities to handle grain economically and efficiently. That is a fact. As a matter of fact if you go back in the records you will find that Canadian ports have been handling in some years, at least when the United States was a large exporter, almost as much United States grain as the United States ports were handling of Canadian grain, not quite balanced. In 1930 I think Saint John handled 30,000,000 bushels, and 17,000,000 bushels of that was American grain.

Mr. BOWMAN: How are the figures at Montreal? Have you any figures for Montreal?

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): No, I have not gone into that. A statement from the Canadian National Railways, which I think was given to the shipping committee, gives an indication of what is happening. The number of bushels of Canadian grain moving through Canadian ports, crop year 1928-29, was 83,512,520. In 1930, Canadian grain shipped by way of Buffalo, amounted to 92,479,728 bushels; 72,277,730 bushels were shipped by United States ports, and 20,201,998 through Montreal.

It has been said that we have regulation as a result of the act of 1923, and with regulation we ought to be able to take care of the producers' interest. The act of 1923 provided that the board of grain commissioners could fix maximum rates. It provided for the

publication of tariffs, and that brokers who were handling contracts for space could not handle insurance. Doctor MacGibbon in commenting on that act, dealing with freight and handling charges, says at page 257:

A fundamental difference between lake rates and rail rates is that the latter are approved of by regulative bodies in both the United States and Canada. They are relatively stable, and they are non-discriminative, in that between two points under similar conditions the same rates prevail for all shippers. But with lake rates, the rates charged are reached by a process of bargaining between the individual shipper and the carrier. In each case there is a separate contract, so that the rate varies according to the amount of space demanded, the terminal point designated, the season of the year when carriage is desired, and, in general, the amount of grain offering for carriage in relationship to the bottoms available; all these play a part in influencing the terms of the contract. It follows that it is open to the lake freighter to carry in the same vessel on the same date, and between the same points of origin and destination, shipments of wheat of the same quality at different rates per bushel. One lot of wheat may be paying three cents and another lot four cents per bushel. The individual bargain accounts for the rate.

In dealing with the Inland Waters Freight Rates Act of 1923 we have the following, at page 261.

This measure provided that shipping companies should file with the board of grain commissioners a tariff of rates to be charged for the carriage of grain. When the rates proposed appeared excessive or unjustly discriminative in the opinion of the board, it could prescribe such rates as it deemed reasonable.

This act, which was intended to regulate shipping rates for grain, proved altogether unworkable in its main features, and it was drastically amended in 1924. The main features of the act of 1923 were the setting of a maximum rate and publishing the tariff, and of course the separating of the insurance and the allotting of space. The only real difference between the act of 1923 and the amending act of 1924, is that it was provided that instead of simply publishing the tariffs:

Every shipper shall immediately after entering into any charter party, bill of lading or contract for the carriage of grain from Fort William or Port Arthur to any other port or place in Canada or the United States by lake or river navigation, and before the grain shall have been laden in pursuance thereof, file with the Board of Grain Commissioners of Canada a true copy of the said charter party, bill of lading or contract for carriage.

The point is that the board shall prescribe a maximum rate. In railway matters the board of railway commissioners practically set the rate; they conduct an exhaustive inquiry with regard to the proper costs of equipment and so on and then fix the rate. In lake shipping, however, in connection with the freight rates we have a situation something the same as obtains with regard to tramp steamers all over the world. The matter is left to the individual bargain and the contract. As Doctor MacGibbon points out, the conditions are such that you may have different rates applying to different quantities of the same quality of goods on the same vessel. So the fixing of a maximum rate, if you enable the Canadian Steamship companies to eliminate a certain amount of competition, will not prevent a generally higher rate being charged.

Mr. STEVENS: Except that a maximum can be fixed.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): Yes. The other point is that the board of grain commissioners can examine the rate and then report the matter to the governor in council. I do not think the governor in council can be reasonably expected to have time to look after the details of these rates, in view of all the circumstances. That is one reason, in addition to the generally difficult situation confronting the farmers to-day, why I do not want to see any of the competition existing on the great lakes to-day eliminated so far as the steamship companies are concerned.

There is just one other point to which I should like to refer; that is the question of the 6 cent preference. I take it that under this act if grain is shipped from Fort William to Buffalo in a United States vessel it cannot be taken on down to Montreal, because no goods can be moved except in British or Canadian ships. I take it that grain stored in United States lake vessels during the winter could not move to Montreal. I take it therefore that this act would interfere to some extent with the movement of grain from the head of the lakes to Buffalo for storage over the winter, and possibly this would bring about a congestion at the head of the lakes. I believe the first trial shipment that was sent to the old country through Buffalo, and reconsigned from there, did not obtain the preference. I believe a second shipment was sent through with the original documents, but that the preference was not given in that case either. I should like to be corrected if I am wrong in that statement, because I think it has some bearing.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): Has any grain been consigned through Buffalo that did get the preference?

Mr. STEVENS: If I might interrupt my hon. friend, because I know he desires to get the point right, the documentation of the second shipment to which he referred was not correct according to the regulations of the British customs authorities under regulation 12 of the import act.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): Then no shipment has gone through Buffalo and obtained the six cent preference?

Mr. STEVENS: I should not say that.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): So far as we know.

Mr. STEVENS: Any shipment may go forward on a through bill of lading.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): Right from a Canadian port?

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): But as a matter of fact Buffalo is useful, so far as the Canadian grain trade is concerned, for storage and for redirecting the grain.

Mr. STEVENS: And for reconsignment.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): Yes, and because it is necessary particularly in the event of a big crop it seems to me there will be a great deal of confusion so far as the preference is concerned.

Mr. STEVENS: This will not affect the situation at all.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): This is my argument, and my hon. friend may answer it if he wishes. It seems to me there will be that confusion until the question of proper documentation is dealt with and the officials at both ends are thoroughly familiar with all the necessary requirements. It appears to me that grain shipped to Buffalo in a Canadian boat and there unloaded or transshipped will be unable to proceed to Montreal because, if I read the act correctly, it would be impossible to distinguish between the grain hauled from the head of the lakes in a Canadian ship and grain hauled to Buffalo in a United States vessel. You may say that ten million bushels of a certain kind of grain came by a Canadian boat and that ten million bushels will be allowed to go to Montreal by a Canadian boat, but I do not think it would be possible to separate the grain in that way, and a good deal of confusion might arise as to grain going to Montreal and thence to England to claim the preference.

Mr. STEVENS: No more difficulty than there has been in the past.

[Mr. D. M. Kennedy.]

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): I cannot quite see it in that way, but possibly I am wrong. At present grain moves to Buffalo where it is kept in bond for shipment to the old country. It is in the interests of the officials of the United States government to see that this grain does not get on the United States market without paying the duty. The organizations handling that grain, the elevator companies, railway companies and steamship companies, have no interest in mixing that grain or anything else, yet with all these organizations interested in keeping that grain apart from United States grain, and with no real temptation to do anything but get it through, the preference will not be given unless it is sent on a through bill of lading. Evidently if it is stopped on its way through it stands a very good chance of losing the preference, and I am afraid that some time a question will arise as to some of the grain that goes through Buffalo and from there to Montreal, because I do not see how anyone can tell whether it has been sent to Buffalo and reconsigned to Montreal and so through to England or whether it was brought to Buffalo in a United States vessel and had no right to go to Montreal at all.

Briefly I am opposed to this measure because it eliminates competition and will enable our friends of the shipping combine, or those Canadian ship owners who have an agreement among themselves, to take more out of the western farmers in connection with their grain. I am opposed to this legislation because I think we need all the facilities that exist at present on the great lakes and the St. Lawrence in order to properly handle a big crop when it comes along. If the organization is cut down in any way there may be a tremendous amount of trouble and congestion in handling a big crop, perhaps when the weather does not continue favourable for harvesting until the whole crop is in. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I want to register my protest against this legislation.

Mr. D. J. COWAN (Port Arthur-Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, one has only to listen to the observations which have been made by members on all sides of the house to realize the difficulty which arises in framing legislation dealing with the grain trade which will appeal to all interests. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) has spoken on behalf of the western Canadian farmer and he has stated the position in which he finds himself when he comes to contemplate the legislation now before us known as the amendment to the Canada Shipping Act. We are on common

ground in stating that the grain trade and the shipping of grain to market is one of the most important functions in our economic life. The growing of grain is important and the means by which that grain reaches the market is also important. The hon. member has pointed out only one side of the picture. There is another side in which I am particularly interested, representing as I do one of the ports at the head of the lakes which relies almost exclusively upon the shipment of grain for the maintenance of its industrial life.

We have built up in Canada a merchant marine which must be protected and must be given the opportunity to function. Otherwise, the fear which the hon. member has expressed as to the possibility of an absolute monopoly in the transportation of our grain will be realized. The desire of the men who are employed in this merchant marine is that it be given an opportunity of functioning and that they be given the right to labour in preference to seamen employed by the American merchant marine. I think I am on common ground when I say that everyone desires that Canadian grain should be transported to the British market in Canadian owned ships manned by Canadian seamen, that is, provided that no other interests are jeopardized or prejudiced. It seems to me that that is the sensible conclusion at which we should arrive and I propose to address my remarks in an effort to allay the fears which seem to be in the minds of certain western members that their interests would be jeopardized by the passing of this amendment.

If hon. members would read the evidence given before the Senate committee I think they would discover that there is in existence to-day a sufficient tonnage of Canadian ships to handle all the Canadian crops. This may not have been true ten or fifteen years ago but I think the evidence was conclusive that there are in existence to-day sufficient bottoms to handle the entire Canadian crop. If that be the case and the rates charged are not exorbitant, what good argument can be advanced that Canadian wheat should not be shipped in Canadian bottoms from Canadian ports? We have the facilities and the Canadian seamen have a right to work in preference to the seamen of other countries. At Port Arthur and Fort William I have seen American ships, fitted out and supplied at other ports, leaving with a cargo of Canadian grain while our own seamen stood idle on the docks. Such a situation should be remedied and it is intended to remedy it by this amendment to the shipping act. As I said a moment ago, I do not think that anyone would disagree with this proposal provided there was no increment in the rates. In my opinion there are at least four ways in which this can be prevented.

In the first place, there is the competition between Canadian companies. I do not think anyone needs to be told at this time that the shipping companies are working in the red. I believe that every company operating a fleet of boats on the great lakes to-day is losing money and has lost money for some time. I mention this only to show that there is competition amongst such companies as the Patterson Company, the Canada Steamship company, the Matthews line and so on. When companies are insolvent or facing bankruptcy there is always a desire to get business even at cut rates. This has been the case in Canada during the past year. In order to get business and meet competition these companies have been willing to cut rates.

There is a second reason why these rates will be kept within bounds. There is an alternative route available to grain shippers by way of Buffalo, the Erie canal and New York. A Canadian shipper or exporter in Winnipeg is bound to take advantage of the cheapest route and if he finds that the route via Buffalo and New York is cheaper than via Port Colborne and Montreal, he will ship his grain over that route. There will always be that competition which will prevent the Canadian companies making the rates unduly high. If they do that they will find that their route will be forsaken in favour of the Buffalo route.

If that argument is not strong enough to convince my hon. friend, there is the further argument of the Inland Water Freight Rates Act which provides that the board of grain commissioners may fix a maximum rate. It is true that they do not fix actual rates, that being left to competition and other factors, but they do fix a rate which cannot be exceeded. This act forces the shipping companies to keep their rates within bounds.

Then there is the further fact that the governor in council may exercise their powers to suspend this law. That provision is an advantage to the shipper because if the rates become unduly high, the governor in council have the right to suspend this act. In all frankness I say that in my opinion that would be done only when the rates became exorbitant. I do not think there is cause for fear on the part of hon. members of this house that a monopoly or combine would be brought into being. I think it would be impossible

for such a thing to happen. Consequently, I approve of the principle of this bill.

There are a number of other sections with which I do not propose to deal other than to say that I give them my support. These have to do with safety devices, the providing of better working conditions for the men and so on. Such provisions will always meet with hearty approval at my hands. The Seamen's union is at one in saying that they are to their advantage. I do not propose to speak at any greater length on those sections of the bill. With regard to the section dealing with the coastal laws, I think it will be to the advantage of Canada to see that this section is put through and at this session so that the resultant changes can be made during the current year.

Correlated with the business of shipping is that of dry dock construction plants. It appears to me that it would be to their advantage to have this legislation go through so that a greater amount of repairs, when damages occur, might be completed at Canadian dry docks. A United States boat will not go into a Canadian dry dock for repairs, because of the regulation that there must be paid to the United States government a tariff of 40 per cent of the cost of such repairs when the boat returns to its United States registry. This bill is designed to put us on a parity with United States shippers; it is their law practically word for word. I do not see that anything could be said by interests adverse to us as to our giving them a sample of their own medicine, because if this measure goes through, Canadian boats will have exactly the same privileges as United States boats and the latter will have no advantage over Canadian boats in Canadian waters. I therefore commend the government for bringing this bill down at this time and I intend to give it my hearty support.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, the only clause of this bill that I shall discuss in any detail is the one which deals with the proposed amendment to the coastal laws. As regards those clauses dealing with the interests of labour engaged in hazardous employment, we can only say that we would give them our hearty support. I say therefore, it is regrettable that this highly contentious clause of the bill should be introduced along with those clauses that we would like to support, and we shall therefore be compelled, because of this contentious clause, to oppose the whole bill, notwithstanding the fact that there are some clauses which we would like to approve, sympathetic as we are towards all legislation that would protect men who are engaged in hazardous employment.

The proposed amendment to the coastal laws is one that we as producers of wheat cannot view without alarm. Anything that has within it the possibility of increased freight rates must, to say the least, merit the keenest scrutiny on our part and we are not going to be very easily convinced that this bill does not contain that possibility. The avowed purpose of the bill is to protect Canadian shipping and when any measure is introduced that has for its object the protection of a particular class of the community, it almost inevitably results that that protection is given at the expense of somebody else. That that protection can be given only by taking something more from the Canadian producers of wheat is the opinon that we on this side of the house hold, and we intend to protest against any such course. I am not going to say that it is the deliberate purpose of the government to overburden the producer of wheat. I do not know whether the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) made that statement as he was quoted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens). Certainly we would not say that it was the deliberate purpose of the government to place additional burdens on the producers of wheat, but I say that the almost inevitable result of this bill will be to impose such burdens on him and that is something that at the present time he cannot stand.

There is nothing of greater concern to the wheat producer than freight rates on wheat. Situated as we are in the middle of the continent, competing as we have to do with other wheat producing countries more favourably situated, the question of freight rates is to us of prime importance, infinitely more important than to our Australian, or Argentine, or even our Russian competitors. The question of raising the freight rate on wheat by even the fraction of a cent, with wheat at its present low price, is to us a matter of prime importance. The wheat trade and the production of wheat constitute our principal industry. I do not underestimate the importance of the live stock industry; our cattle, beef, hog products, poultry and dairy products are all important, and in spite of the opinion which is sometimes given expression to in the east, we are engaging in those industries to the utmost extent that we find profitable. Nevertheless it is true that for many years to come, the agriculture of western Canada will be based on wheat, and therefore freight rates

that are paid on that commodity are to us of first importance.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce will pardon us if we are not so readily convinced as some hon. members opposite seem to be that this will not result to our disadvantage. We are not going to be very easily convinced that there will be no increase in the freight rates on wheat. We have had similar assurances in regard to the tariff and there has been no indication as yet that the assurances of the government in regard to increases in tariff have not been prejudicial to those of us who have to buy the products of Canadian manufacturers. The hon. member for Port Arthur-Thunder Bay (Mr. Cowan), who has just spoken, says that the interests of the producer will not be jeopardized. We have reason to fear that they will be because we have had some experiences in the past when there has not been sufficient competition in the carrying of grain. They tell us that there will be no increase in local rates. Will hon. members opposite explain to us why it is that wheat is carried to Buffalo cheaper than it is carried to Georgian bay ports? Does anyone imagine that on the basis of actual cost, it costs more to carry wheat to Georgian bay ports than it does to Buffalo or that it costs more to carry wheat to Port Colborne than it does to Buffalo? The figures that have been furnished by the board of grain commissioners absolutely disprove any such statement. I have before me the figures for the years 1930, 1931 and 1932, covering the months from April to December and so far as the figures I have are concerned, there is only one month in which the freight rate to Buffalo was higher than either to Port Colborne or Georgian bay ports. Yet, with these figures before us, they ask us to expect that rates will not be increased if Canadian steamships are given the monopoly of the carrying of wheat. We on this side of the house are not going to be so easily convinced as some hon. members opposite seem to be.

Like the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) I was interested when, after the minister had presented his case, he was followed by a speaker on the other side of the house who proceeded to show from the evidence given before the Senate committee that there was strong reason at least to believe that the bill would be prejudicial to our interests. I wondered in my own mind where the hon. member was going to land, but it was quite evident before he got through that he was preparing a soft place on which to fall.

The situation at Buffalo is unique. It is unique in that it has always been to the advantage of the producer of wheat in western Canada and to those who export wheat. As has been said, Buffalo is the strategic point at which wheat can be stored. Wheat stored there can be carried to any of the American ports or to the port of Montreal, and as I have said, that is a unique situation which has been to our advantage. We do not propose to lose that advantage through any failure on our part to make our fight against changing it. We have no prejudice against Canadian ports; we have no prejudice against our wheat going by Montreal or Halifax or Saint John; but the position to which we are going to adhere is that we must have these alternative routes open. It is only by keeping them open that under the present conditions under which grain is handled we can expect to get the utmost possible return to the producer, and that is the important thing to-day.

I have said that the situation at Buffalo is unique. The government tell us that they introduced into this bill the exact wording of the United States bill dealing with similar matters. That may be, but the situation in the United States is not parallel at all. What would be a parallel situation? It would be the shipment of grain from, say, Duluth to Port Colborne in Canadian vessels, and then an American law stepping in forbidding the carrying of that grain from Port Colborne to another American port. It may possibly be that the American law as at present existing would forbid such a transaction. I suppose it would, but that is a situation which simply does not arise to any extent, because to what other American port could the grain be carried from Port Colborne? Perhaps across that little bit of water to Buffalo or down through the canal to some points on the south shore of lake Ontario—

Mr. STEVENS: Or through the Erie canal to New York and Albany.

Mr. BROWN: But does that happen to any great extent? If it does, we want the minister to give us the facts and figures with regard to that situation when we are in committee.

Mr. STEVENS: It does not happen at all so far as Canadian vessels are concerned. The law prohibits it.

Mr. BROWN: That is what I say. Then that thing in itself is not a matter of importance to the Americans so far as protecting the situation from their viewpoint is con-

cerned, but it is of importance to us that the strategic point at Buffalo should be preserved.

After all, Mr. Speaker, this bill is the product of an attitude of mind that sees the necessity for ensuring a profit to everyone in the secondary industries in this country at the expense of the primary industries. It is one of the problems that concern us. I do not know how we are going to get away from what seems to be an inevitable situation, that the farmer is compelled to take simply what is left after everybody else has been paid. Since we have nothing to say at all, or only under very rare circumstances, in regard to the price we shall receive for our products, it is almost inevitable that the farmer has to take what is left after everybody else has been paid. In view of that situation we have to resist to the utmost extent of our ability any move that increases the costs that are taken off our product between the time it leaves us and the time it reaches the world's market. We have to make demands, as we have upon every occasion when we were dealing with the tariff, that our production costs shall be kept as low as possible. That is the only way we have to protect ourselves. It is the only kind of protection that the government can give to us, to ensure that our cost of production shall be at the lowest possible point, and it has always been upon that ground that we have resisted the impositions that have been made upon us for the benefit of other industries.

I wonder if the government have considered some of the possible results of this legislation. It is generally found that when established trade routes and established trade methods are interfered with there are some unforeseen and unintended results. We cannot foretell all the results in this case, but I am prepared to believe that the first result will be an increase in freight rates by Canadian ships. Do we imagine that the Americans are going to lie down entirely on the question of carrying Canadian grain? I wonder if the hon. member for Port Arthur-Thunder Bay (Mr. Cowan) fully realizes the significance of the admission he made when discussing this question, when he said that the exporter of grain would have the alternative route via American ports, and that if the grain went cheaper that way the exporter could ship that way. Here is what may happen. American steamers will not lie down on this job. They will carry Canadian wheat to Buffalo, where it will be stored, and let us rest assured that they will carry it in competition with Canadian vessels carrying grain to Port Colborne or to Georgian bay ports. Now has not that situation the possibility in it of sending a larger quantity of Canadian grain via American ports and less via Montreal?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Has my hon. friend lost sight of the fact that Canadian ships can compete in that trade? They can carry grain from Fort William to Buffalo.

Mr. BROWN: I realize that they can, but rest assured that if there are lower rates or if the spread between the rates to Buffalo and Port Colborne or Georgian bay ports is wider than it is at present, it matters not whether that grain is carried by American ships or Canadian ships. The situation still has in it the possibility of sending a larger amount of grain by American ports. Not that we as grain growers could object to that; I am not advancing it for that reason. But I am asking the government if they have considered the possibility of the adverse influence it may have upon the port of Montreal. So that, as I pointed out, these changes are very far reaching. One cannot be sure that the results intended to be achieved will be achieved, and that no ill effects will be the result.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to ask a question. If as the hon. member has argued the result of this legislation will be to divert the grain trade from Canadian into American channels, how can he complain that in using that route his interests will be prejudiced?

Mr. BROWN: I am not complaining that this legislation, particularly, is prejudicial to that route. When I spoke of that I was simply dealing with a general proposition, namely that we want the alternative routes preserved. That portion of my argument was not addressed to this bill. We want the alternative routes preserved. I simply pointed out to those who are strongly advocating the use of Canadian ports that this very step they are taking to help Canadian ports may have the opposite result.

Mr. STEVENS: You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. BROWN: I am not trying to have it both ways. All I intend to do is to point out that the thing you are going to do may not have the result you expect. Much of the legislation of this government has had unexpected results. All restrictions upon trade have had unintended effects. I am simply

pointing out that this legislation may be prejudicial to the interests of those who are advocating it, and who think that they are speaking in their own interests.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Does the hon. member not think that the six cent preference will be protection for the port of Montreal?

Mr. BROWN: If you ask me my opinion in regard to preferences, I would say that we have yet to see that they have been of any value to us.

Mr. STEVENS: They certainly have.

Mr. BROWN: When we go into committee we are going to ask the minister to prove conclusively that grain has been shipped through the port of Buffalo, and that it has received a preference. That is a matter I had not intended to discuss at the moment. My attitude towards the preferences in general is that up to the moment they have meant nothing.

We have heard something about maximum rates, and that competition has kept the rates below the maximum. That may be true, so long as there is free competition. But when competition is removed the inevitable tendency will be for the maximum rate to become the minimum rate. That is almost certain to be the result. Further, I do not wish to be unduly offensive concerning any hon. member of this government, but I must state frankly that we have not confidence in the governor in council, under this government—

Mr. STEVENS: We understand that fully, because we have heard it so often. We know it, and we do not expect anything else—individually or collectively.

Mr. BROWN: We have not confidence in the governor in council because their attitude has been to give secondary industries first consideration. How can we be expected to have confidence in the governor in council, after some of the things to which we have had to submit? Let us consider, for instance, repairs to farm implements, to which we have had occasion to refer.

Mr. STEVENS: Are you dissatisfied with what we have done in that connection?

Mr. BROWN: No, we are not dissatisfied with what you have done. The minister tries to get away with that kind of stuff, but it won't go.

Mr. STEVENS: No, my hon. friend is the one who tries to get away with it.

Mr. BROWN: The minister is trying to do now what he tried to do when he spoke on the budget. He tried to prove that we were absolutely opposed to everything in the budget. Of course we are satisfied with the present situation in regard to repairs to farm implements. But we are satisfied only because we brought conditions to the attention of the country and the government. For that reason the government simply had to withdraw from the position they had taken. That is the only way we can get anything from this government to help the farmers.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: It is like pulling teeth.

Mr. STEVENS: Some you do not have to pull.

Mr. BROWN: Even if we had confidence in the governor in council, the probability is that their action would be so slow that it would be of little benefit. The hon. member for Port Arthur-Thunder Bay said that the governor in council could take action only when rates became exorbitant. I suppose an exorbitant rate would be a maximum rate, above which they could not go. I think there were some inconsistencies in the argument of the hon. member for Port Arthur-Thunder Bay.

I do not know whether it is necessary for me further to discuss this matter. I believe I have made it clear that representing a western constituency I must view with alarm even the possibility of an increase in lake rates on our wheat. While I regret having to oppose the whole bill, because of other provisions in it, to be true to the interests I represent I must do so.

Mr. A. B. THOMPSON (East Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, coming from a constituency which has within its borders the Georgian bay ports of Midland and Port McNicoll, I should like to say a few words concerning this proposed legislation. I shall direct my remarks more particularly to the amendments to the coastal law. One hon. member opposite has asked these questions: "What is the need for the bill now before us? Why is this legislation necessary." If I were to answer I would say that the reason is to remedy an injustice which for a long time Canadian elevators, Canadian ships and Canadian mariners have suffered by reason of Canadian grain being routed on American vessels to Buffalo, thence re-routed via American vessels to the elevators at Montreal and other Canadian ports. To my mind this is a condition which should have been remedied years ago, and it is gratifying to know that at last we

have a Minister of Marine backed by a government prepared to do something for our Canadian steamers.

Let me read what the Canadian Unionist, Canada's national labour magazine, has to say in connection with this matter. I find the following:

> One direction in which the Canadian government can relieve unemployment is by enacting the many amendments to the Canada Shipping Act which have been proved necessary by long experience and which have been under consideration for the last twenty-odd years. The most important of these proposed amendments is one to ensure that Canadian ships shall be manned by Canadian seamen. At present Canadian ports are full of idle seafarers, while Canadian ships are manned by citizens of every country but Canada.

The article goes on to say:

> The Department of Marine has come under new management in the last couple of years, and there is a possibility that the long-overdue revision of the law will be undertaken at the present session of parliament.

Then, further on:

> The new Minister of Marine, Hon. Alfred Duranleau, is a much brighter lad than Hon. Pierre Cardin. Between them Messrs. Duranleau and Hawken have at last managed to put a tackle inspector on the Vancouver docks, which Messrs. Cardin and Johnston never would do, despite the appalling list of fatalities that accumulated under their cold-blooded "do nothing" administration.

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that in common with other countries we have been passing through a period of depression—

Mr. SPEAKMAN: May I ask the hon. member a question? From what official document was he quoting?

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): I said at the outset that I was reading from the Canadian Unionist, "Canada's national labour magazine."

An hon. MEMBER: That is a good magazine.

Mr. CASGRAIN: When it supports the government.

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): We are passing through a period of depression. The greatest cause of the depression is unemployment. If this bill becomes law it will to a very considerable extent relieve the unemployment situation, because a great part of our Canadian grain which is now carried by American vessels and passes through American elevators will be carried by Canadian vessels and pass through Canadian elevators. When this bill becomes law Canadian grain shipped from one Canadian port and destined to another Canadian port, directly or indirectly, must be carried in Canadian vessels. We know that a great deal of money is spent in the handling and carriage of this grain, and when it is moved by American vessels through American ports Canadians derive very little benefit from it. Certain hon. gentlemen on the opposite side appear to think it is a serious offence for anybody to speak for the Canadian shipping interests. No vessel owner has ever spoken to me about this legislation, but ever since I have been a member of parliament I have had Canadian seamen and masters and mates and engineers come to me and want to know when our government was going to put our coastal laws on the same footing as those of the United States, giving to Canadian seamen the same measure of protection that the Americans give to theirs. Surely, sir, if we can do something for the Canadian mariner it is up to us to do it. The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) speaking yesterday seemed very anxious to know what the American government would think if we passed this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG: What they would do I was more concerned about.

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): He was very much concerned about what they would think and perhaps what they would do. I will tell him what in my opinion the American government will think; they will think more highly of us and have more respect for us, that we had the courage and backbone to pass legislation which they have had on their statute books for many years.

Mr. YOUNG: They will be quite flattered that we have copied them!

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): It has been one of these cases of jug-handled protection that the Americans have enjoyed at our expense. Let me give an illustration of what took place in my riding two years ago. A large quantity of American grain was brought down to Port McNicoll just at the close of navigation to be stored in elevators there. When navigation opened the following spring that grain had to be carried to Buffalo, and although there were a number of Canadian boats lying idle at Port McNicoll and Midland not one of them was allowed to take part in that traffic because the American coastal laws would not permit it. Now we are going to put our boats in the same position as the American.

Mr. YOUNG: Did they pay storage on that grain?

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): I assume they did, it is customary.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Canadians pay storage on grain in Buffalo.

Mr. VALLANCE: Is the hon. gentleman right in that statement that Canadian boats could not take it out of Port McNicoll?

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): Certainly, it came from an American port and was destined to an American port, although indirectly; and according to American coastal laws that grain must be carried exclusively in American bottoms.

An hon. MEMBER: It would come over in bond.

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, Canada is a maritime nation. We have thousands of miles of coastline on our seaboard and our rivers and inland lakes, and to my mind it is of the utmost importance that we protect this shipping industry and give it a chance to survive. The people who would suffer most if our shipping industry were driven out of existence are the grain growers of the west, because then they would be at the mercy of the American vessels; we have no control over their rates. The hon. member for Port Arthur-Thunder Bay (Mr. Cowan) has shown to the house what protection the grain growers will have in the regulation of rates, it is not necessary for me to go over that ground again. We have the competition of our own boats, the competition of the Buffalo route to a certain extent, and the powers of regulation of the government and the grain commissioners.

Some hon. members who have spoken say that the grain grower gets no protection. Why was the Hudson Bay railway built? Was it not built to give to the grain grower of the west an outlet for his grain to the markets of the world at a lower transportation cost? Why did Canada spend millions of dollars in the enlargement of the Welland canal if it were not to help the grain grower of the west?

Mr. BROWN: No.

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): Absolutely yes. Millions of dollars.

Mr. BROWN: It was never asked for by the west.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It was, years ago.

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): We on this side of the house are not concerned in setting one class against another. We want to do what is for the general good of the country.

Mr. YOUNG: You are setting one class on the backs of another.

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): For that reason, in order to help the farmers of the west, we have spent all that money on the enlargement of the Welland canal and the building of the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. YOUNG: Who is "we"?

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): I think it is to be regretted that some representatives of the western farmers do not realize what Canada has done for them.

Mr. YOUNG: We are beginning to realize it.

Mr. THOMPSON (Simcoe): I would like, if it were at all possible—I am afraid it is not, because the hon. gentleman who preceded me has shown that he could not be convinced against his will—that the hon. gentlemen who are opposing this bill should withdraw their objection and join hands with us and let us all work together for the common good.

Mr. YOUNG: Withdraw the bill.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a few words with regard to this bill, before it goes to committee. Before doing so I must express my appreciation of the sentiments that have been expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the need of looking after the welfare of those engaged on ships, and I hope they will extend those sentiments to the ships operating on the Pacific coast. I pointed out a few evenings ago that only about ten per cent of the employees on Canadian Pacific ships were white men, and that this company had their ships repaired in China rather than in Canada because it could be done more cheaply there.

I am not particularly concerned with who own the ships. We may call them Canadian owned ships, railways, docks or whatever they are, but the bondholders are in all parts of the world, and recently we were told that until such time as the bonds are paid up we do not own these utilities. I am interested, however, in the first part of this bill which refers to the protection of workers against accidents occurring while unloading or loading ships. I commend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) for bringing in these amendments at the present time. Unfortunately, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) has said, they are linked up with other amendments which we may not like, but those to which I have referred are long overdue. While commending the minister, however, there is some uneasiness in my mind with regard to section 681f. Subsection 2 of section 1 repeals

sections 674 and 681 of the Canada Shipping Act, but section 681, subsections (a) to (f) inclusive, does not come into operation until a date fixed by the governor in council and proclaimed in the Canada Gazette. Until that proclamation is issued sections 681 and 674 remain as they are at present.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this implies that the rest of the act will come into effect as soon as the bill passes this house but that these sections will not come into operation until a proclamation is issued by the governor in council. My reason for being uneasy is the fact that opposition has always manifested itself when anything has been attempted in the way of protecting those engaged in loading or unloading ships, or having to do with safety on board ships. I understand that last year the Minister of Marine took steps to appoint an inspector of tackle and that when this became known it was opposed by the shipping federation of British Columbia. If up to the present they have been able to prevent the Minister of Marine from doing what I believe he considers the right and proper thing to do, and something which it is very necessary to have done, I am afraid they will be able to exert enough pressure to prevent this section from coming into operation for some considerable time. Of course if the minister can give an assurance in that regard in committee he will have my full support so far as these sections are concerned.

With regard to the rest of the bill, which has to do with the ships which may or may not engage in the coastal trade of Canada, I believe it is inevitable that there should be some regulation in this regard. We may talk as we please about free competition, but really that is a thing of the past. As a matter of fact competition always tends towards monopoly; it only remains competition until such time as the bigger ones have absorbed the small ones, when it becomes a monopoly. If these amendments with regard to our coastal trade are to be put into operation I believe we should insist on sufficient safeguards so that those furnishing the freight for the shipping companies may not be unduly penalized.

In conclusion I may say again that so far as the first part of the bill is concerned, dealing with the protection of those engaged on the ships, I will extend my unqualified support.

Mr. F. P. QUINN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make just a few observations with regard to the bill now before the house. I think the best recommendation for the bill was that quoted by my good friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson) from the labour magazine, which expressed the attitude of the working men of Canada towards this measure.

I have always been an advocate of the Canada first policy. I have always advocated Canada for Canadians, Canadian seamen on Canadian ships and Canadian workmen in Canadian shipyards, and I have always held that when ships were required by the government or by Canadian shipping interests, if at all possible those ships should be built in Canadian shipyards by Canadian workmen and that so far as practicable Canadian materials should be used in their construction. I am surprised at the attitude that has been taken by some hon. gentlemen opposite. They fear that there may be a monopoly.

Mr. YOUNG: There is one now.

Mr. QUINN: Well, as the hon. member for Port Arthur-Thunder Bay (Mr. Cowan) has pointed out, and as hon. members should know, we have the necessary safeguards in the Canada Shipping Act, section 938. There is the further safeguard that the competition with Buffalo will still exist; a great deal of Canadian grain will be shipped through that port for European ports. Only the preference on Canadian grain going to the United Kingdom will prevent much of our grain going through Buffalo. In addition we have the Hudson Bay route. I believe a considerable quantity of Canadian grain will be shipped via Churchill. The competition to be offered by Vancouver is an important factor. Above all, I believe that this bill should be given a fair trial. It will mean much for Canadian unemployed. We should look with favour upon any legislation which will relieve the present condition of unemployment and give preference to Canadian seamen on Canadian ships.

I might extend this a little further. We have ships running out of Canadian ports on the Atlantic seaboard which are not manned by Canadian seamen. There are always available highly qualified masters, mates, engineers, firemen, cooks, stewards, deckhands—all that is necessary to make up the personnel of a ship's crew. Even in the personnel of the crews of the Canadian National steamers are many old country men. While I have nothing against our brothers from across the sea, as I said in the beginning, I am for Canada and Canadians first. Wherever there is a master, an officer, an engineer or a member of the crew available in this country, he should be given preference over all others. My attention was called to a large concern in this country which operates a fleet of ships under Canadian charters. They took these ships out of Can-

ada and had them registered in Great Britain to be manned with British crews. They pay a lower rate of wages to their masters and crews than is paid by Canadian shipping interests and I presume it was for that reason they took the action they did. Our own men should be given protection. If permits are to be granted to Canadian interests for the operation of steamers through Canadian ports, there should be some provision to compel them to employ Canadian officers and crews.

The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. MacInnis) expressed some doubt with regard to the clause in the bill covering the appointment of inspectors of ship's tackle. He doubts the efficiency of this clause because it can come into effect only by order in council. I do not suppose it can be brought into effect until there are available the proper men to be appointed as inspectors. I say to the minister and to the government that care should be taken in the selection of these officials. They should be familiar with the type of work carried on on the waterfront. They should be men from the ranks who have worked up and become efficient as stevedores or master freight handlers. This should not be a white collar job; it should be a job for a man who thoroughly understands the work and has had years of experience. For some years I have urged the necessity of having such inspectors; a year ago I brought this matter to the attention of the minister. I have before me a letter received under date of October 26, 1932, from the Halifax Longshoremen's Association. It reads:

F. P. Quinn, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons.
Dear Sir,—

The Halifax Longshoremen's Association, local 269, I.L.A. have for some time been pressing the Dominion government to appoint a full time inspector of gears, tackles and working ways for the port of Halifax, and up to the present has not met with any success in having the appointment made.

At the last regular monthly meeting of the association I was instructed to write you and ask you to again enlist your good offices to the end that such an inspector be appointed as soon as possible.

The changing character of the methods of carrying on the work render it more necessary than ever that the appointment be made and we respectfully request you to direct the government's attention to this matter as soon as you can conveniently do so.

Yours truly,
A. M. Sullivan,
President,
Halifax Longshoremen's Association,
Local 269 I.L.A.

I commend and congratulate the government for having taken up this matter and providing this amendment to our shipping act.

There is another matter which I am sorry has not been dealt with by this bill. It is a small matter and it may have escaped the attention of the minister and the committee when the bill was being drafted. Perhaps it is not too late to have it included in the present amendment to the act. I refer to the unfairness of the charge for pilotage in the St. Lawrence made against ships plying from Nova Scotia to Ontario. I have before me a resolution which was passed unanimously by the Halifax board of trade on March 14 of this year. It reads:

Whereas under the provisions of the Canada Shipping Act, R.S.C. 1927, chapter 186, St. Lawrence river pilotage dues are payable by ships navigating between ports in the maritime provinces and ports in the province of Ontario;

And whereas by section 457, subsection c (ii) of said act, ships employed in trading between any one or more of the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and any other or others of them are exempt from payment of said dues;

And whereas payment of said dues is illogical and without merit, and a great injustice and hardship to ships navigating between the maritime provinces and the province of Ontario in that if said ships sailing from the maritime provinces were bound only for the port of Montreal, or were proceeding from the port of Montreal to the maritime provinces, said dues would not be payable, but because said ships proceed to and from ports in the great lakes they are subject to said dues;

And whereas the imposition of said dues is a great impediment to interprovincial trade;

Now be it resolved that the Halifax Board of Trade and the undersigned interested parties place themselves on record as strongly urging and petitioning the government of the Dominion of Canada and the Minister of Marine that section 457, subsection c (ii) of said act be amended by inserting the word "Ontario" before the word "Quebec" in the second line thereof.

I submit this to the minister and ask him to give it his most careful consideration. There is another matter which I intend to bring up but I shall deal with it when the bill is in committee.

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) referred to page 54 of the evidence given before the Senate committee with reference to the rates charged by the Canada Steamship company. As I said before, there seems to be in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite who represent the wheat growers a great fear with regard to rates. It was pointed out, I think by Mr. Enderby in the proceedings of the committee, that the carriage of grain was not enough to pay the company for the cost of operation. I submit to hon. gentlemen opposite that it is as unfair for them to expect the owners of Canadian steam-

ships to carry grain at a rate too low to give them a reasonable profit, as it is to expect the grain growers to raise wheat and sell it for forty cents a bushel.

Mr. DONNELLY: They are doing it.

Mr. QUINN: Yes, but we have the evidence in the last few weeks that the price of wheat is gradually rising; it is not going up fast enough to suit me, but it is gradually rising and I hope in the very near future to see it at a price that will pay the Canadian wheat grower a sufficient profit to allow him to operate at an advantage and also to pay a fair and decent rate to those who are transporting his grain to the seaboard and across the ocean.

Mr. AHEARN: The hon. member should thank President Roosevelt.

Mr. QUINN: Hon. gentlemen on that side of the house will thank anybody other than the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) and the Conservative party. I have no quarrel with them; they are elected and they sit there to oppose this government, and they are doing so with all their might.

Mr. REID: Not with all our might.

Mr. QUINN: Well, they have given a pretty good exhibition of it in the last few weeks.

Mr. REID: If we were to do so, there would be a revolution.

Mr. QUINN: I do not want to go any further with regard to that. Hon. gentlemen opposite are entitled to their opinion and we are entitled to ours. President Roosevelt, as we all know, is a man of energy and he has proven that he is a wonderful leader of a government. I congratulate the country to the south of us on having such a brilliant man at the head of it; I also congratulate Canada on having at the head of its government a man who will walk hand in hand with President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald and the leaders of other countries in bringing this world out of the chaos of the last two or three years.

Mr. T. F. DONNELLY (Willow Bunch): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend at this late hour of the session to detain the house by making any lengthy speech on this bill. I rise chiefly to enter my protest and to voice the protest of my electors in the west against this measure as at present framed. Anything that savors of freight rates is of vital importance to the farmers of western Canada. Situated as they are in the middle of a continent, on anything they produce, whether it be wheat, cattle, eggs or any other commodity, they have to pay a long freight haul to carry it to the market. Their butter, eggs, beef, poultry, pork, all have to come to eastern Canada in order to be marketed; their wheat has to go to the markets of the world in order to be sold and they have to pay the freight. Similarly on anything the farmers of the west have to buy there is a long freight which they must pay in the price thereof. So it is that matters affecting freight rates are of immense importance to the western farmers, and on that account alone they view this bill with a certain amount of fear. They look upon it as another load placed on their shoulders, because they cannot help feeling it will mean they will have to pay more freight. This is another blunder by a blundering government, a government which has done nothing but blunder ever since it came into power. The first thing it did when it took office was to limit the farmers to a more restricted market than they had before; it imposed a duty on everything they had to buy and restricted the farmers more and more until they could hardly exist. Not content with that, the government next started to restrict the market in which the farmers had to sell. This was done by what is called the government's sound money policy, a policy which puts the Canadian producer at a disadvantage with, practically speaking, all the other producers in the world. Not many months ago when we sent a steer to England and got £10 for it, instead of getting $48 and some cents when that money came back here, we got only $38. If we had lived in Australia or New Zealand we would have got $63. Our markets were restricted until the farmer was bled white, because the markets in which he had to buy and those in which he had to sell were all restricted.

Now the government comes along with a bill that will make the farmer pay more freight on the wheat he has to ship out and that will take the last drop of blood out of him. Is it any wonder the farmers of the west are rebelling against this bill? Some say that the shipping interests cannot operate at a profit on the lakes and the rates will have to be raised to enable them to do so. Why is this bill put through in the last minute of the last hour of the last day of the session? Why is it brought in now when it has been in cold storage for twenty years? It is being brought to the light of day only now and an attempt is being made to put it through the house because the government think we are tired out and will make no objection. Why is

this bill being introduced? For no other reason than to try to help the shipping interests, not to help out the farmers.

Let us look at conditions as they exist on the lakes. Anybody who knows anything about transportation on the lakes knows there are two kinds of boats, the large boats that operate only on the lakes and the smaller boats that carry the grain on the lakes and down the river. The larger boats carry the grain from Fort William or Port Arthur down to the lake ports, Port Colborne and Buffalo, and the smaller boats carry it from Port Arthur or Fort William right down to Montreal. Most of the grain carried through to Montreal is taken by Canadian boats, because they are the smaller vessels, but most of the grain taken to lake ports or to Buffalo is carried in United States bottoms, for the simple reason that they are large boats which cannot go down the river to Montreal. But the minister has not told us who carries the wheat from Buffalo to Montreal. Some say that the United States boats do this. That is wrong. Most of the wheat carried from Buffalo to Montreal is taken by Canadian boats, because they are the small boats and the only ones that can go down the river. When we get into committee of the whole on this bill I expect the minister to tell us the quantity of wheat carried from Buffalo to Montreal by United States and Canadian boats—and I do not mean boats belonging to companies which are partly of United States ownership; because there are boats of Canadian registry in which the United States people may own some stock.

I want particularly to deal with the effect this legislation will have upon rates. We believe it will create a combine and that this combine will force rates up on the lakes. If we look at the rates at present what do we find? I will give a couple of instances. We had the experience in the past when Canadian boats had a monopoly of all the lake traffic, and what did we find? In the spring of 1931 a dispute arose between the insurance companies and the American boats, and the result was that American boats, by reason of the wording of the insurance policy for a time did not enter the trade on the lakes at all. When the Canadian boats had a monopoly on the lakes the price of handling wheat down the lakes from Fort William to Montreal immediately shot up to nine cents a bushel and was kept there for six weeks, until the dispute between the insurance companies and the American boats was settled, and when the American boats again came into competition the price immediately dropped three to six cents a bushel. That is a matter of record, and the minister knows it.

But we had another experience. In 1932 due to competition the rate on wheat from Fort William to Montreal kept going down and down month by month until in June it was 4·1 cents a bushel. Then a shipping combine was formed on the lakes. Some say there is not a combine, but we know there is, we know who is the head of it, and we know what he gets out of it; do not make any mistake about that. This shipping combine was formed and the plan was that the rate should be shot up half a cent a bushel month by month. In June the average rate was 4·1; in July, 4·54; in August, 5·27; in September, 6·40; in October, 6·79, or almost 6·8. Then our Minister of Trade and Commerce, through the board of grain commissioners, stepped in and said that the rate could not go above 6½ cents, although it had been above that figure. The rate then came down to 6½ cents. But let us see what were the rates to Buffalo, where there was competition, during those same months. As compared with the rate of 4·1 to Montreal in June the rate to Buffalo was 1·56. The rate to Montreal went up half a cent in July, and the rate to Buffalo in the same month was 1·57; to Buffalo in August, 1·54; September, 1·52; October, 1·52; November, 1·55. In fact, during all those months the rate to Buffalo hardly ever varied. Contrast that with a rate of 4·1 from Fort William to Montreal in the month of June and almost 6·8 from Fort William to Montreal in October; and these high rates to Montreal were due to there being a combine of shipping interests on the lakes. But going to Buffalo there was competition, and the rates remained the same. Naturally, then, if we do away with this competition, this alternative route to Buffalo, we are afraid that freight rates on the lakes will be shot up, and I think we are justified in that belief.

Why is it that we have these rates that now exist? Buffalo is the only port where we have competition. The rate going to Port Colborne in 1930 was 2·41 on the average, and the rate to Buffalo, a longer distance, 1·9, or half a cent higher going to Port Colborne than to Buffalo. Again in 1931 the rate to Georgian ports was 1·84, the rate to Port Colborne 1·89, and the rate to Buffalo 1·65, or nearly one-quarter of a cent less to Buffalo than to Georgian bay ports. Canadian boats are charging more for going a shorter distance than the rate to Buffalo, and hon. gentlemen opposite want the farmers to pay this extra rate and take their punishment. We are ready, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr.

Quinn) said, to see our own Canadian people get all the traffic they can, but we are unwilling to pay them more than anybody else; in fact, we are not able to. The western farmer is bled white, and right at a time like this to ask him to pay more in freight rates is ridiculous. I wonder how the western members opposite will vote on this—my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Turnbull), for instance.

Mr. TURNBULL: Don't worry.

Mr. DONNELLY: Your constituents will worry, don't make any mistake about that. A rise in freight rates will affect all the people in western Canada, the people in the cities just as much as anybody else. Wheat is the lifeblood of our people in western Canada, and we are being asked by this bill to pay more in rates for the benefit of the shipping interests on the great lakes. This increase will be taken out of the farmers and nobody else.

In 1932 the rates were even worse—on the average 2·08 cents to lake ports; to Port Colborne, 2·22, and to Buffalo, 1·55, or nearly three-quarters of a cent more to ship to Port Colborne than to Buffalo, and half a cent more to ship to Georgian bay ports than to Buffalo although to Buffalo is a longer distance. Yet we are asked to vote for this bill to give Canadian shipping interests a monopoly of all the trade on the lakes.

With regard to the movement of grain at Buffalo, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), speaking on this bill said that Buffalo occupied a unique position. There is no doubt about that. The grain of western Canada comes to Fort William and is shipped from there to Buffalo, and from Buffalo it goes down the lakes to Montreal, or out via New York, Philadelphia and other United States ports. Both Canadian and American boats have been carrying this grain, but if this bill is put into effect any grain which is going down the lakes and is intended for Montreal must go in Canadian bottoms; if it goes to Buffalo it must go in Canadian bottoms. If the grain goes in American bottoms it will be in violation of this bill. There is no doubt that the rate to Buffalo to-day is the lowest, and there is no doubt that if this bill goes into effect it will affect Montreal injuriously. To my mind it is certain that the port of Montreal will suffer. All the wheat that is going to the markets of Europe outside of Great Britain will go to Buffalo and out through New York and Philadelphia, and on to Europe. Some wheat will go to Buffalo in either American or Canadian bottoms, but very little in Canadian bottoms. Only the bigger boats will take it, and the majority of the Canadian boats are smaller boats. Only the bigger Canadian boats will bring wheat from the head of the lakes down to Buffalo. It would not pay the smaller boat; the rates would be too low. They would rather go to Port Colborne, Goderich, or any other port where the rate will be higher, or take it through to Montreal. If this bill goes into effect it will be to the disadvantage of Montreal. We will find a lot more grain going through American ports to the markets of Europe via American bottoms, than we find at the present time.

I do not intend to delay the house any longer. I have risen merely to voice my protest against this bill. I resent some of the references made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson). He referred to what eastern Canada had done for western Canada, and how eastern Canada had built the Hudson Bay railway. I always understood the Hudson Bay railway had been built by money which the people of western Canada had paid for their preemptions. The greater part of the money put up by western Canada for their preemption payments of $3 an acre had been put into a private fund. That money was used for the building of the Hudson Bay railway and, of course, further amounts came from the general revenue. I am sorry to hear any hon. member say that eastern Canada has been handing out anything to western Canada. The hon. member said, "Oh well, we built the Welland canal for you." Western Canada never asked for the Welland canal; it is of no advantage to us. It gave labour to people in eastern Canada, particularly in Ontario, and the same applies to the St. Lawrence waterway development. If the people of eastern Canada want to build it, well and good; but so far as we in western Canada are concerned, we are not at all interested in it. We do not want to be told that the St. Lawrence waterway development is for us, or that the Welland canal was built for us. Only now, when western Canada, on account of its poverty, has ceased to be a market, does eastern Canada realize what we mean to it. Western Canada has always been your market, and still is. We are proud and willing to buy from you—understand that. But we hate to be branded as something to which gifts have to be handed; we are not looking for charity from eastern Canada. We are looking only for our just due, for a square and fair deal. We do not like to be told continuously that we are objects of charity on the part of eastern Canada, that we want gifts handed to us, or that this or that has to be done for us. It is regrettable that that stand has been taken, and I resent it.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I regret to delay the house even for a few moments, but under the circumstances, when we consider the condition of the order paper, it is possible that the delay is not as serious as it otherwise might be.

The other day the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) made reference to the various beneficial features of the bill. I should like it to be understood at once that in anything I may have to say in criticism of a part of the bill I am making no reference, nor have others made reference, to the features of the bill which are wholly commendable. The provisions which deal with the administration of Canadian shipping, with the protection of those working in Canadian vessels, with proper inspection, with the protection of men working in hazardous trades —in fact, all these provisions for the proper regulation and safeguarding of shipping meet with my approval; they are wholly commendable, and we should be pleased were we in a position to support them by our vote. With the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) and other hon. members who have spoken may I voice my regret that one section in an otherwise commendable bill should be such as to make it impossible for us to register our support. That section has been discussed so widely, and its potential or possible effects have been described so frequently and so clearly, that it is unnecessary for me to go into the matter at great length.

There is, however, one phase of the situation to which I wish to make reference. I believe it will be generally agreed that the cost of freight rates, as the cost of anything else, is determined essentially by the laws of supply and demand and by competition. If in Canada at the present time we were working under a wholly planned economy, were we to have every phase of our production, transportation and distribution planned, regulated and controlled, it is possible that competition would be unnecessary. But under existing conditions the main and indeed the only effective regulatory influence we have in respect of transportation costs is that commonly known as competition.

When we deal with competition in lake shipping, the subject specifically under discussion, there are several factors which must be considered. Unquestionably each of the various routes competing with one another —that is, the routes out from Vancouver, the routes through Hudson bay and others I need not mention—is a regulatory factor in respect of other routes. No one can stand by itself.

In the grain business the margin of profit is so small that a fractional increase in cost on one route may divert the trade in another direction. I believe that is the only effective safeguard we have left. But when we consider that feature, we have to remember that it works both ways, and that just as the shipment through Vancouver or through Hudson bay must have its effect upon shipping costs on the great lakes, so any possible increase in shipping costs on the great lakes —which, again, is a regulatory factor over Vancouver and Hudson bay—will have its effect generally on the other routes. So the principle of competition is a matter of importance, and applies to every route and to every cargo of grain shipped, no matter through which route it may travel.

May I say at once that the section of the bill which protects Canadian shipping and gives to it a virtual monopoly on Canadian coastal trade, whether carried on directly or indirectly, is wholly consistent with the policy of this government as it has been developed and demonstrated since the election of 1930. There has been constant evidence of a national policy of restriction. Under this policy, so far as possible, every branch of Canadian industry shall be given its proportionate share of protection. Each shall be given, so far as the law will permit, at least a suggestion of a monopoly in its own field. May I venture to suggest that it is only when each of the industries concerned is upon an equal footing that such a policy may be applied with any degree of equity. There is nothing unfair as between any one of these interests, so long as each receives the same degree of protection, and so long as each one of them is wholly national and domestic in its scope, although a continuation of such a policy may be detrimental to the country as a whole. Unfortunately in this particular case and in respect of the commodity which will be affected to the greatest degree, namely grain, we are attempting to do the impossible. By this proposed legislation we are attempting to inject a policy of national restriction into the one business in Canada which is essentially and inherently international in character, the wheat business.

Mr. POULIOT: Give Judge Sedgewick a chance.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Judge Sedgewick has nothing to do with it. There is no business in Canada which from that point of view is at all comparable with that of wheat growing. It is essentially an international business. Four fifths of the entire production must, in one way or another, and by one route or another, find its market overseas; the domestic sales

are an insignificant factor as far as prices are concerned. So by this bill we are trying to do something which in my opinion cannot be justified and cannot be made to work successfully; we are attempting to apply the policy of national restriction to a business which essentially is international in character. What will be the result? Of course, as has been said, we are guessing, we are estimating, we are forecasting. We are saying what the result may be, not what is it. But I think we are fully justified in suggesting that the only possible result must be to raise, if it be only infinitesimally, the charges for transporting wheat by the lake route. If that happens it is perfectly logical to expect that it will find its reaction in a slight increase in rates on other routes in respect to which this route is a competitive factor. I say it is only reasonable and logical to expect that this will be the result; for why is the bill brought in? It can have only one of two purposes, either to give to Canadian shipping a greater share of the present available tonnage at the same rates, or to give to Canadian shipping a chance to charge a little higher rate than they are now able to charge because of American competition. It has been stated, and I see no reason to dispute the statement, that at the present time there is not one Canadian shipping line on the great lakes whose business is not written in red ink; they are all carrying on at a loss. It has been pointed out as a deplorable situation. It has been suggested that no business can be expected to carry on indefinitely under such conditions, and that to persist in such a course must inevitably result in bankruptcy for the companies and the final disappearance of that shipping. If that is the situation, and if it is brought about by rates that are too low, and if it is to be corrected by this legislation, how can it be corrected other than by giving the shipping companies an opportunity to charge rates higher than those charged at the present time? It has been suggested by one hon. member, and again I am not disputing his suggestion, that when we speak of the farmer as being the only producer concerned in raising wheat our application of the term is too limited; that all the essential industries lying between the soil and the seed at the one end and the consumer at the other must be looked upon as factors and copartners in production. That may not be technically correct, and in order to avoid all possibility of misapprehension I shall refer to the farmer as the primary producer. But suppose that definition to be correct; then what do we do? As far as we can by law, through the railway commission we provide

[Mr. Speakman.]

that the railways shall charge rates which pay the cost of operation and provide a reasonable return to the shareholders. To those who supply the machinery and other essentials of the farmer for raising wheat, as far as we can we give by law through monopolized market the opportunity of carrying on their part of the business at a reasonable profit. By this bill we are endeavouring to make certain that the shipping partner in this undertaking shall be given the opportunity to make a reasonable profit on the carriage of the grain. But must it not be obvious to everyone who considers the matter, whether he be from the east or from the west, that eventually, if only so much money is available to be divided among the various factors, that amount being the price received for the grain on the markets of Great Britain and Europe, and if you ensure a profitable business to all the other factors concerned, to that extent you place the whole weight upon the primary producer, the man who raises the grain?

My purpose, Mr. Speaker, in rising was not to ask the government to depart from a policy upon which they were elected, that of protection, of giving as far as possible a domestic monopoly to the various branches of domestic industry and production, but to show that in this particular case they are trying to do that which is not only illogical and impossible but absolutely unfair; they are trying to apply that policy to the one business in Canada which cannot fit into a domestic plan, which is essentially international in its character and scope. That being the case, that one business at least should be saved from the effects of an intensive policy of national restriction. If prices cannot be controlled, if we must take a dump price on the markets of the world, we should be allowed at least the right to ship by any agency and in any way that will carry our wheat to the markets of the world at the lowest possible rate. Every additional quarter cent added to the cost of carrying wheat at a time when farmers are wondering whether or not they can continue in the business will be a deterrent to that business, an unfair increase in the burden of the farmer, and one which we, representing western Canada, trying our best to be fair, trying to see things from the national point of view, under the present circumstances cannot but oppose.

Mr. H. A. MULLINS (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I am vitally interested in this bill, as much so as any man who sits on either side of the house. The people of my constituency

are engaged in grain growing as well as in raising live stock, and anything that has the effect of raising freight rates on grain would not be satisfactory to me. If I thought for one moment that this bill would work a hardship on the grain producer of western Canada I would not support it. But, Mr. Speaker, we have control of the rates. If rates are raised unfairly we can take way the concession that is given to the shipping companies. The rates are protected under the grain commission. Also we can suspend the coastal shipping laws and let the American boats in at any time we wish, according to the provisions of this bill. Then I wonder what my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Brown) would do with the Hudson Bay railway. He has been fighting for it nearly as long as I have. Mr. Speaker, if there have been reductions in freight rates they were brought about by the Conservative party.

Mr. YOUNG: Trying to make amends now.

Mr. MULLINS: All you have to do is to look at the old Manitoba rate which I had the privilege of helping to make. You enjoyed a ten cent rate on wheat to the head of the lakes from 1901 to 1918. I wonder if the hon. member for Lisgar will deny that. I was there when that protection was given the shippers of western Canada, not only on grain but on all products. We had control of rates then. We have control now on the lakes, and we can alter those rates just as we did previously. I do not doubt that if the angel Gabriel came down here the hon. member for Lisgar would find fault with his wings if he were on this side of the house, but if by chance he happened to be over there he would be all right. Hon. gentlemen opposite have opposed everything designed to help the grain industry, yet they are parading themselves as "holier than thou" and trying to condemn us and find fault with everything we have done.

I should like to direct attention to the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Cardin). What did he do to help the grain growers of the west? Our present minister is trying to help both the shipping industry and the grain growers. Speaking in Montreal about a year ago the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) absolutely opposed the Hudson Bay railway, on which we in the west have pinned our hopes for many years. I have quoted these words in the house previously, but I think they should be mentioned again. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to kill the Hudson Bay railway, and it would not be in operation to-day if they had been in power. Here is what the hon. member said:

> —we can afford things de luxe like the Hudson Bay railway, and Port Churchill. It is like giving your best girl or your wife a present when your pockets are full of money, but these are the days when we have no money, when we cannot even meet expenditures strictly needed. The Conservatives adopt a different attitude. The finances are upside down, yet they spend millions on projects which can wait a year or two years, or even five years—

We would not have had the railway finished for five years if the former minister had been in office. Then he went on to say:

> What is happening to-day as regards Port Churchill? We have Hon. Dr. Manion acting like a beggar in the street, begging people to ship some grain over the Hudson Bay railway to Port Churchill. So eager is he to get some grain there that he is offering free elevators, a cut in railway rates—

He seems to find fault with that reduction in railway rates.

> —and also a bonus to compensate for the higher insurance rates out of Port Churchill. That is what the Bennett government is ready to do. Sane merchants doing a regular reasonable business in grain do not want to send their grain through Port Churchill at the present time—

It is too bad that our only hope, for which we have fought for nearly half a century, should be blighted by a speech made by the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These are his verbatim words, which I am sure he cannot deny. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite find fault because we bring in this shipping bill.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Would the hon. member care to quote the speech made by his own leader at Portage la Prairie in 1926 with regard to the Hudson Bay railway?

Mr. MULLINS: I go by a man's actions. We have finished the Hudson Bay railway; we are giving the grain growers of the west every opportunity to get their grain out by way of Hudson bay.

Mr. BROWN: Who let the contract for the construction of the elevator?

Mr. MULLINS: Who finished the elevator? Hon. gentlemen opposite were too busy letting contracts all the time they were in office. If many other contracts had not been let all over the country Canada would not be in her present condition, and the hon. member must know that to be a fact. The Conservative party has given the farmers everything possible in the way of freight rates from western Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite harp on the Crowsnest pass agree-

ment, but that does not amount to anything. Manitoba should get back the rates she had prior to 1917, which hon. gentlemen opposite took away. What were they doing from 1922 to 1930; were they asleep at the switch? Those rates, which were forty per cent less than the present rates, belong to Manitoba. Manitoba enjoyed those low freight rates from 1901 to 1917; the Conservative party then in power in Manitoba, which brought in those rates, saved millions of dollars to that province but hon. gentlemen opposite do not give us a bit of credit. They are not fair enough to do so. I am big enough to give them credit for anything they may have done to help the west. I am more interested in moving live stock and grain from western Canada than I am in holding this seat.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Why not resign?

Mr. MULLINS: I would resign to-morrow if by doing so I could bring about a cheaper freight rate in the west. I want those farmers to get their commodities to the markets of the world as cheaply as possible; that is my primary object in this house, and I know that at present they cannot get their products to the markets of the world at anything like a decent figure. I do not want to waste eight years in this house, as hon. gentlemen opposite did, without getting lower rates.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MULLINS: Mr. Speaker, when the house took recess at six o'clock I was discussing the shipping bill as it would affect freight structures. During the recess I have studied every part of the bill and I cannot see that the western farmers are other than safeguarded in every detail. If I thought for one moment that anything would be done to make freight rates higher, I would not support the bill.

Before I proceed, may I be permitted to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Charters). I notice a splendid bouquet on his desk and I know what it means.

Mr. DUPUIS: With permission of my hon. friend, I would like to second him in his congratulations.

Mr. MULLINS: I listened with a great deal of attention and interest to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown). I have known the hon. member for many years but I wonder if he is sincere when he refuses to support this bill. Has he a sincere regard for the farmers who have to struggle and pay tribute in the way of high freight rates. What did the hon. gentleman do down through the years to have those freight rates reduced? I cannot see that he has done anything to help the farmers of western Canada obtain a reduction in freight rates. When I look over the Liberal platform with its fourteen points I cannot find anything which will help the farmers to obtain any redress. It is the same old song and the same old chorus. The farmer can go on working and slaving on the land, he can continue to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water, and he will never find one bit of assistance in this platform.

Mr. BROWN: I guarantee that I can hew more wood and draw more water than the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mullins).

Mr. MULLINS: The hon. member is a faithful follower of the Liberal party. I do not find any fault in that because if he is faithful, he will stand true to his party. There is not one word in this Liberal platform about a reduction in freight rates. The hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly) throws up his hands and speaks against the provisions of this bill. I wonder if he has noticed that there is not one word about a reduction of freight rates in the Liberal platform. You cannot succeed in the west with the present freight structure. It costs 70 per cent to ship lumber to the prairies. The mill gets 30 per cent but the railway company takes 70 per cent. Under the old agreement which I had the honour and pleasure of helping to put into force, things were different. It was the Conservative party that brought about this agreement, and I think I told the house something about it when I was speaking previously. I looked up the terms of this agreement and I would like to put certain particulars on Hansard so that the hon. member for Lisgar can look them over at his leisure.

The Manitoba agreement with the Canadian Northern was dated February 11, 1901. The appeal should have been taken to the Court of King's Bench before it was taken away. Compared with the Crowsnest rates, the Manitoba agreement lowered the rates on grain four cents per hundred pounds from all points in Manitoba to Fort William or Port Arthur. I hope the hon. member gets the significance of that reduction of four cents per hundred pounds. There was a reduction of

fifteen per cent in the rates on general merchandise from Fort William and Port Arthur to all points in Manitoba and from all points in Manitoba to Fort William and Port Arthur. The Crowsnest pass contract applied only to a limited number of commodities and in a limited territory. It applied to commodities moving in one direction only, while the Manitoba contract covered movements from all points in Manitoba to the east, west, north and south. The Manitoba contract controlled both express and passenger rates. On October 6, 1903, an agreement was reached with the Canadian Pacific Railway covering uniform rates from all points in Manitoba to Fort William and from Fort William to all points in Manitoba. This company filed their tariff for reduced rates with the railway commission on October 7, 1903. The manitoba contract remained in force until March, 1918, when it was overridden by the War Measures Act. In 1919 subsection 5 of section 325 of the Railway Act was passed in an endeavour to override the Manitoba contract. This subsection was to remain in force for three years. In June, 1922, an amendment was passed by which the subsection was to remain in effect until July 6, 1923, and it was continued in force for a period of one year by order of the governor in council. The Crowsnest pass rates were never taken into account after the Manitoba contract came into force in 1901. The Manitoba contract was taken as a guide for everything. This contract saved western Canada $100,000,000, and it was brought into being by the Conservative party with which hon. gentlemen opposite find so much fault.

Hon. gentlemen opposite should not object to keeping out American boats, especially when we have sufficient Canadian bottoms. A few years ago they sold a number of boats to a lot of grain men at a ridiculously low figure. I am surprised that they should find fault with this bill and want these American bottoms to come in when they put practically a whole fleet of boats on the lakes for which they had paid millions of dollars. The Liberal government built these boats and sold fifteen of them to their friends, those boats are in operation—boats that cost nearly $1,000,000 apiece were sold for the paltry sum of $50,000 each. I know one good, staunch Liberal friend who bought four and he still has them in operation on the lakes. Surely when so many of my hon. friends' friends have these boats, they will not be so strong in opposition to them.

Ten days after that contract between the government and the Canadian Northern Railway had been signed, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made the government of Manitoba the following offer:

> That if the Manitoba government would assign to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the contract as made with the Northern Pacific Railway Company ten days previously, the Canadian Pacific would assume all the rental charges and put into force as well a reduction of grain and flour rates of four cents per 100 pounds below the Crowsnest pass rate, together with reduction on other commodities, from points in Manitoba to Fort William for the term of the lease as made with the Northern Pacific Railway Company for 999 years.

That was a business government that made a business deal and got for western Canada cheap rates that the people there enjoyed over the years they did, thus saving to the province nearly $100,000,000. This government is bringing in just such another bill involving just such another transaction with the lake shippers, and I believe it will save millions to western Canada and give our shipping interests a chance. We have control; we can cancel at any time, and I do not see why hon. gentlemen opposite are so frightened when those conditions are inserted in the bill.

It was not my intention to speak on the matter, but I felt it my duty to do so when I listened to hon. gentlemen and know and realize how unfair they are to this side of the house, giving us no credit for anything we endeavour to do to save the agricultural industry and the situation in general. As a member I am and have been very much concerned about conditions of agriculture on the western prairies. As regards unemployment and agriculture, far be it from me to do anything that would be detrimental to the man who is struggling on the land. Is there a man on the opposite side who has given the government credit for introducing the stabilization fund? I have heard nothing but fault-finding speeches from that side of the house. When my faith is shaken, hon. members will hear from me strongly from this side, but I have every faith that this shipping legislation will be carried out satisfactorily, and as for all the little, narrow points hon. members opposite are bringing up in connection with it, they are only drawing a red herring across the trail.

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I rise, for more reasons than one, to oppose the bill which is now before the house. Representing as I do an agricultural riding in western Canada, one that is predominantly agricultural in complexion, I cannot see legislation of this kind go through the house without opposing it.

In doing so I am, as I understand the situation, taking the viewpoint of the majority of the people in the three western provinces. I feel that I am taking the stand that every farmer or tiller of the soil in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta would wish me to take. I might except some of the Conservative members from western Canada who have said already in this chamber that they are not going to oppose the bill but that they are prepared to support legislation of this nature. That would be about the only exception that I could make in what I am saying in regard to the bill now before the house. I therefore leave those hon. members on the government side of the house who represent constituencies in the three western provinces to speak for themselves.

The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson) this afternoon spoke about certain shipping injustices. If this legislation did not go through, he was pitying the Canadian shippers, ship owners, masters, mates and all those who go down to the sea in ships. Beyond mentioning the injustices to the interests I have named, I did not hear the hon. member say anything about injustices suffered by western farmers in connection with legislation of this kind. The hon. member also said that this bill ought to have been before the house years ago; that it was a belated piece of legislation. I inferred from his remarks that during the past decade or so the gathering storm on behalf of this bill had been growing greater and greater until it had to burst forth. It is a peculiar thing that the storm that has been gathering in order to put this bill through has gathered the velocity and momentum it has during the period a Conservative government has been in power. If the storm were gathering a few years ago, it did not break forth, or if it did do so in any measure, it did not have any effect; it did not get very far; nothing was done; but, as I understand the matter, the Liberal government of the day, if representations were made to it on behalf of legislation of this nature, took the position that it could not be carried out seeing the expense had to be paid largely by agriculture.

The hon. member—and I am still speaking of the hon. member for East Simcoe and I want to quote him fairly—said that he was supporting this bill because it was going to help employment, to relieve unemployment. If we are going to support the bill to relieve unemployment or to help employment and the legislation is going to boost prices, I cannot see, in the last analysis, that it will help employment very much; on the contrary, it will create more farm unemployment. But if we are going to help employment in Canada, there is a very good way of doing it. If we want unemployment to disappear; if we want the activities of the Canadian people in the way of industry and commerce to grow apace, there are many things that ought to be done entirely apart from a measure of this kind. This legislation will not meet the situation at all. We ought to lower our tariff walls. That would help to relieve unemployment. We ought to organize and effect commercial treaties with every nation in the world. We ought to have as our objective international trade, not any narrow insular ideas in regard to building up Canadian trade and commerce. Clearly we ought to remove all restrictions on trade, thereby giving international business an opportunity to function. If these things were done, commerce would flourish, business would increase and unemployment would disappear, and there is no way by which it can disappear except by taking action along these lines. To talk of relieving unemployment by putting through a measure of this kind is to talk the veriest nonsense.

The same hon. member this afternoon said that the Americans had adopted legislation something like this and that we ought to follow their example. The idea of tit for tat in international relations and in formulating a national policy is not sound procedure. Surely we have reached the stage in the history of this government when its supporters will not stand up and say: Our policy must be dictated from Washington. They told us a few years ago that the Liberal policy was dictated from Washington. That was not true, and I hope it will not be true of any government in Canada that its policy will be directed from Washington. So I see little merit in an argument of that kind. They say that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Even if it is, I would hesitate to imitate the Americans in any policy that was going to be of doubtful benefit to Canada.

I do not think this measure will get us very far on the road to relieving unemployment or building up a sound national spirit. I would suggest to the hon. member that if we want to develop the shipping business in this country, we might take off the 25 per cent duty which ships must pay to get into this country after they are built. Instead of loading the dice against them, let them come in free and give them a chance to function profitably. Then there would be no necessity for legislation of this kind.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) mentioned, and I want to quote him as fairly

as possible, the Hudson Bay railway, the Vancouver route, the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence waterway, and he said: There in those routes you have the means for competition to keep down rates. I would not say that of any of those routes. I would not like to use the Hudson Bay railway as an argument for establishing a shipping monopoly in Canada and then after it is established say: Well, we have the Hudson Bay route to make the monopoly of none effect. I think it would be far better for us in adopting a policy of this kind to put no confidence in any regulating body whatsoever. My policy would be this. I would say that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and rather than regulate a monopoly after you have created it, rather than control a merger after you have brought it into existence I would say have nothing to do with either from the start. Prevent the thing right from the beginning, and then you will not have to correct it, will you? You will not have to regulate it, will you? You will not have to control it, will you? The answer is self-evident. Briefly, see that no merger or monopoly takes place, and then your argument for regulation and control disappears, as it ought to disappear, because such a monopoly would endanger the very foundation of the agricultural industry of Canada.

Another member this afternoon—I do not remember who it was—brought the question of the Hudson Bay route into this debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to give the party opposite some credit for helping with the Hudson Bay route. I am not going to be small enough to get up and say that the Liberals ought to take one hundred per cent credit for it. I think we ought all to be first-class Canadians and give each other credit where credit is due in a proposition of this kind. But I should like to draw attention to the fact that the contract for the Hudson Bay railway was let by a Liberal government, and by a Liberal Minister of Railways in 1911. What took place between 1911 and 1914? Was anything done in connection with the Hudson Bay railway? Nothing. And a Tory government was in power during those years. Then why mention the Hudson Bay railway? What was done from 1914 to 1921? Nothing whatever.

Mr. ARTHURS: There was a war on.

Mr. McINTOSH: That is no argument. The road was left in disrepair and public opinion in certain parts of Canada was being built up against the route. The steel was left to rot to a certain extent, and no advance step was taken in the matter from 1914 to 1921.

What resulted after 1921, when the Liberals came into power? We know what took place. The Liberals, as I said, in the first place let the contract for the railway. It was they who began the railway. You have to begin a thing before you finish it, haven't you? There is no use taking credit for finishing a railway and claiming credit for everything about it just because you finished it, because if it had never been started you would never have had it to finish. So from 1921 to 1930 the Liberals went forward with the Hudson Bay railway, and I am here to say that every member from the province of Quebec sitting on the government side of the house from 1921 to 1930 gave fair support to that undertaking. They were with the Liberal party in the prosecution of the great enterprise, and they did not oppose any money vote in this house for the purposes of that railway. Consequently no man can say that Quebec as a province opposed the Hudson Bay railway. It is a sound national policy, and any argument to the effect that any minister or any member from the province of Quebec went out of his way to oppose that road is not borne out by the facts of the case.

More than that, when the Conservatives did push the road onward, where did they push it? To Port Nelson, to the wrong port, and we had to correct that blunder and to put the terminus at Churchill, where the road ought to go, and where it did go. With these few remarks I shall leave the Hudson Bay railway.

The essence of the bill which is before the house will be found in section 935 which reads:

1. No goods shall be transported by water or by land and water, from one place in Canada to another place in Canada, either directly or by way of a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation in any ship other than a British ship.

2. No ship other than a British ship shall transport passengers from one place in Canada to another place in Canada either directly or by way of a foreign port.

That is the essence of the bill, as I understand it. As I see it the objective of the bill is to hand Canadian shipping to Canadian bottoms or to Canadian ships. That principle is all right; I am not going to quarrel with it. I think it is sound, if it can be done without too great a cost to any industry in Canada. If it can be done without great cost to western agriculture, it is sound; otherwise it is not. That is the angle of the question I wish to approach. But if this cannot be done, what

are you doing? You are applying to the shipping interests of Canada the principle of Canada first, the principle of economic nationalism, the principle of a narrow, self-sufficient Canadianism which is directly the opposite of an internationalism which to a very great degree must dominate the minds of Canadian statesmen, if we are going to get anywhere in national and international affairs.

It is because the bill is wholly in favour of what might be termed a narrow nationalism and wholly contrary to what you might term a sound internationalism that I think it ought to be opposed. What are we doing to-day? We are trying to build up a new ideal of internationalism by way of disarmaments, settlement of international debts, and adjustments of tariffs and trade. Therefore anything which will prejudice a sound internationalism on the part of any government in Canada ought to be opposed, because it will help only to bring failure agriculturally and otherwise when we attend international gatherings and when we put forward the viewpoint which we as Canadians ought to express.

Further, some of the speakers were in doubt about the bill having the effect of increasing or boosting the rates. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not much doubt about it. I am not doubting. I do not think a man ought to be a doubting Thomas in a case of this kind. I am afraid the increase in prices will be such a grim reality that there will be no room for doubt. I am afraid that this price boosting under a new shipping combination will be a reality. Therefore as a western member I must oppose it.

May I say I did not like the way this bill was introduced to the house. It came in a roundabout manner. It came in an indirect manner—in an irresponsible manner. It came from the Senate. A bill of this kind should not come from the Senate, but in the first instance should come before this House of Commons. Any representations to be made on behalf of Canadian shipping interests, on behalf of industry or on behalf of agriculture should be made before a committee of the House of Commons, not before a committee of the Senate. This bill was introduced in the wrong way, just as the railway bill was introduced in the wrong way. For that reason I opposed the railway bill—at least that was one reason. I oppose this legislation for the same reason.

Further than that, dealing with a matter of this kind the Senate will do a certain amount of work, will hear certain representations, and will begin to frame a piece of legislation. Then when the Commons get it we find it is altogether wrong, ill-constructed, and the time of the house is taken up in undoing what the Senate has done. Therefore I say that to make progress, to get on sound ground, to give every one a chance to make representations and to have the bill properly drawn up in the first instance it should have been brought before the House of Commons, and should not have been presented to the Senate until the House of Commons was through with it. Sound democracy demands procedure of this kind.

Let me congratulate the minister upon his plausible defence of this measure. I always appreciate hearing him speak, and if I am opposing this measure I should like it understood that I am not opposing the minister. I believe him to be one of the most competent and most courteous men in the House of Commons. Therefore I do not wish him to think there is anything personal in my opposition to this measure. The Minister referred to legislation dealing with other subjects, such as the appointment of inspectors of ships' tackle, regulations for protecting workers against accidents while loading or unloading ships, powers of inspectors in connection with an order for cessation of loading or unloading, marking of heavy packages or objects, regulations respecting grain cargoes and deck cargoes, and, lastly, pilotage and lighting facilities for loading ships. All these are worthy parts of the measure. I say they ought not to have been mixed with the other parts of the bill. A different bill ought to have been brought down. However, since a bill containing these worth while measures has not been brought down, there is nothing for us to do but to oppose the whole measure. If we oppose the measure we are not necessarily opposing those goodly things which form a part of it, but are opposing it because we have to object to the main portion of it—the transportation of goods and passengers.

The minister stated the legislation was to nurture Canadian shipping interests. From that I would understand it is to improve Canadian shipping, to build it up, to make it strong and to give it more power. We are going to give it more power by framing legislation which will make comparatively easy the building up of a shipping trust, and as a result of this nurturing there will come into being a real shipping combination. This nurturing policy will of course take care of the capital structure of any shipping trust. The costs of every ship owner will be included in

the rate structure, and every care will be taken to see that so far as ship owners are concerned the capital structure is sound, that it will bring forth a profit and that it will pay. If it pays it will do so at the expense of the farmers. In such legislation as this I should like to ask where the farmers' interests come in. Who is looking after the farmers' costs and his capital structure? Under a high tariff government his capital costs have gone up; the production of a bushel of wheat costs more than ever. If you add to his costs by building a shipping merger he will be worse off than ever. I fail to see how any western member can stand in this House of Commons and vote for this measure.

Just to show what is going on, and to show the cost of carrying a bushel of wheat from the head of the lakes to Georgian bay ports, to Port Colborne and to Buffalo, let me quote the figures for the year 1930. For 1930 the average cost of carrying a bushel of wheat to Georgian bay ports was 2·5 cents; to Port Colborne 2·41; to Buffalo 1·92. You will notice the rate to Buffalo is away below that to the other two ports. In 1931 the average rate to Georgian bay ports was 1·84, to Port Colborne 1·89 and to Buffalo 1·65. Again the rate to Buffalo is below the average to Port Colborne or the Georgian bay ports. For 1932 the average to Georgian bay ports was 2·8, to Port Colborne 2·2 and to Buffalo 1·55. So for these years the Buffalo rate was lower than that to Port Colborne or the Georgian bay ports. There you have the situation as plain as it can be put. With Buffalo an open shipping point, a storage point and a transfer point, we have lower rates to that port than to Port Colborne or Georgian bay. If by legislation we practically close Buffalo, if we say to our Canadian ships: You must carry all the grain from one Canadian port to another, then we practically eliminate Buffalo as a competing factor, and only one result will follow; the cost of carrying wheat will go up, and the western farmers will have to pay, pay!

I must say that this is the most inopportune time in the history of Canada to bring in legislation of this kind. We are in the midst of a world depression, the farmers are carrying on under the greatest difficulty, they need every cent they can get to enable them to live, they are unable to pay their taxes because the cost of production is away above the price they are getting. Being in such a predicament, I would say that such legislation would far better have been left to another time and not brought before this parliament without the most thoughtful consideration. Farming to-day in this country, is in a worse position than it has been in for fifty years, and this is no time to bring in legislation as to the result of which there is even a doubt as to its helping the farmer. I think this legislation will do every farmer great injury and perhaps be the means of bringing to bankruptcy numbers of western farmers. For these reasons and many others I stand up to oppose this measure, and I hope the government will act wisely and withdraw it. If however the government presses it to a vote I hope all the members from western ridings will have the courage to oppose it, even if it means voting against their own party.

Mr. OSCAR L. BOULANGER (Bellechasse) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief in my remarks. I may state that I was greatly tempted to cast my vote in favour of the bill, and I would have done so, had the principle on which the bill is founded been frankly and entirely applied. I think it is of national import to limit the transportation of Canadian goods to Canadian ships and railways, and this, through Canadian ports. All should agree on this policy. This provision, morever, seems to be embodied in the merchant marine laws of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and in those of most of the countries of the world. There should be therefore, no objection to that principle being embodied in the Merchant Marine Act of Canada. Unfortunately, sir, it is not that policy which is applied in the bill under discussion. The reserve made is not to the advantage of Canadian ships. And, I repeat it, if the bill restricted the transportation of Canadian goods, between Canadian ports, to Canadian ships only, I would support the bill. According to the bill, this reserve is made not in favour of Canadian ships but in favour of British ships, namely English, New Zealand, Australian and South African ships, etc., etc.

Well, sir, as between the two sources of competition, I consider that the one which Canadian ships will have to meet from British ships will be just as injurious to our trade as that of the United States ships. The principle is the same.

I am aware that it will be contended that in practice there is very little danger that British ships will cross over to compete with Canadian ships on the Great Lakes. I readily admit that the danger is remote, however, this does not alter the principle. Moreover, if the danger of this competition does not exist for the Great Lakes, it does for the Pacific coast, because, at present, Canadian shipowners and seamen complain of

the competition waged there in coastal trade by British ships and seamen. If the policy of "Canada First" is to be applied, let it be applied frankly and completely and, let it be stated in the Canadian Merchant Marine Act that the transportation of Canadian goods is entirely restricted to Canadian ships. It is not sufficient to suppress the competition from which Canada suffers on the part of United States ships; let us do the thing thoroughly and suppress all competition from whatever country it may arise.

I stated a moment ago that Canadian ship owners on the Pacific coast complain of the competition waged in the coastal trade by British ships. I have before me a telegram which I want to read to the house before closing my remarks. This telegram was sent to me on May 16 by Mr. C. M. Woodworth, one of my friends in Vancouver, also a prominent lawyer in that city. It is as follows:

J. O. L. Boulanger, K.C., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Canadian shipowners, seamen, engineers and officers have waited on me and strenuously object passage sections nine thirty two, nine thirty five Bill C one Canada's coastal trade must be reserved to Canadians described above.

(sgd) C. M. Woodworth.

I therefore repeat, sir, that I would support the bill if the principle on which it is founded applied to every country. However, as the bill affects United States ships and affords no protection to Canadian ships against the competition by other nations, I shall vote against it.

Mr. J. T. SIMPSON (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the shipping act now under discussion provides for Canadian shipping the same protection as the United States gives to United States shipping. All the arguments that I have heard against this bill, and I have paid particular attention to the debate, were very effectively answered at a previous session of the house by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens). The hon. member for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly) this afternoon made some criticism about this bill being introduced at this time; he said it was too late in the session. I would like to point out that this bill, or one somewhat similar to it, was introduced on May 6, 1932, but was not proceeded with at that time. It is now some two or three weeks since the bill was introduced in the Senate, and ample time was given

hon. members as well as the public generally to become acquainted with its contents and to make any objections they thought should be made.

The hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh), who spoke a few moments ago, said that two sections of the bill should have been left out but that he was in perfect accord with the other sections. I suppose it would be difficult to frame a bill that would please everyone, and it is the privilege of the hon. gentleman to oppose the bill or any section of it if he thinks that should be done.

The first Canadian coasting law was enacted in 1870. Prior to that time the Imperial Shipping Act and Customs Act regulated Canadian shipping, but in that year the Canada Shipping Act was passed, providing in one section that no goods or passengers should be carried from one port in Canada to another except in British ships. That section has been in every shipping act up to the present time, though it has been changed and modified by certain orders in council. Section 958 of the act of 1870 provided:

—the foregoing provisions of this act shall not apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country, and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place to another in such country.

That power of suspension was vested in the governor in council, and this provision remained in our shipping act until 1923, when section 958 was inserted, reading as follows:

The governor in council may, from time to time, by order in council declare that the foregoing provisions of this part shall not, for the period specified in such order in council, apply, either throughout Canada or in any specified waters of Canada, to the ships or vessels, or to any specified, ascertained or ascertainable class or number of the ships or vessels, of any foreign country.

This amendment extended the powers of suspension to cover ships or vessels of any foreign country, thereby giving the United States fleet on the great lakes an opportunity to compete with the Canadian fleet.

The first elevator at the head of the lakes was built and put into operation in 1884. Since that time the elevator capacity has been increased to meet the demand brought by the development of grain growing in the west. In 1911 the elevator capacity at the head of the lakes amounted to 26,000,000 bushels, while in 1931 it amounted to 91,000,000 bushels. The elevators on the lower lake and bay ports as well as on the St. Lawrence have been increased accordingly. In 1928 we had the largest movement of wheat from the head of

the lakes that has ever taken place; in that year 404,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat came down the lakes, together with 185,000,000 bushels of United States wheat. That was the peak year; that figure has not been reached before or since. Owing to greater wheat production and in order to get away from the long haul eastward from Alberta the port of Vancouver was developed. In 1923 we shipped 25,000,000 bushels of wheat through that port, while in 1932 that figure increased to 104,000,000 bushels; thus in nine years the amount of wheat shipped through Vancouver was quadrupled. Now the Hudson Bay route will become a factor in the handling of Canada's wheat. I do not think it necessary at this time to go into the history of the establishment of these routes by the different governments that have been in office during the last twenty-five years.

Some mention has been made of the increase in freight rates in 1922, when the rates went higher than they ever had been previously. In 1922 there was a coal strike in the United States, which was settled in the fall of that year. Then there arose a great demand for the transportation of coal from United States to Canadian ports as well as to other United States ports at the head of the lakes, and there was more money for the shipping companies in the transportation of coal than in the transportation of wheat. The grain trade had contracted for a large amount of ocean space; they were unable to get the wheat east to occupy that space, so they offered increased rates in order to induce the shipping companies to carry wheat instead of coal. In 1922 the tonnage carried on the great lakes was nothing like the tonnage carried to-day, but at present there is sufficient tonnage to carry the grain from the head of the lakes, and there is no danger of the rates being increased or of a monopoly or combine being created among the shipping companies.

The other evening the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Bowman) referred to the evidence submitted to the Senate committee which dealt with this act; he quoted from the evidence of Mr. Bredt, who appeared before that committee, and who stated that there was no possibility of an increase in grain rates from the head of the lakes. Mr. Sydney Smith also stated that the fear of an increase in freight rates was only a bogy, and that it had no foundation in fact. Besides, there are the provisions of the Inland Water Freight Rates Act. It has also been pointed out during the debate that the board of grain commissioners has power to fix a maximum rate for the carrying of grain from the head of the lakes.

I think it was in the month of May of last year that two cargoes of wheat were carried from the head of the lakes at the rate of three and a half cents per bushel. That was a distress rate; no shipping company engaged in the business of carrying wheat can do it at that price. It happened that one or two boats had taken cargoes to the head of the lakes; they had to return and there were no cargoes offering on their return, which meant their having to lay up for the rest of the season. In order to make expenses on the way back they contracted to carry grain at this rate. I do not think my statement will be contradicted when I say that not a fraction of this saving in freight rates went back into the pockets of the grain growers. The total difference between the normal and this special rate went into the pockets of the grain dealers.

The price quoted to the western farmer is for wheat delivered at the head of the lakes, and from the head of the lakes to the place where the wheat is consumed there is an average freight charge. The price paid to the producer is based on the Fort William price plus the freight charge to the place of consumption. Any reductions in rates, such as those I have mentioned, do not benefit the producer in any way.

The statement has been made during this debate that a number of the Canadian grain boats are obsolete. I know for a fact that during the last two or three years some of the most recently built grain boats have not been put into commission because of a scarcity of cargoes. This has happened while cargoes have been carried by United States boats. It seems to me that Canadian shipping interests should be protected by the passing of this bill. If this bill is put into effect it will mean that employment will be given to many men who have learned the art of sailing and who are qualified to fill the positions on these boats. If Canadian shipping is protected it will add very materially to employment. A number of the steamship companies have boats lying idle which could handle all the Canadian grain from the head of the lakes. Among these companies are the Paterson Steamships Limited, Canada Steamship Lines Limited, Mathews Steamship Company, and others. There are besides many individual ship owners. To my mind this trade should be preserved for Canadian ships. I should like to quote from a letter of the Paterson

Steamships Limited dated March 22, 1932, as follows:

During 1930 our steamers Fort Willdoc and Windoc did not operate at all, thus, employment was lost to 46 men, being 23 men per vessel.

We are listing the following vessels with the time lost by men, who would otherwise have ben employed on these vessels. We figure that their total employment, if working throughout the season, is nine months.

1930

Steamer	Operating time	Time lost
Vandoc	20 days	8 months
Soodoc	1 month	8 months
Canadoc	20 days	8 months
Saskadoc	60 days	7 months
Bricoldoc	60 days	7 months
Ontadoc	90 days	6 months

1931

Fort Willdoc	No operation	
Windoc	No operation	
Vandoc	No operation	
Soodoc	No operation	
Canadoc	1 month	8 months
Saskadoc	2 months	7 months
Bricoldoc	1 month	8 months
Ontadoc	10 days	Practically 9 months

Our other three upper lakers were operated throughout the seasons but on two or three occasions they were laid up for as long as fifteen days at a time, and, needless to say, no crew were kept on them during these lay-up periods but we cannot give you the time lost by the men.

It will be seen that in the case of this one steamship company a very large number of men might have been employed if the business of carrying wheat from the head of the lakes had been kept for Canadian steamship companies. To my mind the competition between these different companies will prevent any increase in freight rates; and besides there are the provisions of the Inland Water Freight Rates Act.

There is another governing factor in the power of the board of grain commissioners to fix a maximum rate for the carriage of wheat. I feel quite sure that if this bill is passed there will be no increase in freight rates from the head of the lakes. I know something of the cost of producing grain and other farm commodities and I know that the producer, as has been stated in this debate, is entitled to every cent which can be got out of his product. However, I feel that in the interests of Canada as a whole no sacrifice would be made by any class through the passing of this bill. I intend to give it my very hearty support.

[Mr. Simpson.]

Mr. W. J. LOUCKS (Rosetown): Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken part in this debate if the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) had not challenged me last evening. I want to make clear to the house that if I thought the passing of this bill would mean an increase in the freight rates to the farmer, I certainly would oppose it. I should like to say to the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) that there would be no hesitancy or lack of courage in my action; I would oppose the bill. But I think I speak for Saskatchewan members on this side of the house when I say that because I feel assured now that we shall not be exploited in rates and for other reasons that I shall mention, I am prepared to support the bill.

When I spoke on the budget I read a resolution from the town in which I live and I mentioned that some two hundred farmers who were at the meeting at which the resolution was passed asked me to bring it before this chamber, requesting the federal government to introduce legislation whereby we might preserve the identity of our wheat. To my mind there is nothing that will accomplish this better than the legislation which is now before us. There is a strong feeling throughout my part of the country, and in fact throughout the west, especially in Saskatchewan, that our wheat loses its identity when it goes through United States ports. In other words, our wheat is blended with an inferior grain and when it reaches the British or a foreign market, it is inferior to Canadian wheat. I am more convinced than ever of this, and perhaps I have the right to speak, because hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon mentioned the impossibility of keeping our wheat from being blended with United States wheat when it reached Buffalo. If that be the case, I think we are more than justified in seeing that the major portion of our wheat should go through Canadian ports.

I have other reasons for supporting this bill. When I read in Hansard to-night some of the statistics given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) indicating that for some years an average of over fifty per cent of our wheat had been going through United States ports in United States bottoms, there is enough of good Canadian in me yet that I would like to see a little more of our wheat going through our own ports, especially when I am assured that no additional burden will thereby be imposed upon the farmers of western Canada. When I compare the rates for the last number of years and see that we had a rate as high as ten cents and an average of

eight cents for a few years, in fact having to go to 1932 before it came down to five cents and a fraction, and when I am assured that there will be a maximum rate of six and a half cents, this appears to me to be a better policy than to take a chance on the rate going up to ten cents, which would be possible, as it has done in the past. Therefore as a farmer and representing a rural constituency I rise to justify my action in supporting this bill.

I do not like and am not going to criticize hon. members opposite. This is a chamber for free speech. They may be sincere in what they are saying, but when the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) was speaking, a few ideas passed through my mind. He has for a number of years been an agitator in favour of a Canadian flag; he wants a Canadian flag, but now he apparently does not wish to see Canadian vessels get the support they should from their own country; he is more concerned to see that our wheat coming down the great lakes goes through United States ports. I confess I cannot understand the psychology of the hon. gentleman. When the question is one of supporting our own shipping facilities and our own ports, I feel quite justified in my action and as I said to the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young), I am not concerned when I declare my stand on this question because I know the sentiments of the farmers in my constituency. I do not know that they are so very different from those in the constituency he represents, but I know there is a strong agitation that something should be done to preserve the identity of our wheat, because there is a feeling that we have lost, as I have already stated, millions of dollars through our wheat leaving Canada through United States ports and being blended with inferior wheat. I am still more firmly convinced that I am right from the fact that the British government, when they granted the preference of six cents, took exception to our wheat being rebilled through United States ports. That shows there is some ground for my contention that our wheat should not be blended.

I do not know why hon. gentlemen opposite should be so doubtful of this bill when we are assured by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce that should anything happen, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said in reply, I think, to the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote), it would not take weeks and months to change the measure; that it could be done overnight. If that be so, why should we worry this evening? Why not give our own ports and our own shipping interests a chance? If the privileges granted are abused, I assure the house that I shall be the first to rise and voice my opposition.

I have always been led to believe that volume counts, and it seems to me that if we could turn 100,000,000 bushels of wheat through our own shipping facilities, we might get a lower rate. Volume does count. Again I say I am justified in asking that this measure be given trial.

The criticism has been made that this measure should have been introduced long before this, but we have now had ample time to discuss it. I did not intend to speak upon it, but I want to assure the house, and particularly hon. gentlemen opposite, that all farmers are not thinking in exactly the same terms as they are, according to some of the former speakers. The farmers of a goodly portion of Saskatchewan believe they have been losing a great deal of money because our wheat has not been going through our own ports but has been shipped through United States ports and blended with inferior grain. I only wish to declare that I have no hesitancy whatever in supporting the bill.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Melville): Mr. Speaker, I had intended remaining quiet because I did not think it necessary to advance any arguments why we from the west should oppose this bill by both vote and voice, but when my good friend the hon. member for Rosetown (Mr. Loucks) capped the whole climax this evening by saying that he was prepared to support this legislation, I had to rise and congratulate him on his loyalty to his party rather than to his electors. What are the good farmers of his riding whom he has been willing to sacrifice on account of his loyalty to his party, going to think when the rates go up?—because when you restrict the shipping the rates will go up. The hon. member is apparently prepared to take that chance; I do not know whether he has many chances to take or can afford to take many of them, but that will be discovered later. There is only one thing lacking to make this scene complete and that is for the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) to rise and speak likewise. These two hon. gentlemen are, I think, the most loyal supporters that the government have in the house; in season and out, on every question conceivable, they have always stood up faithfully for their side. A measure of pride may be taken in such an attitude. When they go as far as that, putting their heads in a noose and sacrificing the interests of their constituents, they are overdoing a good thing, as I believe they are in this instance. I think I see the hon. member for Rosetown going

up and down the highways and byways of his constituency trying to explain what a delightful thing it is to have a monopoly of shipping on the great lakes.

Mr. LOUCKS: It will be an easy matter for me to explain.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If he chooses to take that attitude, I have been in the house for some years and in the west for longer and my hon. friend is the first farmer to get up and brazenly and openly advocate what the government is going to do to-night. This is a government of agricultural folly. I do not think, since they came into office, there is anything under heaven they have missed making a fool of, especially as affecting agriculture. If there is a chance to give agriculture a knock behind the ears or in any other fatal spot, they get after it with a club. One more coddling of the big fellow, and one more swatting of the little fellow—that is what it is. This is not a new question, Mr. Speaker. It was before the house many times when the Liberals were in power. The Minister of Marine in this government had it up last year in a somewhat halting, hesitating fashion. I do not think he knew what it was all about himself. It might have been some story of Adam and Eve for all he knew. He did not seem to possess any knowledge of it, and at last he rather reluctantly retired from the scene of action with his bill and left it till to-day to bring it up again.

I wonder if this is one more source for replenishing the war chest. I am wondering, in my innocence, what all these trusts mean, and how much there is in it for the boys. Does the hon. member for Rosetown figure he can take a chance on losing a few votes, by reason of what he will acquire by having access to a plenteous war chest?

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit that it is not within the right of any hon. member to suggest that another hon. member is expecting to overcome a possible loss of votes by his access to a war chest. I submit that it is not competent for any hon. member to suggest any such thing.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think it is out of order at all, Mr. Speaker, but I will be quite accommodating and—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Sullivan): I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will apply the same remarks to the sugar trust, which is in exactly the same category, and then, to save time, withdraw for both.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Mr. SPOTTON: Getting old enough to know better.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Although, Mr. Speaker, if I cared to enter into an argument I do not think I was out of order. I suppose I cannot say anything about cream separators or barbed wire or anything of that nature.

I should like to say a word about the attitude of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Mullins). There is another loyal old scout. There is one thing I do like about him. No matter how hopeless the debate may be for the government, the hon. member for Marquette always nicks in, and when you would naturally expect all the government supporters to hide their faces behind the curtains the hon. member for Marquette always shoots up in the government's defence. But there was one night last week when he did not. I thought he was about to expire. He did not even clap his hands or endorse the government's policy on that occasion by any vocal noise he was capable of making. He simply sat silent. I forget just what the occasion was but I think it was the salary grab for the chairman of the tariff board. There were so many events last week that I could scarcely distinguish them, but at any rate one was almost too much for the hon. member for Marquette to swallow. I suppose other hon. gentlemen sitting opposite have swallowed so many, so much, that their larynxes have become so distended that they are capable of taking down almost anything without a wink; and so with this bill. I think we shall have to be forgiving towards them. I did not think that you would ever find a full-fledged protectionist from western Canada on either side of the house who would support this shipping bill, but here are members from the west sitting opposite supporting protection in its most vicious form. I wonder what the hon. member for Rosetown's predecessor would have said. Just think of what those votes at some elections mean! The gentleman who preceded the hon. member for Rosetown, Mr. John Evans, was one of the extreme low tariff or indeed absolute free trade men in this house.

Mr. STEVENS: And he was left at home.

Mr. LOUCKS: He pretty nearly lost his deposit over what he said in the last campaign.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Here is his successor taking absolutely the opposite side. It will be interesting to look forward to the next representative for Rosetown.

Mr. LOUCKS: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not see why there should be occasion for calling me to order so frequently.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Sullivan): What is the point of order?

Mr. LOUCKS: I was taking a little exception to some of the things the hon. member for Melville said, and I want to inform him—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Sullivan): That is not a point of order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I conclude with one more remark, and I expect that that will be out of order also: "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

Mr. V. C. PORTEOUS (North Grey): Mr. Speaker, this bill opens up the whole subject of transportation. Many hon. members have referred to steamships as if they were the only means of transportation, but surely they must realize that in times past different governments in this country have frequently given bonuses for the development of transportation facilities so that freight carrying charges might be reduced. We have in times past built docks, done very considerable dredging, and spent a tremendous amount of money on aids to navigation for the sole purpose of eliminating some of the costs of transportation for the benefit of the producer of the commodities transported. The benefit goes back to the farmer and the producer of the products of the forest and of the mine. I have sometimes thought that the assistance given to navigation facilities was not warranted because it meant competition for our railways. In the past large sums of money have been granted to the railways with a view to bringing about cheaper transportation rates, but much more public money has been expended on water transportation than rail transportation. I have sometimes wondered if the large expenditures that have been made on the Welland canal, for instance, did not warrant tolls being charged on the ships passing through, but I realize that that would add to the transportation costs. Many hon. members have presented that phase of the situation in the debate on this bill. They must realize, however, that these vast amounts of public money have been spent in order to lower transportation costs and thereby allow a profit to the producer of the commodities which are shipped.

It is also true that an enormous amount of private money has been invested in shipping facilities such as boats, elevators, and so forth. I wonder if the farmer from western Canada realizes that if it were not for that large amount of private money invested he would be in a much worse position than he is in today. If Canadian capital had not been invested in this country. American shipping would have taken the business and would have tended to create a monopoly; and so I say that the investment of Canadian capital in transportation facilities has increased competition and in that way kept down freight rates. It is also true that numbers of men in eastern Canada are employed on our ships and on harbour work, aids to navigation, and so forth. I do not think that the western farmer will stand in his place and begrudge the sailor or navigator his honest means of livelihood. When we accuse Canadian shipping interests of entering into a monopoly we must remember that we might be faced with a similar monopoly in a foreign country. I do not think any hon. member in the chamber would say that he would trust American interests more than Canadian interests. Therefore I think it wise that these amendments to the shipping act should be passed. If there is a combine we have our Combines Investigation Act with which to effect a remedy, but I do not see how there could possibly be a combine in connection with transportation facilities of this country. Not only have we our own Canadian steamships, operated by many different companies seeking to get business through a competitive system, but we have competition from the railway companies. We have shipping carried through the Panama canal; we have the Hudson Bay route, to which reference has been made. Apart from that, as hon. members have said, the man who has a commodity to sell will find the cheapest channel through which it may pass to reach its port of destination.

If this bill becomes law there will be competition with American ports for a great part of our wheat which is not shipped to the United Kingdom. I do not wish to comment at length, but in my view it is high time that a bill of this kind was put through in order to give our Canadian shippers and those employed in lake shipping an opportunity equal to that enjoyed in the United States. Hon. members will realize that at no time has the United States allowed coastal trade from one American port to another American port by Canadian ships. Why should we not take the same step. I am perfectly convinced that there is sufficient competition to keep down transportation costs. Were I not so convinced I should be inclined to oppose the measure. But, as I have said, transportation is not limited to Canadian steamships. The railways are in competition. It is not limited only to great lakes ports; there is competition from

the ports in the far west and those of the Hudson bay. Further than that, Canadian shipping is in competition with American ports for that portion of the wheat which may be shipped to points outside the United Kingdom.

On the grounds I have stated I have no hesitation in supporting the bill. I am convinced that it will be in the best interests of all concerned, and that it should be passed without delay.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I shall not speak at length, as I have only a few observations to make. First, I should like to answer the objection raised by the hon. members for Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly), Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) to the effect that this bill should not have been introduced at the last minute of the session. That was the expression used by the hon. member for Willow Bunch. Is it necessary to repeat what I said earlier in the debate. These amendments have been before the Senate for over two months; they were embodied in the complete revision of the shipping act. These particular amendments now before us were discussed before the banking and commerce committee of the Senate. Surely the hon. members in this house are familiar with these amendments and their purport.

The second objection of my hon. friends is that the measure should not have originated in the upper house. Why? My answer to that is that hon. members who have read the proceedings of the Senate in regard to this bill, and more particularly the inquiry before the Senate committee, will have to admit that wonderful work was done. Every phase of the matter was thoroughly studied and this work done by the Senate is of considerable assistance to this house. When the hon. member for Willow Bunch suggests that the measure was brought in at this late hour of the session, because we were afraid of the opposition and that we anticipated no objection, on account of the fact that the opposition is tired, I say he is greatly mistaken. This government is not afraid to bring any measure before the house at any time in the session, because this government would submit to this house only measures of public interest and on all such occasions hon. members opposite will have full opportunity for discussion. If this measure was brought down late in the session it is due to the well known fact that the complete revision of the shipping act was abandoned only a few days ago in the Senate. This remedial measure was introduced at this session because its urgency had been clearly demonstrated to the Senate. I think hon. members opposite will admit that they have had ample time for the discussion of this proposed legislation. Many of them have addressed the house. Some have thrown some light on the subject; others have not. As a whole however we had a fair discussion of the bill and I do not think it is fair to criticize on this point.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly all that was said on this measure, nobody denies that Canadian ship owners, Canadian shipbuilders, Canadian elevator owners and Canadian mariners are entitled to fair protection from the administration. They are important groups of citizens, and it is the feeling of this government that they are entitled to fair protection. That being so, and since the American law prohibits the shipping of goods from an American port to another American port either directly or indirectly in a Canadian bottom, it is only fair that our Canadians should receive the same protection. Unless very serious grounds can be urged against it, I submit it is the duty of this government to accord such protection.

The main objection to the bill on the part of my hon. friends opposite is that it will increase freight rates on the great lakes. But my hon. friends did not bring any reasonable proof of their contention in that regard. I do not know on what they rely. In the testimony of those called before the Senate committee to oppose the bill there is nothing that would justify the contention that rates would be increased as a result of this legislation. Some of my hon. friends say: You are asking the farmers to pay more. My hon. friend from Willow Bunch made that statement. The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) said: You have no right to take one cent more per bushel from the farmers to help the Canadian ship owners. Where do you find any proof of anything of the kind before the Senate committee? Mr. Bredt is practically the only one, apart from Mr. Smith, who was heard in opposition to the proposed legislation, and he could not affirm, as was done in this house by our friends opposite, that the effect of this bill would be to increase the rates. Mr. Bredt was very frank; he was representing the Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba pool organizations. At page 46 he said:

> It is very difficult, of course, to state definitely that it would mean an increase in rates.

You have there the statement of a man who had some responsibility and wanted to be on the safe side. He said he could not

affirm positively that it would mean an increase in rate. He repeated the same thing two or three times. At page 51 Mr. Ballantyne put this question to Mr. Bredt:

Mr. Bredt, if this act went through do you claim it would increase freight rates?
A. There is the danger as we see it. We may be wrong.

Did any member opposite in this house say to-day: "We may be wrong"?

Mr. BROWN: Mr. Bredt is opposed to the bill, nevertheless.

Mr. RYCKMAN: That makes it all the stronger.

Mr. DURANLEAU: At page 55 Mr. Meighen asked Mr. Bredt:

Before you get to that point, Mr. Enderby says that that very same competition which resulted in reducing the rates would exist just the same after the passing of this legislation as before. I cannot see why it would not. What do you say to that?
Mr. Bredt: Frankly, we are afraid that that would not be so.

There was a fair statement by a man sent by the western growers to oppose the bill. In view of the proof given before the committee by many people from the west who know the business, who proved positively that there would be no increase in the rates, I say that in the position they take my hon. friends have not a leg to stand on.

I think it was the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) who asked this government if we had considered the injurious effect of this legislation upon the port of Montreal. He did not, I believe, definitely so state, but that was the effect of his question. The hon. member for Willow Bunch said he was sure this bill would be detrimental to the port of Montreal. Well, Mr. Speaker, those were only assertions, without proof. I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friends to the memorandum which was filed with the committee of the Senate by Mr. Campbell, representing the Toronto Elevators, Limited, Sarnia Elevator Company, Limited, Midland Simcoe Elevator Company, Limited, The Great Lakes Elevator Company, Limited, Collingwood Terminals, Limited, and Goderich Elevator and Transit Company, Limited. What was the memorandum of those organizations on this question? The main proposition put forward by these companies is as follows:

1. The proposed provisions will have the effect of diverting a larger volume of grain through an all-Canadian grain route which has been established by the expenditure of large sums of money by the government of Canada and private interests.

This is the opinion of a large number of citizens interested in these elevators, that instead of injuring the port of Montreal or our Canadian ports it will direct a larger volume of business through them. The same memorandum—I am giving only the headings—says:

2. The proposed amendment will eliminate the existing unfair competition from American vessels.

Is it true or is it not that our Canadian shipping is suffering unfair competition from American bottoms? If it is true, is it not our duty to give some protection to our own people? Then the memorandum goes on:

3. The transportation and handling of Canadian grain is principally dependent on Canadian vessels and elevators both rendering public service entitled to the support and assistance usually afforded public services.

Then:

4. These provisions will have the effect which was intended by previous legislation, the language of which was insufficient to effect its intent.

To-day our law protects Canadian ship owners from direct shipping from one Canadian port to another by United States vessels, and we are asking now that they be protected against indirect shipping in the same way.

This afternoon I heard some hon. gentleman refer to labour. I remember that two years ago I received a delegation composed of sailors and others citizens who came here to urge the adoption of this very legislation. They represented to me that very often during the navigation season they had many empty and idle Canadian ships in their ports while the sailors were walking about watching United States ships passing in front of the ports, manned by United States sailors but loaded with Canadian grain which had been taken on at a Canadian port and was to be delivered in another Canadian port. I think it was proved very clearly, as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Simpson) stated this afternoon, that a great many Canadian sailors are actually idle and unemployed and a great many Canadian ships are anchored in our ports while many Canadian elevators are capable of handling much larger quantities of wheat than they are getting to-day. If this is all true, I do not see why we should not give our Canadian sailors and ship owners an opportunity to get larger business.

I am greatly indebted to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) for the generous support he has given me in this instance, because I frankly admit

that I am not an expert in these matters. My colleague stated very clearly that if we had thought for a moment that this legislation would injure the grain growers of the west in any shape or form it would not have been brought before the house. It is because we are convinced that the farmers of the west are fully protected that we believe this protection should be given the other classes in our community.

My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger) said he approved of the principle of this bill in so far as it affords protection to Canadian ships, but that he could not vote for it because it would protect British ships as well as Canadian ships. I want to tell my hon. friend that the competition with which Canadian ships are faced at the present time, and which they have faced for several years, does not come from British ships or from vessels belonging to nations to which we accord most favoured treatment. British ships, as a rule, do not cross the ocean to compete with our Canadian bottoms. That competition comes from other sources. and I think we are protecting Canadian ship owners and the people of Canada as a whole against those who would injure our best interests. I hope that my hon. friends will permit the second reading of this bill so that we may get into committee as soon as possible.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I did not hear all my hon. friend's remarks, and before he takes his seat I should like to ask if he made any explanation with regard to the powers that are to be delegated by the minister to some of his officials.

Mr. DURANLEAU: If my hon. friend will wait until we are in committee I shall give all the information required.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Duranleau) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Anderson (Halton),
Arthurs,
Barber,
Barrette,
Belec,
Bourgeois,
Bowman,
Boyes,
Burns,
Bury,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Cotnam,
Davies,
Duguay,
Dupré,
Duranleau,
Edwards,
Esling,
Fortin,
Fraser (Cariboo),
Gagnon,
Garland (Carleton),
Geary,
Gobeil,
Gordon,
Harris,
Hay,
Laflèche,
Larue,
Loucks,
MacInnis,
MacNicol,
McGillis,
McGregor,
McLure,
Maloney,
Mitchell,
Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon),
Myers,
Neill,
Nicholson,
Peck,
Pickel,
Porteous,
Quinn,
Ryckman,
Senn,
Shaver,
Simpson (Simcoe North),
Simpson (Algoma West),
Smith (Victoria-Carleton),
Spankie,
Sproule,
Stanley,
Stewart (Lethbridge),
Stirling,
Sutherland,
Swanston,
Tétreault,
Thompson (Simcoe East),
Turnbull,
Weese,
White (Mount Royal),
Wright.—66.

[Mr. Duranleau.]

NAYS

Messrs:

Blair,
Boulanger,
Bradette,
Butcher,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Coote,
Denis,
Dumaine,
Factor,
Fafard,
Ferland,
Garland (Bow River),
Girouard,
Golding,
Goulet,
Hanson (Skeena),
Hurtubise,
Jacobs,
Jean,
Luchkovich,
Macphail, Miss,
McPhee,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Rhéaume,
Sanderson,
Thauvette,
Totzke,
Young.—30.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Arsenault,
Baker,
Baribeau,
Beaubier,
Bell (Hamilton),
Bell (St. Antoine),
Bell (St. John),
Bennett,
Beynon,
Black (Halifax),
Bowen,
Cahan,
Cantley,
Casselman,
Cowan (Port Arthur),
Cowan (Long Lake),
Dickie,
Dorion,
Embury,
Ernst,
Ganong,
Manion,
Gott,
Guthrie,
Hackett,
Hanson (York-Sunbury),
Johnstone,
Jones,
Kennedy (Winnipeg),
Laurin,
Fournier,
Bertrand,
Beaubien,
Ahearn,
Mercier (St. Henri),
Raymond,
Dubois,
King,
Euler,
Dubuc,
McKenzie (Assiniboia),
Rinfret,
Cardin,
Howard,
Ilsley,
Irvine,
Reid,
Verville,
Bothwell,
Spencer,
Deslauriers,
Gardiner,
Rutherford,
Lapointe,
Perras,
Veniot,
Donnelly,
MacLean,
McIntosh,
Fontaine,

Lawson,	Gray,
Lennox,	Pouliot,
MacDonald (Cape Breton),	Urquhart,
Macdonald (Kings),	Speakman,
Macdougall,	Lucas,
MacLaren,	Fiset,
MacMillan,	Mackenzie (Vancouver),
McDade,	Dupuis,
McGibbon,	Power,
Matthews,	Moore (Ontario),
Morand,	Parent,
Mullins,	Howden,
Murphy,	Stewart (Edmonton),
Perley (Qu'Appelle),	Munn,
Perley, Sir George,	Marcil,
Pettit,	Bouchard,
Price,	Hanbury,
Rhodes,	Ralston,
Robinson,	Desrochers,
Rogers,	Heaps,
Ross,	Roberge,
Rowe,	Lacroix,
Ryerson,	Taylor,
Sauvé,	Séguin,
Short,	Heenan,
Smith (Cumberland),	Duff,
Smoke,	Cayley,
Spence,	Fraser (Northumberland),
Spotton,	Hepburn,
Stevens,	Malcolm,
Stewart (Leeds),	Elliott,
Stinson,	Hall,
Stitt (Nelson),	Weir (Macdonald),
Stitt (Selkirk),	Kennedy (Peace River),
Sullivan,	Brasset,
Tummon,	St-Père,
Weir (Melfort),	Motherwell,
White (London),	Gershaw,
Willis,	Brown,
Wilson,	Vallance.

Mr. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I was paired with the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. Munn). Had I voted, I would have voted for the bill.

Mr. STINSON: I was paired with the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Hall). Had I voted, I would have voted for the second reading of the bill.

Mr. AHEARN: I was paired with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Beaubier). Had I voted, I would have voted against the second reading of the bill.

Mr. REID: I was paired with the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR: I was paired with the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Ryerson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ROBINSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Desrochers). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. SMOKE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Cayley). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. WHITE (London): I was paired with the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gershaw). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was paired with the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Stewart). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BROWN: I was paired with the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Willis). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. VALLANCE: I was paired with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DONNELLY: I was paired with the hon. member for Cape Breton North-Victoria (Mr. Johnstone). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Macdonald). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. McINTOSH: I was paired with the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Kennedy). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. COWAN (Port Arthur): I was paired with the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I was paired with the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Murphy). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MULLINS: I was paired with the hon. member for St. Boniface (Mr. Howden). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. STEVENS: I was paired with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GOTT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Rutherford). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. GARDINER: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion). Had I voted I would have voted voted against the motion.

Mr. SPENCER: I was paired with the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Ernst). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I was paired with the hon. member for West Hamilton (Mr. Bell). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. McKENZIE (Assiniboia): I was paired with the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Bowen). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ST. PERE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Hastings (Mr. Tummon). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LUCAS: I was paired with the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Macdougall). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BARIBEAU (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Beaubien). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DORION (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Verville). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ROBERGE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BERTRAND (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Toronto Northeast (Mr. Baker). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (N.B.) (Mr. McDade). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PERRAS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Sir EUGENE FISET (Translation): I was paired with the hon. minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. MacLaren). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee, Mr. Gott in the chair.

On section 1—May delegate duties by way of confirmed by-law.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Before this clause is disposed of I think we should have some explanation from the minister. If I asked some questions before the second reading it was due to the fact that I was not sure that the way this clause stands at the present time will meet the requirements of the pilotage authorities of the district of Montreal. I think representations have been made to the minister and the officials of the department with reference to the powers to be given to the officers of the department, the deputy minister and other officials when the minister happens to be absent. These representations have endeavoured to point out what may happen should this section stand as at present. The explanatory note reads:

> The object of these provisions, which are new, is to avoid the necessity of the actual attendance of the minister as pilotage authority, possibly at Halifax or Vancouver, in certain cases and to attach the powers of the authority to the department rather than to the persona of the minister.

According to the explanatory note, this section is to cover only the ports of Halifax and Vancouver. I think it would be better, rather than conferring the present extensive authority upon the officials of the minister's department, to insert in the bill a provision that this would obtain only in cases concerning these two ports, so that there would be no ambiguity about the matter. I was told also there were conferences with some of the officials of the department regarding certain improvements that might be made to this clause along the lines suggested to the minister. The clause the way it stands was one of the principal reasons I voted against the bill, but on the other hand, other clauses may contain paragraphs which might have induced me to support this legislation. This clause as it is now is not acceptable to certain interests and I think there are members on the other side who hold the same views as I do. I would ask the minister to give whatever explanations may be necessary in connection with this measure, and to indicate in what respect, if any, I am wrong.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I am sorry my hon. friend was not in the house when I moved the second reading of the bill, because then I said very clearly that this clause would be deleted and replaced by another one which reads as follows:

3. Whenever the minister is appointed as pilotage authority for any district, his successors in office or any acting minister or, in the absence of the minister, his lawful deputy, shall be the pilotage authority, and any such pilotage authority may by by-law confirmed by the governor in council, authorize the superintendent of pilots in the district to exercise any of his functions. Moreover, such pilotage authority may, for such time or such purpose as he may decide, authorize any person to exercise any particular function or power vested in the pilotage authority by this act or any by-law made hereunder.

This amendment was asked by the pilots and I think, under the circumstances, it is a fair amendment.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I wanted to be sure.

Mr. STEVENS: I move that amendment.

Mr. DORION (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I read over carefully the amendment that the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) has just submitted to the house. As the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) stated a few moments ago, I think that it should be stipulated in the proposed amendment that this clause does not apply to the pilotage authority in the Montreal and Quebec districts. The reason for this is that there are two sections in the Merchant Marine Act, of which one, No. 395, is as follows:

The minister shall be the pilotage authority of the pilotage district of Quebec, and all the powers vested in the harbour commissioners of Quebec, previously to the twentieth day of July in the year one thousand nine hundred and five, as such pilotage shall continue to be vested in the minister.

Previously, the pilotage authority in the Quebec district was entrusted to the harbour commissions. Later it was entrusted to the Minister of Marine on condition that the pilotage authority remained in the hands of the minister. The same conditions prevail in the Montreal district; section 397 of the Merchant Marine Act is as follows:

The minister shall be the pilotage authority of the pilotage district of Montreal, and all powers vested in the Montreal harbour commissioners, previously to the twenty-fourth day of October of the year one thousand nine hundred and three, shall continue to be vested in the minister.

If the authority which was previously entrusted to the minister by these two sections is delegated to the Deputy Minister of Marine or else to the superintendent of pilotage, the same thing which happened last year will occur once more. One of the Marine department officials, thinking that the pilotage authority had been vested in him, suspended six or seven pilots of Quebec. Pursuant to the amendment moved, the provisions of sections 395 and 397, which heretofore protected the Quebec and Montreal pilots would disappear. As the member for Charlevoix-Saguenay pointed out, if this amendment has only affected the Halifax and Vancouver pilots, why not state so.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Quite so. Those are my views.

Mr. DORION (Translation): I submit, sir, that these amendments are introduced with a special and indirect purpose, that of embodying all pilots; under the pretext of amending section 414, it is proposed to amend the two sections 395 and 397. However, it goes further. If one reads section 391, we find the following definition:

(i) pilotage authority means any persons authorized to appoint or license pilots or to fix or alter rates of pilotage, or to exercise any jurisdiction in respect of pilotage.

Therefore, the superintendent of pilots or any official of the marine department, may, in the absence of the minister, license or suspend pilots, alter the pilotage rates or exercise any particular function or power over the pilots and pilotage.

I submit, sir, that the Minister of Marine is deprived of the powers vested in him by the act or his authority is diminished. Extraordinary powers are vested in persons in no way responsible to the house or people. At any time, we may be faced with orders in council appointing authorities who will take decisions over a whole district, when, by virtue of the act and the history of pilotage, pilots had acquired rights. When the Quebec pilots accepted the Minister of Marine as pilotage authority, they gave up certain rights which they, previously, possessed. Why? Simply because they were guaranteed that the pilotage authority would be the Minister of Marine and not a superintendent whatsoever.

If the Minister of Marine simply wishes to affect, by his amendment, the pilotage at Halifax and Vancouver, let him state so in this clause. However, if the intention is to change the pilotage authority in the Quebec and Montreal districts, let him state so, as I wish to be apprised of it.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): The hon. member is quite right, I agree with him.

Mr. DORION (Translation): It is most important. I submit that this amendment has an indirect purpose and is introduced with the set idea of wiping out the advantages which sections 395 and 397 conferred. I am therefore opposed to the amendment introduced by the hon. Minister of Marine.

I also wonder why only a paragraph of part VI of the act is amended. No other clause of the same part is changed. One particular clause, a small and hardly noticeable one, is altered in part V of the act, however, tomorrow one will discover that Mr. so and so, an official of the marine department has been handed over the pilotage authority in the Quebec and Montreal districts. I would be inclined to move an amendment or subamendment. I would request the hon. Minister of Marine to state, at least, that sections 395 and 397 will have their full effect as in the past.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to put a question? The minister himself cannot see to everything. In his absence, is it not possible for the deputy minister to exercise the duties delegated to him? I think that the deputy ministers in the various departments have greater powers conferred on them than these.

Mr. DORION (Translation): Let me refer to what I stated just now. The pilot unions of Quebec and Montreal were, in the past, under the authority of the Quebec and Montreal harbours, respectively. They had quite extensive rights, and one of the main reasons which made them sacrifice their rights, was because they were guaranteed, at the time, that the Minister of Marine alone would have pilotage authority. The act states: "Pilotage authority" signifies all persons authorized to appoint or license pilots. There is nothing else mentioned, to license pilots, appoint pilots and fix or alter pilotage rates or exercise any particular function or power over pilotage. These are the powers which it is intended to vest in the deputy minister or head of a department. I submit that such powers should remain in the hands of the minister.

Mr. MERCIER (Translation): As the bill reads, the person who has authority can delegate it, under certain circumstances.

Mr. DORION (Translation): That is exactly to what we are opposed, namely, that the Minister of Marine should delegate his authority to fix rates and license new pilots.

Mr. MERCIER (Translation): Is the deputy minister not as conversant as the minister in regard to pilots?

Mr. DORION (Translation): I do not think so. It is a right granted to pilots. They accepted the Minister of Marine as pilotage authority, on condition that it be the minister himself and not another official of his department. In sections 395 and 397, it was specially stated:

> The minister shall be the pilotage authority of the pilotage district of Quebec.

Further it is stated:

> The minister shall be the pilotage authority of the pilotage district of Montreal.

Those who prepared this act intended to vest the pilotage authority in the minister only.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Is it not a fact that in all departments the deputy minister carries out the duties which are delegated by the minister.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): At present, there is no deputy minister in the Marine department.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Why is not one appointed?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): The deputy minister receives his instructions from the minister and is responsible to him. In an urgent case when action is required, the deputy minister is in charge of the administration and he must act.

Mr. BURY: May I ask what is the effect of the amendment that has been moved? I cannot see any practical difference between the amendment as proposed and the amendment as it appears in the bill. Is there any real difference?

Mr. STEVENS: In the absence of the minister the deputy acts.

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to very strongly oppose the proposed amendment; in fact, I admit that in the absence of the minister, it is important at times, under urgent circumstances to have in the department an official authorized to take immediate action. I simply wish to inquire from the hon. minister whether he intends to adopt a similar amendment in connection with section 397 which refers to Montreal. I frankly confess that I am not an expert in the matter, however, I wonder why special provisions are made in so far as the

Quebec district is concerned, when no change is contemplated for the Montreal district. Why should the hon. minister be replaced by an official for the Quebec district, while he keeps for himself all the authority and prerogatives in connection with the Montreal district?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): There is nothing in the amendment to that effect.

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): If a special amendment is sought for the Quebec district and if the Merchant Marine Act, in so far as the Montreal district is concerned, remains unchanged, I submit that this constitutes a contradiction devoid of sense.

Mr. RALSTON: I would point out what seems to be a real difference. The first change is to insert the words, "in the absence of the minister." The other is that by the last clause of this proposed amendment the power of delegation of the pilotage authority can be given effect to without the approval of the governor in council. Under the bill as originally introduced into this house it required the approval of the governor in council both for the authorization of the superintendent of pilots to exercise any of the pilotage authority functions, and for the special authorization in connection with any particular power. Under the proposed amendment the pilotage authority, which may be the minister, the deputy minister, or the acting minister, or the superintendent of pilots, may authorize any one of his functions to be performed for such time or such purpose as he may decide without the deterrent of having that authorization given the approval of the governor in council. Is that not a distinct difference?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I think, Mr. Chairman, that it must be done by by-law approved by the governor in council.

Mr. RALSTON: Not according to the amendment now before us.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Better to leave things as they are.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The amendment reads:

> Whenever the minister is appointed as pilotage authority for any district, his successors in office or any acting minister or, in the absence of the minister, his lawful deputy, shall be the pilotage authority, and any such pilotage authority may by by-law confirmed by the governor in council, authorize the superintendent of pilots in the district to exercise any of his functions.

Mr. RALSTON: Then follows the clause to which I referred.

Mr. DURANLEAU: It continues:

> Moreover, such pilotage authority may, for such time or such purpose as he may decide, authorize any person to exercise any particular function or power vested in the pilotage authority by this act or any by-law made hereunder.

I think everything should be done by by-law ratified by order in council.

Mr. RALSTON: But not as it reads. My point is that the pilotage authority may authorize the exercise by any person of any of his powers under this act without the sanction of any by-law and without the approval of the governor in council, as the last clause now reads. In the original amendment the approval of the governor in council is made a condition precedent both to the appointment of a superintendent of pilots to exercise the powers of the pilotage authority, and to authorizing the delegation by the pilotage authority to anyone else of his functions in any particular case. But in the amendment now before us the approval of the governor in council is not necessary. The pilotage authority may delegate his power without reference to the governor in council or without any by-law, for such time or such purpose as he may decide.

Mr. CARDIN: The last clause referred to a particular function.

Mr. DURANLEAU: This amendment was suggested by the pilots themselves after consultation with the Department of Justice, but if my hon. friends think there is a doubt as to the meaning of the amendment I have no objection to adding a word or two to make it clear. We might delete the words between the word "functions" in the eighth line of the typewritten amendment and the word "for" in the next line, and insert after the word "functions" the word "and".

Mr. BURY: Is there any other difference in the amendment except that the absence of the minister is a condition required before his deputy can exercise his powers? If, not why not simplify it by adding after the words "his stead and" on the twelfth line the words "in his absence." The section appears to me to be admirably drafted.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Objection was taken as to the wording of certain parts of the draft. The words "without more," for instance, were objected to by someone yesterday.

Mr. BURY: That is all right; the words "without more" are necessary; the authority goes without anything further than the act itself.

Mr. DORION (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I put a question, just now, to the hon. minister. I wish to know whether sections 395 and 397 will have the same effect as they had previously, when this amendment is adopted?

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the section which we intend to amend does not only affect the pilotage of Quebec, Montreal, Halifax and Vancouver, it affects all pilots who come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Marine, so that there will be no discrimination between pilots of Quebec and Montreal or other parts of Canada. May I add that the amendment such as proposed, after the changes suggested by my hon. friend are made, meet all the needs of the situation; it is perfectly clear and I submit it should be accepted.

Mr. RALSTON: The minister spoke about pilots having been consulted concerning this amendment. Does he mean pilots of Quebec and Montreal? Have the pilots of Halifax and Vancouver been consulted?

Mr. DURANLEAU: The pilots generally.

Mr. RALSTON: Representatives of pilots generally.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I believe I have not understood my hon. friend correctly. I do not believe the pilots of Halifax and Vancouver were consulted. This amendment was asked for by officials of the department. Pilots of Montreal I understand objected to the wording of the amendment, and suggested the substitution of the amendment which was just proposed.

Mr. RALSTON: As I understand it the amendment is suggested because of the fact that in some cases it is found necessary for the pilotage authority actually to be in attendance at the port. Would the minister tell me what those cases would be?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Let us consider subsection (j) of the general powers of pilotage authorities contained in section 415 of the act:

(j) provide for the compulsory retirement of licensed pilots who have not attained the age of sixty-five years, proved on oath before the pilotage authority to be incapacitated by mental or bodily infirmity or by habits of drunkenness.

If proof has to be taken in Halifax and Vancouver, under the law as it stands to-day the minister would have to go there to take such evidence.

Mr. RALSTON: Or they would have to come here?

[Mr. Bury.]

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, or they would have to come here. Therefore we want to delegate the power to someone else so that such person could take the oath.

Mr. RALSTON: Why not let Mahomet come to the mountain?

Mr. STEVENS: It may cost a lot of money.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I do not think the amendment means much, because it is effective only in the absence of the minister. And as stated a moment ago by the hon. member for St. Henri surely the deputy minister must have some authority in the department. There are other duties performed by the deputy minister in the absence of the minister.

Mr. CARDIN: And more important duties.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The minister is always head of the department, and on his return he could make a change in the decision made by the deputy minister.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): It is only a delegation of power in some special instances.

Mr. DORION (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I have received a telegram from the Pilot Association of Quebec strongly protesting against this amendment being enacted. As I stated at the outset of my remarks, when the explanatory note states that the amendment only affects the pilots of Halifax and Vancouver, it is clear that this was intended to deceive us. It is as follows:

These provisions which are new, is to avoid the necessity of actual attendance of the minister as pilotage authority, possibly at Halifax or Vancouver . . .

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): It is because they are the most remote points.

Mr. DORION (Translation): In truth, it looks as if the amendment was aimed at the Quebec and Montreal pilots. However, sections 395 and 397 remain in the Act, thereby liable to stir trouble. In the future, if the Quebec pilots refuse to conform themselves to an order received from the pilotage authority, they may base their contentions on section 395 which stipulates that they are still under the authority of the Minister of Marine Who will decide whether section 395 or section 414, as amended, should apply? I submit that there is ambiguity and had the intention been to only include the pilots of Halifax and Vancouver, it should be so stipulated in the amendment.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): The cities of Halifax and Vancouver were mentioned because they were extreme points which the minister could not reach. In such instances he would delegate his power.

Mr. DORION (Translation): It is stated "possibly."

Mr. CARDIN (Translation): The amendment applies to the sections you have just quoted, because it is stipulated that when the minister is appointed as pilotage authority, his powers may be delegated. That applies to your case.

Mr. DORION (Translation): Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) may think, from the legal aspect, section 395 still will provide that the minister constitutes the pilotage authority.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): The minister or his deputy.

Mr. RALSTON: My concern is this: While apparently the amendment is for the benefit of the harbours of Quebec and Montreal, they really do not need the amendment because the minister could attend at those points. It seems to me that in effect the amendment will apply only to the points far away. If there is any benefit in having the act as it was before, with the minister acting as pilotage authority, it does not seem to me that those points should be deprived of a benefit simply because other points happened to be nearer. I am in accord with the idea of delegating authority to a certain extent in special cases. But this amendment goes much further by way of delegation than is usually the case. As a rule the term "minister" includes an acting minister. The present amendment, however, goes further and provides for the "deputy minister," and then there is further provision "in the absence of the minister." As a matter of fact there is usually an acting minister, if the minister is absent any length of time. It seems to me that that should cover the case, rather than have a further delegation not only to the deputy but to someone else altogether, namely the superintendent of pilots. Then from the superintendent of pilots it goes to someone else. I submit this is delegation with a vengeance.

Mr. STEVENS: Everything is done by by-law.

Mr. RALSTON: I am showing that the delegation is not done by by-law. The delegation is done simply by someone writing a letter. In any other function of the minister you do not have the minister delegating his power; the acting minister always has power. Sometimes the deputy minister has power, but you do not have a further delegation to the superintendent of pilots, then to some other official, and then from him to somebody else. It seems to me we are making the section more involved than is necessary. As pilots from outside points have not been consulted, there may be some objections. I do not know whether or not there could be, but if there was any benefit in having the act as it stood before and as it has been for many years, why change it just at this time, and have all these powers of delegation?

Mr. DURANLEAU: The hon. member has stated that the proposed amendment may be useful in outside districts such as Halifax and Vancouver, but that perhaps it may not be necessary at other points because the minister could go to Quebec and perform his pilotage duties. However if there were an inquiry held even at Quebec I should hesitate to go myself. In some circumstances I believe it would be proper to delegate powers to hold an inquiry even in Quebec, instead of forcing the minister to leave his office for that purpose.

Mr. RALSTON: Would the minister tell me how many pilotage districts there are in Nova Scotia? Sheet Harbour used to be a pilotage district, but I do not know whether it is now or not.

Mr. DURANLEAU: There are two, Halifax and Sydney.

Mr. RALSTON: Under the minister.

Mr. DORION (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I still maintain my contentions in connection with the amendment proposed. Last year, an official of the department, Captain Robertson, on his own responsibility, suspended seven pilots. A number of pilots having refused to undertake some special service, those who had made the request immediately communicated with Ottawa. At the time, the hon. Minister of Marine was absent What happened? Captain Robertson, on his own authority, suspended six or seven pilots, by telegram. These Quebec pilots were suspended because they had refused to undertake some special service, notwithstanding the fact that such pilotage authority was not vested in the superintendent. Not only he had not that authority but he was unaware of the provisions of a contract between the shipping federation and the Quebec Pilots' Union. If that authority is vested in the superintendent, the same thing will happen as last year, he will suspend without any cause these pilots. I again contend that the authority to appoint pilots and fix pilotage rates should not be vested in officials of the

department, but that this authority should be left with the minister or, perhaps, the deputy minister and no other official.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Could the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion) inform the house as to what happened to these seven pilots? I understand they were suspended in virtue of the authority delegated by the minister?

Mr. DORION (Translation): No, they were not suspended under authority delegated by the minister. Fortunately, the minister after examining the facts of the case, gave instructions that these pilots be reinstated. Nevertheless, the superintendent of pilots was under the impression, when the suspensions took place, that he was the pilotage authority. That is exactly why this amendment to the act is moved this evening, it is to avoid a similar occurrence in the future. After a pilot is dismissed or suspended by an official of the Department of Marine, what recourse will we have, if this amendment is adopted? The minister will then reply that the pilotage authority had made such and such a decision, I am helpless.

I contend that such powers should be vested in the minister or deputy minister only.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): The minister may delegate such powers and appoint a competent official. Pilots who do not wish to carry out special duties, will be suspended, and this will only be fair and just.

Mr. NEILL: I have heard the amendment read once, but I have not heard the amendment as amended. Would you mind reading it now as amended, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gott): It now reads as follows:

> Whenever the minister is appointed as pilotage authority for any district, his successors in office or any acting minister or, in the absence of the minister, his lawful deputy, shall be the pilotage authority, and any such pilotage authority may by by-law confirmed by the governor in council, authorize the superintendent of pilots in the district to exercise any of his functions, and for such time or such purpose as he may decide, authorize any person to exercise any particular function or power vested in the pilotage authority by this act or any by-law made hereunder.

Mr. NEILL: Is the authority to be granted to the original minister's deputy or the second minister's deputy?

Mr. DURANLEAU: His lawful deputy.

Mr. NEILL: Both ministers have lawful deputies. I want to know which deputy is referred to.

[Mr. Dorion.]

Mr. DURANLEAU: It is the lawful deputy of the Minister of Marine.

An hon. MEMBER: There is no deputy minister of marine.

Mr. NEILL: The deputy of the present minister. A good many of these references will apply to the port of Vancouver. May I ask the minister if any request has been made for this legislation from any of the pilotage boards of British Columbia?

Mr. DURANLEAU: No, we have had no such requests. It is purely an administrative amendment.

Mr. NEILL: Has the minister any reason to believe that this legislation will be acceptable?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Oh, surely.

Mr. NEILL: We have not heard anything to that effect.

Mr. DURANLEAU: To the amendment as drafted I do not think there would be any objection.

Mr. NEILL: But the minister has no knowledge on the subject. The pilotage boards have not asked for it. How does the minister know that this legislation will be acceptable or workable to the pilotage boards of British Columbia?

Mr. DURANLEAU: This does not affect any pilotage board; it affects only the pilots. If there is any place where we need delegation of power it is a place three thousand miles from Ottawa. It is that I may delegate my authority to hold an inquiry in Vancouver, for instance, otherwise I would have to go there myself.

Mr. NEILL: The whole purpose of this amendment, then, is to authorize the minister to delegate his power?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Exactly.

Amendment agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: Mr. Speaker, some of us who have been discussing the difficulties in regard to redistribution have made some progress to-day, and we would like to have to-morrow morning to meet and go further into these matters in an effort to

arrive at a conclusion. If it is satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite I suggest that the house adjourn until three o'clock to-morrow, and I hope we shall be able to make some progress in this matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that the Minister of Marine is a member of the committee that is conferring on the redistribution measure and he could not very well be in both places at the same time. If progress is being made in respect to redistribution I am sure it will be welcome news to all hon. members, and if the matter can be furthered by the house not sitting in the morning, I am sure we will all be agreeable to adjournment until three o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Sir GEORGE PERLEY: I move that the house adjourn until three o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 11 p.m.

Friday, May 19, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. A. U. G. BURY (East Edmonton) presented the fourth report of the select standing committee on standing orders, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

DISCOUNT AND LOAN CORPORATION

Mr. J. A. SULLIVAN (St. Ann) moved:

That pursuant to a special order made March 27 last, Bill No. 110 (Letter F1 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to Incorporate the Discount and Loan Corporation of Canada," be now read a first and second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first and second times.

Mr. SULLIVAN moved:

That Bill No. 110 (Letter F1 of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to Incorporate the Discount and Loan Corporation of Canada," be placed on the order paper under private bills for consideration in committee of the whole this day.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SATURDAY SITTING

On the notice of motion:

That on Saturday the 20th May, instant, the house shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning. That in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock p.m., there shall also be an intermission from one to three o'clock p.m., and that both the order of business and procedure shall be the same as on Friday.—The Prime Minister.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): With the consent of the house I should like this notice of motion to stand until after eight o'clock.

Notice of motion stands.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound): In the absence of the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. MacLaren), I have been asked to explain to the house the amendment made by the Senate. Hon. members will remember that this bill was very hurriedly reprinted and that in some cases reference to other boards had been omitted. Those omissions were corrected in the Senate. They are four in number, three of which refer to the original bill as presented to the committee over which I presided and the other is on account of an agreement between the Minister of Finance and the members of the British Empire Legion. The first amendment is on page 4 of the bill. While provision is here made that a quorum travelling in the country shall be comprised of two members of the board, there was no provision made for a quorum transacting ordinary routine business in Ottawa, and the result therefore would have been that under ordinary circumstances the quorum would have consisted of one-half of the whole body which, if it consisted of twelve members, would compel six of them to remain continuously in Ottawa to hear routine business. The Senate therefore moved to insert the following as subsection 4 of the new section 7:

(4) Except as herein otherwise expressly provided, for the purpose of exercising and performing the powers, authorities and functions vested in the commission, as distinct from a quorum thereof, under this act, the commission shall consist of two or more commissioners; and whenever under this act a quorum of the commission is referred to it shall mean a quorum as constituted under the provisions of section fifty-five of this act.

I think hon. members will understand that. It is simply to provide that for the transaction of ordinary routine business in Ottawa it will not be necessary to have more members present than are at present required under the board of pension commissioners; that is to say, two or more may decide any ordinary routine matter. This does not interfere at all with section fifty-five which provides for a quorum in the field. That is distinctly and positively provided for.

The next amendment is on page 6 of the bill, amending the clause providing for the payment of a pension to those members who have previously to this time served on the commission or the court. It is proposed to insert in 10B (1) after the word "bodies" in line twenty-two the words "or as a member of the board of pension commissioners for Canada or of the pension tribunal." That is to say, the act will provide for service on either of these bodies being counted in the total service.

The next amendment is on page 13, and is a very simple one. It is with regard to the presentation of cases to the chief pensions advocate. The amendment is to insert after the word "before" in line ten on page 13 the words "the commission or." I think my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) will understand that. It simply means that the applicant has the power to appear before either the commission itself or a quorum thereof.

The next amendment is on page 18, amending clause 63 by adding after the words "reference" in line five the words "or submission." Our committee found that it was necessary to allow the applicant to submit a stated case to the court, not necessarily the file, and consequently the words "or submission" have been inserted.

The next amendment is on page 21, and this is the one which applies to the agreement entered into between the Minister of Finance and the representatives of the soldier organizations. It was never intended that the prospective pension of a dependent mother or father, or brother or sister, under section 33 of the act should be limited, and consequently the Senate have struck out in line eighteen on page 21 the words "or section thirty-three." Those words were evidently placed in there under a misapprehension, and I am sure the house will agree that this amendment is perfectly proper.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) (for the Minister of Pensions and National Health) moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 78, to amend the Pension Act.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Shelburne-Yarmouth): The house will appreciate that it is a little difficult to follow the sections as my hon. friend has indicated the amendments rather quickly. The section I am most concerned with is the one that does not seem to fit in with the reprinted bill I have before me. I have the reprinted bill as amended and reported by the special committee. I realize that we are not in committee here, and that all I can do is to ask a question and have the explanation made again. Section 19 of the reprinted bill which I have here simply provides for the coming into force of the act.

Mr. ARTHURS: What page is that?

Mr. RALSTON: On page 21. I have just been handed another copy of the bill which I have no doubt is the same as my hon. friend has been using in indicating the amendments. My hon. friend referred to prospective pensions to dependent parents. Did he also say to widows?

Mr. ARTHURS: No.

Mr. RALSTON: Clause thirty-three does not apply to widows.

Mr. ARTHURS: No. To mothers, fathers, brothers or sisters.

Mr. RALSTON: It is prospective pensions to dependent parents and brothers and sisters. They are now being left out of the clause which restricts their pension, and the amendment now is so that they will not be affected by this act or by the budget proposals which were originally made by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. ARTHURS: Exactly. The wording of clause 33 was placed there under a misapprehension. It certainly was not the intention to interfere with them at all.

Mr. RALSTON: If I might ask another question with the permission of the house, have these amendments been seen and concurred in by the representatives of the veterans?

Mr. ARTHURS: Yes, in every case.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

NON-CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Acting Minister of Justice) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this house disagrees with their amendment to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code for the following reason:

Because the wording of the said amendment may be deemed to involve a principle which it may not be advisable to sanction in an act of parliament, and that the clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. DUPRE: After this house had accepted section 3 of Bill No. 71, to amend the criminal code, the Senate deleted subsection

3 of section 3 which concerns an irrebuttable presumption. That was sent back to the Senate and the whole bill came back again to this house with subsection 3 reinserted and subsection 2 amended. Subsection 2 in the bill as it left this house reads:

Every person who, in the home of a child, participates in adultery, or in sexual immorality, or indulges in habitual drunkenness or any other form of vice, thereby endangering the morals of such child or rendering the home of such child an unfit place for such child to be in shall be guilty of an offence and liable, upon summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year, or to both fine and imprisonment.

In order to cover the second case, namely that of a man and a woman living in adultery, where the children might be affected, the Senate added a proviso to subsection 2 which reads as follows:

Provided that this subsection shall not apply in the case of two persons who though in fact living in adultery are living apparently respectably as man and wife, and where the children affected are the children of such union.

Sir EUGENE FISET: That is free love.

Mr. DUPRE: As this amendment or proviso might be considered as a sort of indirect consecration of adultery, we believe it would be advisable to have another drafting or another sort of amendment to subsection 2.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

The house resumed from Thursday, May 18, consideration in committee of Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act—Mr. Duranleau—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: We are on section 1, subsection 681, appointment of inspectors of ships' tackle. Is the subsection agreed to?

Subsection 681 agreed to.

Mr. NEILL: Are we now on section 2?

The CHAIRMAN: No, we are on subsection 681.

Mr. NEILL: We passed section 1 last night before we adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN: We passed the amendment to the first section.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The whole section.

The CHAIRMAN: We are taking it subsection by subsection. Subsection 681 of section 1 is carried. We are now on subsection 681a, "Regulations for the protection of workers against accidents while loading or unloading ships."

Subsection 681a agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 681b, "Powers of inspectors." Shall the subsection carry?

Subsection 681b agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 681c, "May order cessation of loading or unloading." Shall the subsection carry?

Subsection 681c agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 681d, "Meaning of tackle."

Mr. NEILL: I cannot hear. Are we on section 2? I want to speak to section 2. Probably if we had some order in the chamber we could hear.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall call it out when we come to it.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I understand we are discussing section (2). I admit the bill has been badly drawn, as I pointed out to the minister last night. These small, faintly printed letters in brackets are the real sections, and I say that section (2) begins at line twenty-four of the first page.

The CHAIRMAN: No. Section 2 is at page 5 line forty-three.

Mr. NEILL: I beg to differ. I agreed with the minister last night that section 1 had been passed. I now suggest that section (2) appears at line twenty-four. It is improperly marked in brackets, and should appear in black numbers.

The CHAIRMAN: I have the bill before me.

Mr. NEILL: So have I.

The CHAIRMAN: I repeat that section 2 is at page 5 line forty-three.

Mr. NEILL: No. Then, section 2 is in twice.

The CHAIRMAN: That is section 2 of the bill.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, section (2) is at page one, line twenty-four.

The CHAIRMAN: No, that is subsection 681 of section 1.

Mr. NEILL: I am not talking about subsection 681. I am talking about a paragraph beginning with the figure two in brackets, and it reads like this:

By repealing sections 674 and 681—

And so on.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a subsection of section 1 which has been passed.

Mr. NEILL: No, it is not a subsection of section 1; pardon me. The one to which I refer is a new section. The minister agreed with me last night. I wish to speak to the words beginning at line twenty-four of the first page.

Mr. STEVENS: I can understand what the hon. member wants and I believe he is entitled to speak. I will admit the bill is rather involved. Section 1 is divided into a large number of subsections, part of the numbering of which is incident to the main bill—that is, the old bill. Subsection (2) at line twenty-four of the first page is really the second paragraph of section 1. The chairman is right enough, but my hon. friend is also right in claiming the right to discuss this particular part of section 1. I believe the noise in the house made it impossible for the hon. member to hear.

Mr. NEILL: I ask the liberty of returning to subsection (2).

Mr. MANION: Go ahead and discuss it.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. NEILL: I do not want to be thrown out. Wait until the chairman gives me permission.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot understand what the hon member means.

Mr. NEILL: If you will let me speak I will go on.

Mr. MANION: Go ahead.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to speak to what is now called subsection (2)—I shall call it anything, for the sake of peace. I am referring to that part of the bill beginning at line twenty-four.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no objection. I understood it was passed, but I have no objection.

Mr. STEVENS: The members could not hear the reading of the sections. I could not hear distinctly, and I am sure my hon. friend could not.

The CHAIRMAN: Last night I called section 1 (1)—3, (a), (b) and (2). Now I have called subsections 681, 681A, 681B, 681C and 681D. We are not proceeding regularly. We should proceed section by section, but we are taking the subsections as they are drafted in the bill.

Mr. NEILL: Then, Mr. Chairman I ask the opportunity to go back to subsection (2) beginning at line twenty-four.

[The Chairman.]

The CHAIRMAN: The sections I am now calling are under subsection (2) of clause 1.

Mr. MANION: Go ahead until you are stopped.

Mr. NEILL: So far as I could hear from this point in the chamber we might have been dealing with the redistribution bill. I have no intention of delaying the house when we should be home. This subsection deals with five sections in the original bill. They cover safety regulations. It was because these details were in the bill that I voted for it, although I was well aware that the primary object of the bill as the minister said was to institute a monopoly on the great lakes, objection to which has been voiced by hon. members to my left and right.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. MANION: He did not say that.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. MacInnis) truly pointed out that while the provisions of this bill in relation to the great lakes come into effect the moment it is passed, the operation of the provisions relating to the safety regulations is postponed indefinitely. I also note with some apprehension that while there is provision for appointing inspectors there is no provision for paying them. That makes one wonder how remote the appointment of these men will be. On the second reading of the bill I did not, of course, criticize these regulations, but I criticized, and I think justly, the method in which this bill was introduced so late in the session, not being sent to a committee where it could be adequately discussed, and no chance allowed to get the views of the men concerned. The men in British Columbia do not even know that this bill has been introduced. For this the Minister of Trade and Commerce took me somewhat severely to task, in language that I think went somewhat beyond the range of parliamentary usage or the dignity that one expects from a cabinet minister—or that we used to expect from a cabinet minister. The minister, when he sat on this side of the house, built up a reputation for fair and logical debate. I must say that I think he rather lessens that reputation when he takes a position of political infallibility, that if anything he sets his signature upon is criticized from the opposite side, the wretched member must be doubly and trebly damned.

Mr. STEVENS: Oh, I never said that.

Mr. NEILL: I do not think that is a desirable attitude. I suggest to the minister that he follow the attitude of his own leader

who the other day said quite frankly when the opposition was putting forward some criticism,—I noted it particularly,—that the criticism put forward by the opposition had a good deal of point to it and was such as he himself would have made had he sat on the opposite side. The Minister of Finance, and also I think the Minister of Public Works, have not once, but several times stated in this house that they were quite ready to welcome criticism. The tolerant point of view, that it is just possible someone else may be sincere in holding a different view, makes for the amenities of public life and certainly facilitates the passage of legislation. Personally I absolutely decline to submit to such dictation; this house is still democratic, whatever the government may be, and I propose to maintain as well as I can the rights of the private members of parliament.

Turning to the minister in charge of this bill, the hon. Minister of Marine, I am glad to second the remark of the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) last night that he always treats criticism with fairness and courtesy. These safety regulations are going to be put into effect, as we find by subsection 681A, by regulations made by the governor in council. I am sorry to see that. It is all to be done by regulation. Why is it not definitely included in the act? This is another instance of what we have seen done so often, our jurisdiction taken away and handed over to the minister, which often means not the minister but his deputy or officials, a bureaucracy which we cannot control. There are two functions of government, the legislative and the executive. We are continually handing over a little more and a little more of our legislative powers either to the cabinet or to some member or official thereof. We have had three glaring instances of that evil this present session. I will not take time to mention any but the last, that is in connection with radio. We gave the government or the radio commission power to make regulations, and I am perfectly certain, and I think every hon. gentleman must be of the same opinion, that if we had been passing those regulations in this house a lot of them would never have been passed in the language which we criticized and commented on a couple of days ago. Now we are doing the same thing here, putting power into the hands of a department to legislate. Not to carry out our decision, but we give them the power, by order in council and regulation, to legislate differently to what perhaps we would do! Why not put it in the act? Perhaps have a general clause giving a little leeway, but the main features should be in the act.

Then I notice that the regulations are to have regard to the following things, and there are one, two, three, four, five—really only four, because the last does not apply to safety—four matters on which they are going to make regulations. They are somewhat vague. As far as they go they are all right, but they do not go far enough. I want to put on record one or two other details that should engage the attention of the department in drawing up these regulations, in the hope that when they come to draw them up they will include them also, although I am a little doubtful as to their power to do so. I am quoting from a memorandum prepared by the Vancouver harbour commissioners some time in 1931. I am only going to quote a few paragraphs:

No block nor shackle shall be rigged directly over the head of a workman if it can possibly be avoided.

No man shall be required to work in holds with the hatches off whilst other work or loading or unloading is proceeding above them unless conditions are such as to preclude anything falling from an upper deck injuring those who are working below.

That is not referred to in the act, and I know a man who was killed a year ago by lack of that precaution.

All vessels loading or unloading shall have each hatch that is working tended by a competent hatch tender.

That is not in the bill.

When the vessel is either loading or unloading lumber—

And this is where I am interested.

—or any long loose material such as round pipes, steel rods, rails, etc., and only one sling is being used on each load, the sling shall be of sufficient length to permit a round turn on the load.

That is a very necessary thing.

In vessels loading a deckload of lumber, logs, piling or poles, the deck load shall be secured by hog lashings at a height of not more than six feet from the level of the deck and every four feet thereafter.

The next one has a similar bearing.

No man shall be permitted to work below walled timber, lumber—

That is piled up timber.

—logs, poles or piling unless such wall has been so secured as to preclude the wall or any part of it falling into the space in which the man is working.

Any vessel loading or unloading from or to booms, rafts or cribs shall supply a rowboat equipped with a lifebuoy and pike pole and have it attended by a competent person.

In many cases that is done voluntarily but it ought to be compulsory.

Men shall not be permitted to go into the holds of vessels after such holds have been fumigated until the holds have been certified in writing, by the officer responsible, to be clear of gas.

Those are all things that, as far as I can see, could not be covered by even the broad provisions of the bill. But they certainly should be there.

Another fault I have to find is that there has been omitted a clause often found in such bills which would go a long way to compensate for the absence of the things I have suggested. I have not got the legal language, but the lawyer members will understand what I mean. I am speaking of a clause something like this: Without restricting the generality of the above section attention is directed to the following items. That is not the technical wording, but all lawyers know that if you do not have a clause like that, the working of the act is confined entirely to the items that are mentioned, whereas if a general clause is put in it is not so restricted and it would be possible to go further with the regulations than the details mentioned in the act. That clause certainly ought to be in, and I submit to the minister that he might as well have it put in now. It is not a question of expense, it is a question of making the act more workable.

I have just one more objection. In subsection 2 of 681a penalties not exceeding $100 and not less than $50 are provided for anyone contravening any regulation made under this section. That penalty is simply ridiculous. I took the trouble to look it up and I find that we have this year on two occasions—I have it under my hand if anyone wants to see it—imposed for a much less serious thing than where men's lives are at stake a possible penalty of $2,000 and not less than $200 and a possible gaol term as well of not less than three months. If the $2,000 is not paid the offender is liable to a further gaol term of not less than three months. What was the crime involved there? In the one case it was being in possession of liquor that had been made illegally, that is, without having a licence. If a man or some poor ignorant woman made a little home brew and did not know that a licence was required, he or she would be liable to a fine of $2,000 and to a gaol term of not less than three months. Here the lives of men are at stake, but if a life is lost through neglect to provide these safeguards, on the first offence the fine is only $50.

[Mr. Neill.]

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, many of these accidents are fatal. If a stick of timber is dropped down two holds and falls on a man he has not much chance to survive, or if a man falls backward into a hold through the lack of a proper guard, his life may be lost. Let me give another instance. Many of these ships are loaded and unloaded in a hurry; perhaps they must pay demurrage if they are not at another port in so many days. There is a rush, and sometimes these safety provisions do take a little while to rig up, and possibly they may cause a little delay in the handling of the cargo. Under such conditions it would pay the ship owner to take a chance and drive his men on in order to get through, ignoring the provisions of the act. If the ship is loaded without accident the owner is that much ahead; he has got away with it and saved expense. But if something should go wrong and a man should lose his life, for the first offence the ship owner would get off with a fine of only $50. Most ships load a couple of hatches at the same time, and in such a case the wage bill would be more than $100 an hour. It would pay a ship owner to take a chance in order to save half an hour's wages. I think we are making a burlesque of the matter when we impose the extreme fine of $100 for an offence which may cost a man his life. Surely there should be some greater severity and some heavier penalty than a fine of $50 in the first instance. I think that is a most regrettable feature.

I intend to propose an amendment when we reach section 681d. Perhaps I should wait until we reach that section; if you say I should do so, Mr. Chairman, I will wait. Section 681d reads:

The expression "tackle," as used in the four sections immediately preceding means the tackle, machinery, gear, apparatus and appliances used on board a ship for the loading or unloading thereof.

That is not the way the section was introduced originally; the Senate changed the wording, and I should prefer to go back to the section as it was drafted by the officials of the department. I think the latter part should read:

—gear, apparatus and appliances used for the loading or unloading of ships, and includes all tackle whether on ship or on shore.

The difference, of course, is that in the one case it is confined to the tackle on the ship, and in the other case it applies to tackle on shore or on the wharf as well. This is very necessary, because vessels are often

loaded by an engine with a derrick, placed on the wharf or on the bank of a river. If the object is to protect the lives of the men this provision is equally necessary whether the defective crane, we will say, is on the boat itself or whether it is on the wharf or the bank of the river. It is suggested that this is beyond our jurisdiction and that, being on land, this tackle would come under provincial authority. The minister was kind enough to discuss this question with me last night, and he said there were provincial officials who were charged with such inspection. All I can say with regard to British Columbia—and I consulted with my colleague from South Vancouver—is that we never heard of any official who performed duties of that kind. There are officials appointed under the workmen's compensation board who go into the woods and supervise the machinery used there, but I do not think their jurisdiction extends to cases such as these. Further than that, the objection is surely overcome by the fact that under the old act the inspection extended to the shore. Section 674 reads:

—may inspect and examine the tackle, machinery or apparatus used for the loading or unloading thereof.

It seems to me we are going back if we limit it to the tackle on board ship when the old act, which we are trying to improve, said the inspection extended to all tackle used for loading or unloading, which would cover tackle on shore.

While I am on my feet there is just one other point I should like to impress upon the minister, also in regard to these regulations. I should like the hon. gentleman to give us some assurance—and I do not see why he should not do so—that when these regulations are formulated, and I hope he will indicate that this will be done in the near future, they will be published in the Canada Gazette so that everyone may know exactly what the regulations are. If the minister would be kind enough to assure me on those two points I will wait until we come to section 691d to move the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. MacINNIS: Before the minister replies may I say that I agree almost entirely with everything that has been said by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni in connection with these amendments. Of course that does not include his reference to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in his opening remarks. The need for these amendments has been so apparent to those engaged in this work that I think we should take every care to see that they are made as precise as possible. Section 681 seems a little indefinite. It says:

The governor in council may from time to time appoint at such places in Canada as he deems advisable—

I believe this could be strengthened by making it read:

The governor in council may and shall from time to time appoint at such places in Canada as he deems advisable—

The same change might be made in section 681a, which reads:

The governor in council may make regulations for the protection against accident of workers employed in loading or unloading ships—

I suggest that this should read:

The governor in council may and shall make regulations for the protection against accident of workers employed in loading or unloading ships—

I believe this change should be made because, as I said yesterday, there has been a great deal of objection on the part of stevedoring companies and shipping federations against the taking of any but the very least precautions for safety in loading and unloading ships. I have before me a letter from the shipping federation of British Columbia to the Deputy Minister of Marine, dated August 23, 1932, in which they regretted that the minister was taking steps to engage an inspector of tackle who would see that safety regulations were carried out. I am sure these objections will continue, and I think for the protection of the minister himself the act cannot be made too strong or too definite. Let me repeat that I agree entirely with the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni with regard to these amendments.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to make just a few observations with regard to this portion of the bill. While I take no great exception to the observations of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), I should like to direct the attention of the committee to the words which he complains are out of order or impose a strain on the decorum of the house, so that I might at least be in the judgment of the committee whether or not I conduct my discussions with due regard to the amenities of parliament. The words to which the hon. member referred were these —I am quoting from Hansard, page 5119, reporting the debate on the same bill:

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) in his usual sarcastic manner—

Mr. Neill: Thank you.

Mr. Stevens: —referred to this part of the bill in most scathing terms. I think his remarks were entirely unjustifiable. There is nothing mysterious about the nautical or shipping terms used in the bill—

Mr. NEILL: Read further.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, further down there is this:

The hon. gentleman is not the only man in the house or in the world who has a fairly wide knowledge of many of these things, and I would suggest to him that he would have been serving those whose interests he frequently pretends to have at heart—

Mr. NEILL: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: Then I was interrupted and I went on:

I say, he would have been serving much better those whose interests he has at heart had he said a word of commendation to the minister for at least the attempt to bring in these measures providing for safety appliances in the ports.

If there is anything offensive in parliamentary debate in the words I have quoted—

Mr. NEILL: "Pretends"?

Mr. STEVENS: —I fancy that hon. members who take exception to discussion of that sort will have great difficulty in carrying on debate at all. I simply say this. As the hon. member who has taken his seat knows, this measure is of great interest to the men working in the hazardous calling of loading and unloading ships in various parts of Canada, and particularly I think in the great port of Vancouver. He has raised the matter here and so have I over a period of years, and as I said the other day, it was hoped that we might have done something in this regard last year. But for reasons which it is useless now to discuss the bill was not then proceeded with. Then we included the present proposals in the general revision of the act this year; but when it was found, for purely constitutional reasons, that we could not proceed with the main act, the minister excerpted from that act these separate provisions relating to pilotage and to lake shipping, and it was considered that, these three matters being of sufficient urgency, we should bring in a separate bill this year instead of putting the whole matter off until next year.

Under these circumstances I submit that the minister ought to have been commended rather than criticized for his action. Now with regard to the observations that have just been made with reference to those measures in the bill dealing with inspection, the minister himself will discuss them from a technical point of view, but I am speaking now as one who for twenty years represented one of the largest ports in Canada and who therefore is deeply interested in the success of this legislation. The observations of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni indicated more clearly than I could in half an hour's argument the imperative necessity of empowering the governor in council to direct these matters by making regulations, because the hon. gentleman cited a number of more or less minor details which illustrate that there must be thousands of such. If we were to put them all in the bill, if we embodied them in the bill in detail, we should probably find ourselves limited to the terms of the bill, with the result that such contingencies as were not actually indicated in the bill would not come within the purview of the inspectors. Under the bill however, and following universal practice in this respect —the practice in other countries and the practice dictated by many of the major statutes of Canada—we have empowered the governor in council to make regulations. Let me read the section as it is here:

681a. The governor in council may make regulations for the protection against accident of workers employed in loading or unloading ships,—

Let us stop right there. That is very broad, and it is a general injunction imposed upon the minister and the governor in council to make regulations of a general character for the protection of those employed in the loading and unloading of ships, and I submit to the committee that this includes everything in the way of risks which might crop up unexpectedly—risks unforeseen in the loading or unloading of ships. It goes on:

—having regard in particular to the following:—

And "the following" are matters that are again fairly broad.

(a) the strength of machinery, tackle and gear and their fitness for the purpose for which they are intended;

That embraces all apparatus used—ropes, cables, blocks and tackle, winches, booms and so forth, everything used in the loading or unloading of ships. All these are subject to the regulations to be made by the governor in council.

(b) the provision of proper safe gangways, stagings and matters of a like character.

This provision anticipates a peculiar class of accident which I regret to say is frequent on the Pacific coast. Late at night in the dark men have on many occasions fallen off the edge of the dock or off an unprotected deck space on the ship, falling between the ship and the dock; and usually, lying be-

tween the ship and the dock, are a couple of large booms, probably three or four feet thick, thirty feet below the level of the dock or of the deck of the ship. Men have not uncommonly fallen down between the ship and the dock and been killed or seriously injured; frequently they are drowned. This provision is intended to take care of such accidents.

The next subsection provides:

(c) protection in the way of rails or other sufficient protection at openings through decks and around wharves and docks.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni suggested that this did not refer to the protection of hatchways. I submit that it covers that very matter. Where there is a hatchway open it usually has a combing and roping around which may be and usually is set up, and this provides that it shall be done. It is provided here that suitable protection shall be given to safeguard against risks of that kind. The next subsection reads:

(d) illumination of holds and decks of ships, and docks or wharves at which ships may be loading or unloading.

I pause for a moment to refer to an observation of the hon. member for Vancouver South. He suggested that the word "may" should be followed by an obligatory "shall." May I suggest, subject to correction by any of the legal gentlemen in the house who are probably better qualified than I am to discuss this particular point, that generally speaking, in statutes the word "may" carries with it the import of the word "shall." And the very fact that we are passing this legislation will impose upon the governor in council the duty of carrying out its terms. I do not think that the hon. member need have any doubts as to the effectiveness of the clause as it stands. When he refers to the inadequacy of the powers which the governor in council will have, may I refer to section 681C. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni will find a subsection giving still further power to the inspectors:

If any inspector of ships' tackle—

(a) is of opinion that any person employed in the loading or unloading of any ship is exposed to undue risk on account of the condition of any machinery, tackle, stagings or the like, or on account of the way in which the operation is being carried on, or—

Then it goes on with another observation, and then it states:

—he may and shall order, orally or otherwise, addressing such order to the owner, master and other person in charge of the loading or unloading of such ship or to any of them, that the operation of loading or unloading such ship shall cease.

That places a mandatory power in the hands of the inspector to deal with the matter if he considers that any machinery, tackle or staging is not proper and safe.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni also referred to the inadequacy of the penalty, but he will notice that the item he quoted in clause 681A is of course applicable to that particular clause and a similar penalty is in the next clause, but under clause 681C where the inspector's mandatory power is provided for, we find this penalty:

If any person so ordered—

That is, so ordered to discontinue the operation.

—continues the operation of loading or unloading or allows it to be continued he shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred dollars and not less than one hundred dollars.

Mr. NEILL: Under that clause only.

Mr. STEVENS: No; I call my hon. friend's attention particularly to this: this is applicable to the mandatory power which the inspector has, if he sees any machinery, tackle or the like not being properly operated, to order those in charge to cease. If he is disobeyed, then the master or the owner is liable to this fine of $500.

Mr. NEILL: Under this one section only.

Mr. QUINN: As well as the others.

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend will permit me I will invite him to consider this point, and I will do so in very courteous terms if I might inspire in him a little confidence in me. This applies to all of the clauses because the mandatory power of this clause is provided in the two or three preceding clauses. Therefore any order given under this clause must carry the very clauses of which he was complaining and the power of fining in this clause is added to the power of fining in the other two clauses; there is no question of that. I say again, borrowing a little from his own sarcasm, if he will permit himself to be fair for a moment, he will certainly admit that.

Mr. NEILL: I certainly shall not.

Mr. STEVENS: Then I confess my hon. friend is hopeless.

I was quite sympathetic toward the anxiety of the hon. member for Vancouver South when he referred the other evening to a possible delay in bringing these provisions into operation. In that regard he referred to clause 681F which provides:

Sections 681 to 681e, inclusive, of this act shall not come into operation until a date to

be fixed by the governor in council and proclaimed in the Canada Gazette, and pending such proclamation sections 674 and 681 of this act, as they now exist, shall remain in force.

I want to say very frankly to the hon. member that if I thought for a moment there would be any unreasonable delay in bringing this into operation, I certainly would not support the measure as I am doing. But may I point out to him a very sound reason and, indeed, an absolute necessity for having it in that way. If we passed the bill as it is and repealed section 784 and 681, during the hiatus or the period of time between the actual passing of this bill, let us say, to-morrow or next Monday or Tuesday as the case may be, and the date when we are able to promulgate very complete regulations which undoubtedly will take a month or two to draft, we would be without any protection whatever, because we would have repealed section 674. The importance and significance of that will be apparent at once when I read the present section 674 in the main act. This section reads:

> Every inspector may, at any time visit any ship, whether registered in Canada or elsewhere, and whether propelled wholly or in part by steam, except ships belonging to His Majesty; and although any such ship is classed in Lloyds register of British and foreign shipping, or in any other corporation or association for the survey and register of ships approved by the governor in council, may inspect and examine the tackle, machinery or apparatus used for the loading or unloading thereof, and, if he considers such tackle, machinery or apparatus defective, so as to be dangerous to life, he shall report thereon to the minister who may order that such tackle, machinery and apparatus shall not be used until permitted by the minister.

I am not for a moment arguing that this section is satisfactory, but what I am saying is that it is the existing protection we have. If we delete or repeal it and do not have in its place the regulation provided for in this new bill, then we shall be denied even that measure of protection.

Then I invite attention to section 681 of the main act which is also repealed by this bill unless the clause that is complained of is substituted therefor. Section 681 reads:

> Any tackle, machinery or apparatus used in violation of any order made by the minister under the authority of this part, prohibiting the use of such tackle, machinery or apparatus until permitted by the minister, shall be liable to forfeiture and seizure by the chief officer of customs at any port, and may thereupon be sold in the same way and under like provision as goods liable to forfeiture for non-payment of customs duties; and the owner of the ship, for the loading or unloading of which such tackle, machinery or apparatus is used in violation of such order, shall incur a penalty of $100, and such ship shall be liable for such penalty.

Again I draw attention to the fact that just during the next few weeks, during the period of time while the minister, in consultation with the harbour commissioners of the various large ports, is able to draft the necessary order in council with the detailed regulations, it is desirable that these provisions should be preserved to us. I trust the hon. member will at least accept from me the assurance so far as I am concerned, as one equally interested with himself in the bill, that I certainly never had in mind any suggestion by the minister or anyone else that it was intended to postpone indefinitely the bringing in of these regulations. Furthermore, it is, I think, obvious to all who have given study to this matter, that these regulations will be very voluminous; that is, they must necessarily cover a very wide range of activities, not only the very few mentioned by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, but a very large and wide range of matters provided for, and those regulations necessarily will have to be very carefully considered by the Justice department and others in order that we may be certain that they are of a character that cannot be challenged in connection with the powers of the federal parliament. It will therefore probably take some little time to draft these regulations. I shall leave it to the minister to declare his own views, but I am speaking now as one who has been interested in this matter for a number of years and I say to the hon. member for Vancouver South that I share with him the anxiety to have these regulations promulgated at the earliest possible date, and that I do not think the interests of those who are most seriously affected are in any sense jeopardized by this clause.

Mr. MacINNIS: Perhaps the Minister of Trade and Commerce and I, although coming from the same city, are not as well acquainted as we should be, but I can assure him that whatever our differences may be in regard to other questions, when it comes to such practical matters as this, he will find me at least quite reasonable and able to see points that he may make. I would ask the minister if there is an inspector at the present time at the port of Vancouver under section 674.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Not actually in office but in course of appointment.

Mr. MacINNIS: That just takes away the ground from under the feet of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If there is no inspector at the present time there is no protection, and consequently if this section should come into effect immediately on the passing of the act we would be in no worse position than we are now in. So on that score there is no valid reason why the section should not come into operation immediately on the passing of the act.

Referring to the penalties provided in section 681C, subsection 2, I would point out that penalties are also provided in section 696 which deals with the manner in which cargoes and deck cargoes may be carried on British ships registered in Canada, and the fine in this instance shall not exceed for any one offence one thousand dollars, but a term of imprisonment is also provided not exceeding three months for non-payment of the fine.

Mr. STEVENS: In what section?

Mr. MacINNIS: In section 696 on page 4 of the new bill. I believe that the proper carrying out of the sections that we have been dealing with up to section 681C is just as important as the carrying out of section 696. Defective tackle at any moment may mean and has often meant the loss of life, and consequently we should make the penalties as severe as possible.

Mr. NEILL: I understand that the Minister of Marine is a lawyer high up in his profession. I would ask him whether in his opinion section 681A would not be greatly strengthened by the clause I suggested, not limiting the generality of the reference by the particular details mentioned. That would give the minister power to cover by regulation many of the amendments I have suggested, which after all were recommended by the Vancouver harbour commissioners.

Mr. DURANLEAU: There is no doubt that when the terms are general, without any particulars, the powers of the minister may be greater, but I think that the different subsections give the minister all possible power to enact regulations. I do not see why it would be necessary to add general powers when everything is covered by the subsections.

Mr. NEILL: My point is that 681A-B-C-D do not cover many of the possible accidents which should be guarded against.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The section reads:

> The governor in council may make regulations for the protection against accident of workers employed in loading or unloading ships, having regard in particular to the following:

Then follow certain particulars, but the first sentence of the clause is absolutely general. We might frame the clause in the manner suggested by my hon. friend, but it would not strengthen the power of the minister at all. The governor in council may make regulations for the protection against accident of workers employed in loading or unloading ships. That is an absolutely general power. Then there are added the words "having regard in particular to the following," but that does not limit the powers at all.

Mr. NEILL: I suggest that it does.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I do not think so, and it has been so held by our courts time and again.

Mr. NEILL: Then why do we so often find in our acts a clause that the generality shall not be limited?

Mr. DURANLEAU: It has been held time and again that where there are general powers, if there are also special powers such as are given here by the words "having regard in particular to the following," that is simply a direction given, but the general power still holds good. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. NEILL: Will the minister undertake, when he draws up his regulations, to consider these other details that I have mentioned?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Of course. I am told by my officials that all the suggestions that have been read by my hon. friend are now in the office of the ministry. We shall not be limited by these subsections at all. If we find that something else should be included we have general powers to cover it.

Mr. NEILL: Can the minister indicate when he expects to have these regulations out, and will he publish them in the Gazette?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I think all these regulations must be published in the Gazette. At all events these certainly will be.

Mr. NEILL: When?

Mr. DURANLEAU: As soon as they have been adopted.

Mr. NEILL: There is an amendment to section 681D. Mr. Chairman, which you have not yet put.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I was just going to say a word on the amendment. The ground has been very well covered by my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I shall add only a word or two. The very question raised by my hon. friend's amend-

ment was discussed at length in the Senate. The original bill included practically the same enactment, but they came to the conclusion that it was better to empower the inspection of tackle only on board ship. There may be tackle on the wharf, of course, but the moment the tackle goes on ship it can be inspected by our officials, and anything that is used from the ship to the shore, such as chains, wires and that sort of thing, can be inspected by our officials. The point was raised in the Senate whether the enactment of an amendment such as my hon. friend suggests would not be encroaching on the jurisdiction of the provinces. It was also felt that every province had a Workmen's Compensation Act in force, which provides for the inspection of machinery used by workmen. My hon. friend stated that in his province the inspectors go into the woods and inspect machinery used there. I am not familiar with the British Columbia act, but under the laws of the province of Quebec, and I presume it is the same in the other provinces, the inspectors have the power to inspect tackle or machinery in any part of the province, including wharves. The workmen employed on the wharves are fully protected by the Workmen's Compensation Act of the province. It was felt in the Senate, in view of the fact that there was a doubt as to whether or not we were encroaching upon the jurisdiction of the provinces, and owing to the fact that provincial laws protect their workmen, that it was advisable to limit the powers of inspectors to the tackle on ships only. The words employed are "tackle..... used on board a ship."

Mr. MacINNIS: Does the minister hold that he is correct in stating the case that way? How can we then, as provided in subsection (c) of section 681a make regulations for the "protection in the way of rails or other sufficient protection at openings through decks and around wharves and docks." Is that not on shore, just as much as the tackle which would be on the wharf for the loading of a ship?

Mr. STEVENS: The wording is "openings through decks."

Mr. DURANLEAU: And "around wharves and docks."

Mr. MacINNIS: Then subsection (d) of 681a is as follows:

> Illumination of holds and decks of ships, and docks or wharves at which ships may be loading or unloading.

If we can make regulations for wharves, surely such regulations could apply to the tackle with which ships were being loaded. Surely it would apply to that tackle as much as to the tackle on the ship. We cannot exclude it in one instance and include it in the other.

Mr. DURANLEAU: There may be some doubt as to what is mentioned by my hon. friend. I do not admit this parliament cannot grant a power of inspection of tackles used on the dock for loading or unloading ships. When I say the Senate thought it better not to give power to the inspector to inspect tackles on the wharf, I must add that the leader of the Senate stated that there was no admission that we did not have that power. He did not believe it was necessary, however, on account of the fact that the workmen on the wharf were protected by provincial laws. There may be something in the point just made by the hon. member; but I do not think it matters very much.

Mr. NEILL: I am glad to hear the minister state that at least there is a substantial doubt. There are two phases before us, namely the bill itself which limits it to the tackle actually on the boat, and the amendment which seeks to put it back to where it was before action was taken by the Senate, namely to have it apply both on ship or ashore. Suppose we go back to the language used in the original act, in the Revised Statutes of Canada, and leave the doubt—which the minister admits is a doubt—open. We may then have some advantage from the enforcement of the law. I suggest we go back to the language of the original section, number 674, which contains the words "used for the loading or unloading thereof." Just use the words "used for the loading or unloading" of ships. Do not say where the tackle is. The minister admits there is a doubt. We will not raise it, and other people will not raise it. Further, this language has the advantage of being in the law to-day.

Mr. DURANLEAU: When the hon. member reads section 674 he will find in the first line the words "every inspector may, at any time visit any ship." Therefore it seems to me that the inspection is limited to the ship.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, but he inspects the tackle used for "the loading or unloading thereof." The tackle may be in the next county, so far as this section is concerned.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The section itself may not be clear. But it provides first for his visit to the ship, and it is on such ship he must carry on his inspection. The language

of the section would imply that his inspection would be limited to tackle or other apparatus on the ship.

Mr. NEILL: Not necessarily. That is only implied.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, I should like to appeal to the hon. members who are opposing this amendment to keep in mind the history of this whole negotiation. During the year 1931 and up until last year we pressed the department for a measure of this kind. It will be recalled that the board of harbour commissioners of Vancouver drafted regulations, part of which were quoted to-day. Upon arriving in Ottawa, their constitutionality was investigated by the Department of Justice. They sought to find out whether it was within the jurisdiction of parliament —the harbour commissioners being a creature of parliament—to approve of or pass such regulations. The Department of Justice found that they did not have jurisdiction. That finding covers all the provisions included in the harbour commissioners' by-laws. I have before me the opinion of the Department of Justice in that respect, and also communications from the department saying that this matter was very carefully considered. I suggest to the hon. members that if they insist upon injecting into this bill the words contained in their amendment chances are that when we come to apply the provisions of the bill we may be attacked by a stevedoring company or a ship which might be libelled. And on a narrow technicality of that kind the whole value of our efforts would be destroyed. We do know of a certainty that this parliament has jurisdiction to deal with the ship. We also know fairly well that we have not jurisdiction to deal with matters ashore. At least such jurisdiction is in question. I appeal to hon. members not to press their amendment unless we are perfectly certain that it is constitutionally intra vires of this parliament, but rather that they should let that section pass as it is. I submit that this is very broad and very general, and while the inspector will have to be a little careful, and enforce his orders only where his jurisdiction extends, to my mind it will be a tremendous mistake to inject the suggested language into the bill, only to find out later that we have destroyed the whole effort we are now making.

Mr. NEILL: The minister has said that the Department of Justice decided along the lines set out in the bill. I point out that the original bill as presented to the Senate—not the big bill, but this one under our hand—did contain a provision about tackle on shore, and the Senate changed it. If the Department of Justice looked into the matter and decided that it was all right to have that provision in the bill—as presumably they did, as the minister said they did—why did the Senate take it out?

Mr. STEVENS: I was referring to the by-law of the harbour commissioners. I cited that as an illustration of the narrowness of the powers or the ground on which these powers are exercised. I would certainly deplore the introduction into the bill of anything that would jeopardize its passage as it stands.

Mr. MacINNIS: I should like to draw the attention of the committee to a slight amendment to the section which, if put into effect, would not be as noticeable as the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. Instead of adopting his amendment I suggest that we delete the words "on board a ship" appearing after the word "used" in the twelfth line. That would not restrict the meaning or interpretation of the term "tackle," and would not be so likely to be questioned as it might be if the amendment of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni were used, which would draw attention immediately to the term "on shore." I believe that would be the best way to pass this section. I submit that to the minister and to the Minister of Trade and Commerce for their serious consideration.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend will notice that the word "thereof" at the end would not fit.

Mr. NEILL: It would need to be changed to "of a ship." I would withdraw my amendment cheerfully. As I suggested a moment ago, that would leave the thing undecided, the doubt unsolved.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to deleting those words "on board a ship," and the word "thereof" at the end, and substituting for the latter word the words "of a ship." It would then read as follows:

> The expression "tackle," as used in the four sections immediately preceding means the tackle, machinery, gear, apparatus and appliances used for the loading or unloading of a ship.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, as the minister cannot move an amendment to his own bill I take the liberty of moving:

> That on page 3 of the bill, line 12, the words "on board a ship" be deleted, and that the word "thereof" at the end of the next line be deleted and in lieu thereof there be added at the end of the section, following the word "unloading," the words "of a ship."

Mr. NEILL: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

Subsection 681D as amended agreed to.

On subsection E—Marking of heavy packages or objects.

Mr. QUINN: If the minister will look at 681B, subclause (a) gives power to the inspector of ship's tackle in the exercise of his duties to:

> . . . go at all reasonable times on board any ship or on any port or dock at which any ship is, for the purpose of loading or unloading, . . .

Now, large ocean liners or cargo steamers have their gangways or stagings rigged from the ship direct into the sheds. Their freight in the majority of cases does not touch the wharf or dock at all, and the operations of stevedoring, loading and unloading, are superintended largely from the sheds. I submit that the inspector should be empowered to go into the shed or warehouse where these operations are being carried on. I submit that that subclause would read better as follows:

> . . . go at all reasonable times on board any ship or on any wharf or dock or in any warehouse or shed alongside which any ship is lying for the purpose of loading or unloading.

I move that amendment.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Of course we are all anxious to have this legislation as complete as possible, but I am asking myself if the word dock does not include warehouses and sheds. The sheds and warehouses are on the dock.

Mr. QUINN: If the minister will interpret wharf or dock as covering warehouses or sheds the amendment is not necessary. The amendment makes it more explicit and definite.

Mr. MacINNIS: I have no objection to this amendment except that I believe it is open to the same objection as the amendment offered by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni to subsection 681D. It draws attention particularly to the warehouse or shed, which I think is rather undesirable.

Mr. STEVENS: Personally I think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) would be well advised not to press this. I think he is running the risk of injecting into this bill terms which may on a narrow interpretation of jurisdiction destroy the bill. It will be noted that the draftsmen have been rather careful in drafting this bill to provide that the inspector may go at all reasonable times on any wharf or dock at which any ship is for the purpose of loading or unloading. That gives him access over the dock to the ship, which of course is absolutely essential and is well within the power of parliament. But when you enlarge that by stating that the inspectors shall go into warehouses and so on I think you give possible ground for dispute. I know this has been very narrowly interpreted, I would deplore injecting into it anything which might jeopardize the validity of the whole section.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Do I understand that the hon. member withdraws his amendment?

Mr. QUINN: If the minister gives me that assurance, that warehouse and shed is covered by the term wharf or dock I am satisfied and will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. NEILL: I call the minister's attention to subsection 681:

> The governor in council may from time to time appoint at such places in Canada as he deems advisable—

I would direct the minister's attention to the need for appointing an inspector at Port Alberni, which is now the third biggest lumber shipping point in British Columbia and employs sometimes as many as three hundred stevedores.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to refer the word "third" to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid).

Mr. NEILL: Third is right. We are ahead of Victoria, and we come a very good second to New Westminster and will very speedily pass it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): May I remind the committee that we are now discussing subsection 681E.

Subsection agreed to.

On paragraph 681F—Proclamation of date.

Mr. MacINNIS: I listened very attentively to the explanation given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in connection with this section, but after pointing out that there were no inspectors at the present time under section 674 I do not see that we would be any the worse off if we did not have this section at all.

Subsection agreed to.

Subsection 696 agreed to.

Subsection 897a agreed to.

On subsection 932—British ships.

Mr. REID: Before dealing with this section I should like to say that I differ with many hon. members on this side of the house; I am absolutely in support of this bill, particularly with regard to the section relating to safety appliances. In regard to the section, now before the committee however, I should like to direct a question to the minister. I know that under the British commonwealth merchant shipping agreement the registry of British ships is defined, and I should like to ask him why we have not followed the example set by Australia and New Zealand in this connection and defined the registry of British ships in Canada as it is defined in that agreement, which I might say was signed by Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Irish Free State and Newfoundland. Under that agreement it is almost imperative that the persons owning or registering such ships shall be British subjects.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I suppose my hon. friend has read section 1 of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1894, which says:

A ship shall not be deemed to be a British ship unless owned wholly by persons of the following description (in this act referred to as persons qualified to be owners of British ships); namely,—

(a) Natural born British subjects;

(b) Persons naturalized by or in pursuance of an act of parliament of the United Kingdom, or by or in pursuance of an act or ordinance of the proper legislative authority in a British possession;

(c) Persons made denizens by letters of denization; and

(d) Bodies corporate established under and subject to the laws of some part of Her Majesty's dominions, and having their principal place of business in those dominions:

Provided that any person who either—

(i) being a natural born British subject has taken the oath of allegiance to a foreign sovereign or state or has otherwise become a citizen or subject of a foreign state; or

(ii) has been naturalized or made a denizen as aforesaid;

shall not be qualified to be owner of a British ship unless, after taking the said oath, or becoming a citizen or subject of a foreign state, or on or after being naturalized or made denizen as aforesaid, he has taken the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen, and is during the time he is owner of the ship either resident in Her Majesty's dominions, or partner in a firm actually carrying on business in Her Majesty's dominions.

As we see, Great Britain has deliberately abstained from defining British ships by statute, and in the past Canada has done so by section 932 of the Canada Shipping Act. The present draft eliminates the word "means" from the definition and adds at the end the words "and are by the law of England" and so forth. So we follow the same practice that is followed in England at the present time. By the marine laws of England it is the place of control in fact of a ship owned by a corporation, and not the place of residence or the nationality of the owners of the shares of the corporation, or even the place of registration of such a ship, that settles the nationality of the vessel.

Mr. REID: There is another point to which I should like to direct the attention of the minister, and perhaps it might be discussed at this time because it is of great importance to many seamen on the Pacific coast. Under the commonwealth merchant shipping agreement provision is made with regard to the certificates of officers. Article 17 reads as follows:

Subject to any special provisions that may be made by any part of the commonwealth as to the qualifications to be required of officers on ships engaged in its coasting trade,—

The next words are those to which I wish to refer.

—a valid certificate of competency or service granted by one part of the commonwealth will be recognized throughout the British commonwealth as indicating that the holder is duly qualified accordingly when serving on board any ship registered in that part.

I take that to mean that in the case of a ship of British registry coming to Vancouver or New Westminster and having a crew engaged in the old country, who had English certificates, that crew would be considered competent to be on board. Take it the other way around, however, with a British ship leaving Vancouver or New Westminster and going to the old country. We find that officers or seamen applying for berths are not considered if they have certificates of discharge issued in Canada, and I understand that this is being done on instructions from Great Britain. I have had several affidavits sent me in that connection. I am not going to take time to read them all, but I have one in particular which explains the whole situation. This affidavit was sworn to by a ship's carpenter named Harrison, who says:

3. That during the summer of 1932, I applied to the assistant shipping master of the city of Vancouver, namely Mr. Menzies, for a berth as ship's carpenter or able seaman or by any other capacity upon any British ship that might be returning to the old country and I was then and there informed by the said deputy shipping master that it would be impossible for me to obtain such employment as all captains of English vessels had been circularized to the fact that they were not to engage any Canadian citizens or English or British subjects who had been domiciled outside of England for a period

of over two years and that as I had been in Canada three years at that time, it would be impossible to obtain such employment.

4. That I have returned to the shipping master's office to obtain employment on numerous occasions and have always met with the same answer.

5. That on Monday the 13th day of March, A.D. 1933, I attended the shipping master in the city of Vancouver, with one, Paul Bailey, who was applying for berth as fireman on board the steamship Juanita, and I heard the assistant shipping master, Mr. Menzies, advise the said Paul Bailey that he could not obtain a berth as fireman unless he had an English board of trade certificate of discharge and that his Canadian certificate of discharge was useless.

6. That I verily believe that amendments should be made to the Canada Shipping Act for the protection of holders of Canadian certificates of discharge and for the protection of holders of English board of trade certificates of discharge who were domiciled in Canada.

I have three affidavits, one from the carpenter, a man named Harrison, another from Paul Bailey, the fireman, and a third from Cornelius Jan Lieuwen, mate, and they all swear that they have been turned down when they have applied for berths on British ships going to the old country. Under the Canada Shipping Act we recognize in this country discharge certificates from any part of the British commonwealth, and I submit that the matter should be very carefully considered. I think we should have an explanation as to why our Canadian citizens who apply for positions on British ships, and who have their discharge certificates from Canada, should be treated in the way these men have been treated in Vancouver recently.

Mr. STEVENS: It happens that I received the same affidavits to which the hon. gentleman has referred. They were prepared by the Seamen's Union. The complaint is of course a very natural one. Here are quite a large number of seamen, some of them ablebodied seamen, others officers, mates and so on. They find themselves out of work and are naturally anxious to be employed, and the complaint is that frequently they apply to the captain of a British ship, or rather, to put it properly, they apply to the shipping master's office for berths on British ships in the harbour of Vancouver, and the master of the British ship declines to take them.

We have not all the facts before us. A statement is made by these men who feel they have a grievance. Now, in this instance, immediately I received these affidavits, I turned them over to the officers of the Department of Marine, through my colleague the Minister of Marine, and I can assure the committee that they are now being carefully looked into. We feel that these men are entitled to have the whole matter fully surveyed, and at the moment we can make no statement. The minister and his officers have been in touch with the situation but there is no answer definitely because the facts have not all been ascertained.

May I hazard one or two observations, not for the purpose of justifying the attitude of the ship's captain but rather that we may have before us at least part of the argument to be advanced on the other side. A British ship comes to the harbour of Vancouver with a British crew, or at any rate a crew taken on at a British port, and as the result of desertion, or possibly discharge or sickness, they may be short a few men. Usually the crew is signed on for the round trip, wherever they may be going—sometimes around the world, sometimes from Liverpool to Vancouver and return, whatever the cruise may be. Frequently on arriving at Vancouver the ship will be short three or four men. The master of a British ship in such a situation will go to the shipping master and ask for a sufficient number of men to complete his crew. The affidavit asserts that these captains have been instructed not to employ Canadian sailors. I submit that that statement in that form looks prejudicial to Canadian interests, but I apprehend that this is the more correct way to put it. Inasmuch as there are a very large number of British born seamen who are themselves unemployed in these days, the owners of the vessels in Great Britain desire that their captains in signing on men in any port away from home—a port in one of the dominions, for instance—should give the preference to British sailors entitled to return to Great Britain, thus finishing a cruise which had been broken in some way. I presume therefore, speaking again without absolute knowledge, that the instructions are not to bring back any man who will not be completing a voyage and who, on his arrival in Liverpool, may be subject to discharge, simply adding to the ranks of the unemployed there. They prefer therefore to bring back if possible British seamen who are competent, shall I say, to finish the voyage in Liverpool in the ordinary course of events.

I am quite certain that neither the British government nor the British board of trade, under which these regulations very largely come, has ever at any time given instructions that Canadian or Australian seamen, or seamen from any of the other dominions shall be treated prejudicially or in any unfair way.

There is no doubt in my mind on that score. I sympathize of course with men who wish to get work and are unable to, but I think it is desirable that we should keep before us some at least of the elements which enter into and complicate the situation for the captain and others concerned. However, the department has the matter in hand and is making inquiries, because I transmitted to the department the affidavits which I received. We expect to have all the facts before us in the course of a few days. Whether they will come to hand in time to deal with the matter here I do not know, but hon. gentlemen can rest assured that the Minister of Marine and I myself will follow it up until we secure a fully satisfactory explanation of all the circumstances.

Mr. NEILL: It is quite natural that the British government should look after British sailors, but there is one point which I think should not be lost sight of. Reference was made a few weeks ago to the case of a man named Bailey, the circumstances being similar to those now under discussion, although there was this additional factor: he was trying to get a job on a boat subsidized by Canada. Now, if Britain can look after her sailors it is the duty of this country to see to it that if we subsidize vessels they shall engage Canadian sailors.

Mr. STEVENS: In that instance the vessel was chartered for a special trip because there was an excess of lumber offering over and above what the two ships owned by the company could carry. As Minister of Trade and Commerce I was faced with this situation. I could have refused to permit the company to charter that ship, but that would have meant that four million feet of lumber would have remained unshipped for a month and the British Columbia workers in the mills and in the woods would have been deprived of a month's work. I felt therefore that it was desirable to permit the company to charter the ship and earn the subsidy in that way—because it was a voyage subsidy. They did so, and I may say to the committee that in a period of about six or seven months there has been moved by this company under the subsidy system something like fifty million feet of lumber of the secondary grades, lifting it off our markets in British Columbia. There is not a lumber exporter, not a lumber mill nor the lumber association itself that will not speak in the highest terms of the efforts made to move that lumber.

As regards this particular man to whom reference is made, the vessel was British and the captain found himself short a man in the port. He had brought out a cargo to Vancouver and was on his way across the Pacific. His ship had been chartered for the outward trip and he would therefore proceed to Liverpool or some other port for which he was headed. It would have been unfortunate for that Canadian seaman to find himself out of a job in Shanghai or in some other part of the world, because we could not have followed him.

Mr. NEILL: Was it not a round trip?

Mr. STEVENS: No. These subsidies are for the outward trip only, and in the case of a chartered ship, they take a cargo at Vancouver and go on to Shanghai, which is always a good kicking-off place. They take on a cargo of soya beans there and go through the Indian ocean and the Mediterranean around to Great Britain, the other way altogether; or they might take a cargo to some other place, but it is an outward bound subsidy.

Subsection 932 agreed to.

On subsection 935—British ships only may engage in coasting trade.

Mr. YOUNG: When this bill was under discussion the other day the minister made a statement to which I would like to refer. I was speaking in regard to grain being consigned from the head of the lakes to Buffalo and the Minister of Railways said that much of it was consigned right through to Great Britain, while the Minister of Trade and Commerce said that most of it was consigned through. Will the minister say how much of the grain is consigned right through?

Mr. MANION: I did not say that much was consigned through; I said it could be consigned through.

Mr. YOUNG: My hon. friend's words were "Often it is."

Mr. MANION: I do not know I said those words, but it does not make any difference.

Mr. YOUNG: The Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

Most of it is consigned through.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the hon. member say from what page of Hansard he is quoting?

Mr. YOUNG: Page 5141 of Hansard.

Mr. STEVENS: If my hon. friend will just examine that language a little—I notice it is always better to check these things up—he will find that we were discussing the hypothetical question of the consignment of grain

through United States ports to Great Britain and its competence to earn the preference on entry into the British market. The hon. gentleman himself goes on to say:

> Mr. Young: But I say that it is not consigned clear through. The shipper has to keep his grain moving; he does not know when he loads it on to the boat at the head of the lakes, where it is going. When it is consigned to Buffalo, it is not consigned clear through.
>
> Mr. Manion: Often it is.
>
> Mr. Young: He wants to be able, when he ships it to Buffalo, to consign it wherever he can make a sale.

Then I said:

> Most of it is consigned through.

My point is this: I really think it is almost senseless for us to have to repeat these discussions on these clauses, but I shall do so in spite of the fact that we are in the dying days of the session and everybody wants to get away. This movement of grain to Buffalo is of two general distinct characters. One is during the open season of navigation when grain moves freely from the head of the lakes to the seaboard by Canadian and United States ports. It will move to Buffalo and naturally be moved as rapidly as possible through to New York, Boston, Providence, Portland, Baltimore, Philadelphia and other ports where it can find the cheapest and best shipping to carry it to the markets of the world. The consequence is that during that period the tendency is to push the grain through. But when we come down toward the end of navigation, the holders of wheat will very frequently, in fact every year, store up as much as they can in Buffalo and hold it there because, as I said the other day, it is a good kicking-off place. The tendency is to do that, but that is for what we call winter storage. In addition to putting the grain into elevators, it is a common practice to rent storage in as many vessels as they can and tie those vessels up to docks contiguous to an elevator spout to be loaded in the winter or spring as the case may be. Those vessels are frozen in and remain there as winter storage. Precisely the same thing applies to Port Colborne, Port McNicoll, Midland, Goderich and other bay ports.

What we were discussing the other day was this principle: Is it possible or competent for a shipper of Canadian grain through Buffalo to Great Britain to earn the preference? I have stated over and over again: Yes, it is, provided he observes the terms of regulation No. 12 of the British Imports Act. Regulation No. 12 in brief is this, that not merely wheat, but goods of any kind, of course including wheat, shipped from a British territory or a British dominion through a foreign country must, in order to earn the preference in Great Britain, be consigned through on a through bill of lading. Then it says further, that in the absence of a through bill of lading, it must have such invoices and other documents as may be certified by the customs authority in the foreign country to show that the goods were shipped through in a direct route from the point of shipment in a British territory to Great Britain. Any wheat or any other commodity that is handled in that fashion will earn the preference.

Let us pause for a moment and study, shall I say, the soundness or sanity of that. Obviously, neither Great Britain nor Canada nor any other country desires to place upon its statute books a preference and then make that preference open for goods that may lie in a foreign country for weeks, months or even years. There must be some control over the goods and so this provision that I have mentioned has been made.

When the wheat shipments were made last winter, this is what happened: Wheat had been moved from Port Arthur to Buffalo and put into storage. But when it was shipped, as is the case with nearly all wheat that is shipped to Buffalo or Montreal, it was entered on the bill of lading as being for export to the United Kingdom. Why do they do that? It is done constantly and daily because that is the most favourable market in the world. But very much of that grain after it leaves Montreal or Halifax or Saint John or United States seaboard ports is redirected while at sea and may go to Rotterdam, Antwerp, Hamburg or any other European or other foreign port; it may go down to the Mediterranean. This is a matter of daily occurrence, and one of the great problems confronting the Bureau of Statistics here and the statistical authorities in Great Britain has been for years to reconcile precisely the imports entered under customs authority in Great Britain and the recorded exports from Canada to the United Kingdom. There is always a variation. We have now got it down to a point where we can estimate that degree of variation; we can make an estimate, but it is only an estimate, because what we call the export entry will be for Great Britain, but the ship may be diverted at sea. In the case I have already cited, the wheat was put into storage at Buffalo and I think it remained there for nearly three months. Then what in the British order is forbidden, was done; the wheat was reconsigned to Great Britain. The documentation of it was broken at Buffalo and because the continuity of the movement so far as

documentation is concerned was broken at Buffalo, the wheat was refused the right of the preference in Great Britain. To emphasize this, may I point out that only yesterday hon. members opposite, in discussing this matter, spent a good deal of time in stressing that you could not ensure the identity of the grain. They pointed out in connection with this very clause that we have under consideration—I think the hon. member for Willow Bunch did so—that when wheat goes into the elevator at Buffalo, let us say from a Canadian ship and, in order to earn that right of coastwise preference under this clause, has to be moved out in a Canadian ship, it is impossible when loading that wheat out of Buffalo for Montreal to determine that it is Canadian wheat. That was the point that was made and emphasized. I am prepared to meet that argument and discuss it, but not at the moment.

What I wish to point out is that it naturally impresses the import authorities in Great Britain as decidedly unfair to ask them to accept as Canadian wheat, wheat which has actually been consigned to Buffalo and has remained there, and is then reconsigned to Great Britain. In other words, there is no continuity of documentation that proves it was Canadian wheat. On the other hand, as my colleague the Minister of Railways and I stated the other day, where the grain is moved on a through bill of lading, as is frequently and almost constantly done, to New York, Baltimore or some other American port, it is entitled to earn the preference when it is so moved. I think I have spent more time than I should have in emphasizing that point.

Mr. YOUNG: The minister regrets that he had to make a speech of some length in reply to my question. I simply asked for some figures. I do not know why he made that speech unless to make me forget what I wanted to ask him.

Mr. MANION: He has done well if he has done that.

Mr. YOUNG: The point I want to make is this: When the minister said yesterday that most of the grain going from the head of the lakes to Great Britain is consigned right through from the head of the lakes, he must either have known or not known the facts. If he knew the facts will he give the figures? That is important for this reason. If that grain leaving the head of the lakes is consigned right through to its ultimate destination and the shipper knows where he can get a ship to carry it, he can route it over whatever route he likes from the head of the lakes to the seaboard. But if he does not know where it is ultimately going to be sold, he has to be very careful what boat he ships it in to Buffalo, for if he ships it in an American bottom he loses the choice of routes when the grain gets to Buffalo. When the grain arrives at Buffalo he might have the chance to sell the grain where it would be to his advantage to ship the grain out through the St. Lawrence route, and he would have to refuse that sale because he could not ship through the St. Lawrence route once the grain had been carried in an American bottom to Buffalo. That being the case, the shipper of grain moving from the head of the lakes to the seaboard, the object of the shipper always being to get it as close to the seaboard as he can and always reserving the choice of routes, will not ship the grain in an American boat to Buffalo because then if he has the chance to sell the grain where it would be to his advantage to ship it through the St. Lawrence, he is precluded from doing so; he cannot make that sale. He will therefore confine his shipments to Canadian boats. Already Canadian ships have a monopoly of the Canadian grain trade between Canadian ports, and this will give them a monopoly of the Canadian grain trade from Canadian ports to American ports.

Mr. MANION: What is there to prevent him from sending the grain out from Buffalo to Great Britain and then changing its destination en route? He has a cargo of grain, and if he ships it to Great Britain he can get the benefit of the preference. The preliminary statements made by my hon. friend are correct. The shipper sends the grain in an American ship to Buffalo, if he chooses that way, and consigns it on through. He can hold it in Buffalo indefinitely until he wishes to consign it through. Then it goes out of Portland or Boston to Great Britain, and there is nothing to stop the shipper, once the grain is on the ocean, from changing its destination to Antwerp or Rotterdam or Marseilles.

Mr. YOUNG: There is this: When he gets the grain to Buffalo he might find it to his advantage to ship it to Montreal.

Mr. MANION: He cannot ship it back to Montreal if it came to Buffalo in an American ship, and my hon. friend was not arguing that. He was arguing that the shipper could not get the preference, and I am asking why.

Mr. YOUNG: He is denied the choice of routes.

Mr. MANION: If he ships it to Buffalo in an American ship; no one questions that.

Mr. YOUNG: That being the case, he will not ship it to Buffalo in an American ship, but in a Canadian ship.

Mr. MANION: What is there to prevent him from shipping it on an American ship and then doing as I suggested?

Mr. YOUNG: If he ships it on an American boat to Buffalo, he might find it to his advantage to ship the grain from Buffalo to Montreal and he would be denied that privilege.

Mr. STEVENS: May I point out that the narrow, technical point my hon. friend makes is correct, but in the main his argument is not very sound because if the grain is shipped from Port Arthur in an American ship it is then competent for the shipper to ship it to any market in the world, by the Erie canal, by Boston, Portland, New York, Baltimore or Philadelphia and I believe other ports. In other words, he has all these American ports that he can ship by. On the other hand, if a shipper wants to take his wheat to Buffalo and then move it on to Montreal, as is frequently the case, all he has to do is to ship it in a Canadian vessel to Buffalo. My hon. friend's point, if it has any point, is that this is creating a monopoly for Canadian shipping, and the second point is that there is a combine of Canadian shipping. Those are the two points emphasized, and we might as well combat them now.

As a matter of fact, this does not create a monopoly. It may give a partial preference to Canadian vessels for the movement of grain from the head of the lakes to the seaboard provided the shipper wants to pass his grain through Buffalo and then through Canadian routes. But what are the routes open? You can move the grain from the head of the lakes in large lake vessels to Port McNicoll, Port Colborne, Midland, Goderich and one or two other ports, and from one of these points you can ship it in a smaller boat by canal down the St. Lawrence to Montreal, or you can ship it from any of those ports by rail to Montreal, and the rail rate usually synchronizes with the lake rate on the fall trip. He has the choice of all these routes. He can also ship the grain by a Canadian ship to Buffalo and by another Canadian ship to Montreal, or from Buffalo in an American ship to an American port, or in a Canadian ship to Buffalo and then out through an American port. Surely he has enough choice of routes. We are narrowing that only very slightly, in this respect: We say that we do not wish to extend the coastwise privilege to foreign ships in our waters, and that if the shipper wants to choose one of these dozen routes by Buffalo to Montreal he must use a Canadian ship. That is all we say.

Many hon. gentlemen opposite have said that we are giving this trade into the hands of a monopoly. What are the facts? There are forty steamship lines plying on the great lakes, on the lower lakes and on the upper lakes. On the upper lakes you have vessels of a large capacity, carrying from 250,000 to 550,000 bushels of grain. Most of the boats plying below Niagara are smaller boats of 80,000 to 90,000 and 100,000 bushels capacity. Forty steamship companies operate in those waters. How many of them belong to what is known as the association? Out of forty companies eighteen belong to the association. I will admit that the large company, the Canada Steamships, is one of that group. But there is competition even among the steamships in the association. Then outside the association there are twenty-two steamship companies operating on the great lakes. So I submit to the hon. gentleman in all fairness that there is no sound reason to assert that there is a combine of shipping on the great lakes.

I pointed out the other day what the rates are at the present time. The rate to Montreal, to Three Rivers and Quebec is six cents a bushel. The maximum rate fixed was six and a half cents, but for the last eleven years, from 1921 until 1932, the rate has averaged yearly from eight cents to ten cents per bushel. No one has complained bitterly about it.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Has the minister noticed the press dispatch of this morning stating that it was cut to four cents yesterday?

Mr. STEVENS: In Montreal?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: I had not noticed it, but I am glad the hon. member has spoken because as a matter of fact I had intended referring to that matter a moment ago when I was discussing the question of the number of steamship companies operating. I should have concluded my remarks in that connection, and shall do so now. I have gone into this matter with great care. To me it has not been a trivial matter; I have spent hours and hours upon it, and my officers and the board of grain commissioners are constantly in touch with it. I have been assured over and over again that not only is there no monopoly, but there is the most bitter kind of competition. I wished to observe when I stated the fact that the rate was only six cents, instead of six and a half cents, that

that was evidence of competition. I have already stated that there is competition within the association itself. But as to the twenty-two steamship companies outside of the association I had intended to say that there was every possibility—I am informed that there was—of keen competition and cutting of rates. The hon. member has just told me that the rate to-day is announced as four cents a bushel. It is news to me, and I thank the hon. member for it. I wish to assure hon. members opposite that in this legislation they will find all the elements of sound competition.

Another point we must keep in mind is this, that during the years to which I referred the other night, when we opened the Canadian coastal trade to American vessels—that was, mark you, for the movement of grain from Port Arthur to our own bay ports, as they are called—during those years that power was exercised because of a paucity of vessels capable of carrying cargo in Canadian waters. But that very paucity of vessels incited the forty companies to which I have referred to purchase ships; as a result they purchased some in the United States and some in Great Britain. Some of them, particularly the larger vessels, were built on the great lakes. Some of them are old Canadian National ships turned into lake carriers. Although I have not the exact number, the figures are set forth in detail in the Senate report. There are literally scores of vessels. I find that there are fifty-two on the upper lakes and many more than that on the lower lakes.

Mr. MANION: With a capacity of nearly fourteen million bushels.

Mr. STEVENS: They had a carrying capacity at one time of fourteen million bushels. That shows the extent to which our lake shipping has developed. Certainly at the present time there is no need to open Canadian coastal trade to foreign vessels. But I do point out to the house that it has been the practice in the past to do that. It has been our practice to do it and, as I said, to do it over night—it requires no length of time.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): How often is that done?—the opening up to which the minister has referred.

Mr. STEVENS: By order in council.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is done for storage purposes in the fall?

Mr. STEVENS: No, not necessarily. I know what the hon. member is referring to. He is quite right in saying it has been common practice to open up at the end of the season for storage purposes. If I am called upon to do so I shall again cite the figures I gave the other night.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not at all interested in that. I know perfectly well that almost every year we are forced to open up in the fall for storage purposes.

Mr. STEVENS: And for carrying.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The minister is stretching a point there.

Mr. STEVENS: No, I am not. I can cite the figures, if I can lay my hands upon them.

Mr. MANION: When my hon. friend's government was in power they asked them to do it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Quite right.

Mr. STEVENS: In 1924 hon. members opposite went to Chicago and invited vessels to come up.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): On several occasions I went through the process of ascertaining whether or not storage space was available in the fall. Large quantities of grain were stored in American bottoms and carried to Canadian ports. No one denies that. The minister is stating it was open for traffic.

Mr. MANION: So it was.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not anticipate that this point would be challenged again, and I find that I have not the figures before me. The other day I gave them for a period of years. I believe I can place my hands upon them. They showed distinctly that what I am stating is true. Hon. members opposite will notice that in some years only a few American boats came to Canadian ports. The figures I gave in my remarks the other evening will indicate the years when the boats were used for storage purposes only.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. STEVENS: I shall give the hon. member an answer, and I am certain he will agree with it. In 1922 only 383,148 bushels were sent in American boats to Canadian ports. No doubt that was some vessel tied up at Goderich, or at some other point. In 1923 there were 1,220,900—storage again. In 1924 there were 4,241,535 and in 1925, 113,810. In 1926 there were about 5,000,000 bushels, and in 1927 over 7,000,000 bushels. I am cer-

tain they were not American ships in storage because that would mean at least twenty of their larger ships. But in 1928 we have nearly 20,000,000 bushels. That was not storage, but represented a very substantial traffic.

Mr. VALLANCE: May I ask a question? How many boats stored wheat in the port of Montreal during the winter of 1928? I say there were seventy-five. I visited the port to see that very thing.

Mr. STEVENS: Seventy-five boats would carry about 7,000,000 bushels, but the figures for that year show 19,000,000 bushels. I submit it is well known that they were admitted occasionally for carrying purposes when required.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I think so.

Mr. STEVENS: Since those years there has been an accretion to the Canadian fleet, and there is no need for it. But if need arises we have power under section 938 of the law.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The same power which existed previously.

Mr. STEVENS: And we have powers under the coastal laws, so that there is ample protection in the law as it stands for all interests which may be affected. The point I am endeavouring to emphasize to the committee is that the facts do not bear out certain allegations made by hon. members opposite. The facts do not show that there is a monopoly of shipping on the lakes which will be used to the detriment of the producers at the head of the lakes. No evidence has yet been produced to support that contention; in fact there is abundant evidence to the contrary.

In the second place, the question of rates has been challenged. The rate to-day is four cents, whereas for a period of ten or eleven years it ranged from eight cents to ten cents. I am not making any suggestions in this connection, but I am merely stating what has occurred. I say therefore that there is no reason to be alarmed in regard to rates. Then, we have the Inland Water Freight Rates Act by which the board of grain commissioners have control. And I submit that that control, which has never been exercised to any great degree, can be exercised more than it has in the past. If operated in conjunction with the power under the shipping act to suspend, the west is ensured against danger of monopoly, unfair rates or anything which will interfere with the free movement of the grain. As I said to the hon. member for Weyburn, out of a dozen different rates for

[Mr. Stevens.]

movement of grain to the sea we are interfering only in part with one. That is all. We are interfering to ensure in larger measure to our own ships the carriage of our own goods, in the interest of the men working on the ships as well as of those who own them.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): This matter is one with which we had a great deal to do in former days. Application was made almost every fall to permit American bottoms to come in and store grain through the winter, thus providing additional storage space, and they would be permitted to take the grain to a Canadian port to unload in the spring. Apparently no change has been made in that respect; it is permissible under the proposed amendments. Am I right in assuming that the only intention of these amendments is that the government will not permit American bottoms to carry grain to Buffalo, unload it there and reship it to Montreal in American bottoms?

Mr. STEVENS: That is right.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): So really the only thing you are doing is taking away the permission to carry grain from Buffalo or an American port to Montreal?

Mr. STEVENS: That is right.

Mr. MANION: Or on either leg of the journey.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Then if the grain is destined to a Canadian port an American ship cannot carry it to Buffalo?

Mr. MANION: That is right.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is much more serious than the other aspect. Because as I have examined these rates I see no reason why the rate to Montreal should not be four cents; when the rate for a journey three times the length, namely to Port Colborne and Buffalo from Fort William, is around two cents or one and a half. I see no reason why they cannot carry it the rest of the distance at that rate. One may assume that the mere fact that American bottoms are carrying grain to Buffalo, even if you stop them there, will have a regulating influence on the movement of grain to lake ports. Every one knows that the bulk of the grain is moved from Fort William to Georgian bay ports and thence largely by rail to Montreal. So there is nothing strange about a four cent rate to Montreal when the average rate in the past three years, without going beyond that, has been less than two cents to Port Colborne and Buffalo.

Mr. MANION: Except that the rate to Montreal includes the transshipment at Port Colborne. Of course that costs something.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Well, competition there did not have the same effect as competition to Port Colborne and Buffalo. Competition to Port Colborne and Buffalo undoubtedly kept that rate down; no one can deny that, or the rate to the lake ports would have been higher when rates were eight and ten cents to Montreal.

Mr. STEVENS: May I interrupt there?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I am not going to say much about this except that having had the matter up so frequently during the eight or nine years we were in office, and having permitted by order in council the storage of grain in American bottoms and the unloading at Canadian ports in the spring, I always felt that the little bit of competition which the permission to American bottoms to carry Canadian grain from the head of the lakes to their own port of Buffalo acted as a regulating influence upon rates from Fort Fort William to the bay ports. After all that is the important end, because I always look upon the direct shipment via bay ports to Montreal by train as the most economical route for handling the grain. I thought all you were doing by this provision was merely taking away the right to move that grain from Buffalo to Montreal in American bottoms. But if you say that every bushel of grain that goes to Buffalo in bond, before they decide whether it shall go out through American or Canadian ports, is going to be denied carriage in American bottoms, then you are handing a pretty strong lever to our Canadian shipping. If that is not true then why for the last ten or fifteen years as far as I know have the Canadian shippers always been complaining about this very thing?

Mr. MANION: Because they are not treated on the same basis as the Americans treat their ships.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If there is nothing in it, why the demand practically every year for permission for American bottoms to handle Canadian grain, always refused as far as I remember except on two occasions, when it became evident that there was not sufficient storage space to take care of the grain?

Mr. MANION: The reason the Canadian shipping objected to American competition was that Canadian ships were not permitted to do the same thing on the American side.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Oh yes, they are.

Mr. MANION: Oh no, the American shipping laws will not permit Canadian ships to take part in any American coastal trade. Let me give an instance. Last year or the year before there was a good deal of sulphur shipped from Texas up the Atlantic coast to Montreal and then transshipped and taken to some inland American port. The Canadian boats wished to share in that traffic but no Canadian boats could get in on it at all; the American shipping laws do not permit them to take part on one leg or the other in intercoastal shipping in the United States. That is the reason Canadian shipping wants to be put on the same basis. This bill merely does that and nothing more—not another thing beyond what the Americans have been doing to the Canadians for years. This is the first time that Canadian shipping is being put on the same basis as American, and it is only fair that it should be. In regard to the remark of my hon. friend from Weyburn—

Mr. VALLANCE: Before the hon. minister leaves that sulphur shipment, is it proposed now to refuse to let an American bottom come to the port of Montreal and do what they did with the sulphur?

Mr. MANION: No, certainly not. We do not interfere with that in the least. I was just giving that as an illustration of the intercoastal trade of the United States, in which they will not permit a Canadian ship to take part on either leg of the journey. We are only putting the wheat trade on the same basis. Previous to this bill an American ship could carry wheat to Buffalo and another American ship could take it thence to Montreal, so that they did both legs of the journey, but Canadians were not allowed to carry on either leg of a corresponding journey between American ports. Now we are putting them on the same basis.

I might give another illustration that came to my notice as Minister of Railways in regard to a large number of cargoes of coal shipped up the lakes. It is said that the Canadian ships are in a combine. The prices quoted for the carriage of that coal ran from 17 cents to 25 cents per ton. Seventeen cents is a ridiculously low rate, a losing rate, and some ships would not look at it, but the tenders ran from 17 to 25 cents; I think some were 20 and 22. That does not look much like a combine. The coal traffic is usually divided amongst them at the lowest rate. If there was anything in the shape of a combine

all they had to do was to get together and instead of tendering from 17 to 25 cents, all put in the 25 cent rate. That came to my notice within the last two weeks. It shows that there certainly is not a combine on the up journey. And by all the methods that the Minister of Marine has mentioned in this discussion the government can certainly prevent a combine on the down journey.

Mr. YOUNG: Has the minister seen the by-laws of the Associated Lake Freighters?

Mr. MANION: I have not seen them recently, but I am arguing the point without the by-laws; we have power through the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Marine and the board of grain commissioners and the shipping laws to break any such combine. And finally, if the Canadian shipowners take unfair advantage, this parliament can repeal the law. I do not think there would be a man on this side of the house who would not at once support the repeal if he thought the Canadian shipowners with their fifty-two ships were taking unfair advantage of this law in any shape or form. Surely every member of this committee is anxious for Canadian advantage; surely it is not the desire of the committee to give to American bottoms the right to drive Canadian bottoms out of the great lakes trade and put into the hands of American bottoms complete control of the carriage of Canadian grain, giving them power to charge any price they choose later on. Surely we do not wish entirely to destroy our Canadian shipping, but that is what is happening to-day. Anyone who has watched the price of the stock of the Canada Steamship Lines, which is the biggest line on the lakes, knows what is happening. This line has the largest fresh water ship in the world, the Lemorne, with a capacity of something like 600,000 bushels of grain. A few years ago the preference stock of the Canada Steamship Lines was selling at 84. Yesterday, out of curiosity, I checked it up, and I found that it was selling at 7. The reason is that the company is on the verge of going out of business; it cannot carry on with the present business that is being done. It is not getting the business, and I think it is only fair that we should want some Canadian shipping left.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The minister had better say they need volume.

Mr. MANION: That is what I said; they are not getting the business. If the United States vessels are allowed to come in and take it away from them they cannot carry on. After all—though my hon. friend will not agree with this—the basis of protection is to give volume, not necessarily higher prices. If our Canadian ships, after they get the traffic, do not treat the farmers of the west fairly I for one, and I am sure I should be joined by all hon. members on this side of the house, would want to undo a law that harmed the farmers. I am not a farmer myself, but the head of the lakes is just as much interested in the success of the farmers as are the farmers themselves.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Will United States vessels still be permitted to carry grain consigned through United States ports?

Mr. MANION: Certainly.

Mr. VALLANCE: Some time ago the minister gave the total capacity of the lake carriers as 14,000,000 bushels. Perhaps the minister, coming from the head of the lakes, will be able to answer this question: On the average how long does it take to make the trip from the head of the lakes and back?

Mr. MANION: To Montreal?

Mr. VALLANCE: Average them all up.

Mr. MANION: It depends to a large extent on where the vessel is going. It is very much shorter to the Georgian bay ports than it is to Port Colborne; it is a great deal shorter to Port Colborne than to Prescott, and it is still farther to Montreal. Since the Welland canal has been deepened it is possible for the large boats to go as far as Prescott. I do not know what the average would be, and I would hardly care to make a guess.

Mr. VALLANCE: Six days?

Mr. MANION: Yes, that would be my guess if I cared to make one.

Mr. VALLANCE: For the sake of argument we will say it takes six days, and we will assume that the lakes are open for twelve weeks in the fall.

Mr. MANION: I see what my hon. friend is coming to, and I do not wish to make a statement that I cannot support. I do not know that six days would be the average. It would be roughly a three day journey from the head of the lakes to Port Colborne, and of course it would take three days to go back. But they have to unload and they might be tied up waiting for other ships or for other reasons. They could not make it to Montreal and back in six days, so I should say that average is rather low.

Mr. VALLANCE: All I want to point out is that if we had twelve weeks in the fall, in

the rush season, with that capacity we could only move 168,000,000 bushels. Would there not be some danger of congestion at the head of the lakes in that event?

Mr. STEVENS: Well, 168,000,000 bushels is a lot of grain to move in three months.

Mr. VALLANCE: Then let me ask the minister this question: On the average how much is offered by the farmers of the west to the trade, and what is the total storage capacity at the head of the lakes?

Mr. STEVENS: There my hon. friend comes up against the question of futures, as he knows. The only way the grain of the western farmers is taken care of, as far as offerings are concerned, is by the existence of the futures' market, and the grain is held by those who desire to go into that business. My hon. friend knows that last winter we held at the head of the lakes something like 68,000,000 bushels. I could look up the figures, if I had time, to show precisely the amount of grain that has been moved during the fall rush, but I do not think it applies to this argument.

May I reply to an observation made by the hon. member for West Edmonton, which I think should not go unchallenged. The hon. gentleman said the rate to Buffalo was two cents, and he went on to say that surely another two cents ought to cover the transportation to Montreal. I know the committee desires to be just and fair. The movement from the head of the lakes to Buffalo or any bay port is made in these large vessels. I will give the capacity of just a few; 420,000 bushels, 460,000 bushels, 350,000 bushels, 550,000 bushels, 220,000 bushels, 320,000 bushels and so on. The capacity of the ships below Niagara, however, is much less; some of them carry 95,000 bushels, 85,000 bushels, 82,000 bushels, 75,000 bushels, 100,000 bushels and so on, most of them less than 85,000 bushels. So the movement of grain over a short distance in a ship carrying 400,000 bushels is a much less expensive proposition than the handling of grain in a ship carrying only 70,000 or 80,000 bushels.

That is the first point. Then we must remember that with the exception of the Soo it is clear sailing from the head of the lakes to Buffalo or Port Colborne or the bay ports, but from Niagara down to Montreal the ships must pass through a long series of canals and locks. The difficulties in navigating these narrower and more difficult waters certainly are much more serious than is the case on the lakes. As a consequence the rates from Buffalo or Port Colborne to Montreal could not be expected to be anything like as low as the rates from the head of the lakes to Buffalo. I think it is only fair to the shipping interests to point out these facts. I am definitely of the opinion that there is no ground for complaint when the rate from the head of the lakes is around six or seven cents a bushel, The present rate of four cents a bushel, while no doubt a good rate for those shipping the grain, certainly is most unprofitable for the carriers.

Mr. DONNELLY: I want to take the minister back to where this discussion started. We are talking about shipping Canadian wheat to Great Britain, and the possibility of shipping that wheat through a foreign country and obtaining the preference. The Minister of Railways and the Minister of Trade and Commerce both told us how easy it was to do this, but they did not tell us how much grain has been shipped in that way. I want to know if any wheat has been shipped to Great Britain through a foreign country that obtained the preference and, if so, how much.

Mr. STEVENS: I have not the figures, but I have made inquiries.

Mr. DONNELLY: That just goes to show that it is rather hard to do. We were led to believe that most of the grain was going that way, but now we are told that no one knows how much is being shipped through a foreign country.

Mr. STEVENS: I said yesterday that I would try to get the figures, and I am still trying to do so. As I pointed out, the movement of grain whether through Buffalo, Montreal or any other export point, is very difficult to keep track of so far as Canadian statistics are concerned. The prevailing practice is to bill the grain out as for the United Kingdom, and then the destination is changed later.

Mr. DONNELLY: That is not the point.

Mr. STEVENS: I am trying to show my hon. friend the difficulty of securing these figures.

Mr. DONNELLY: The minister is not telling us anything we do not know. We are trying to get some actual facts as to how much grain has been shipped in that way, but we are told that no one knows. There is another point I brought up the other day as well. A good deal of our wheat during the past year went to Buffalo and was transshipped to Montreal. We were led to believe that practically all Canadian wheat going to Buffalo was shipped in American bottoms. What I should like to know is how much of our wheat

was shipped in Canadian bottoms and how much in American, going from Buffalo to Montreal. I think you will find that most of it went in Canadian bottoms.

Mr. MANION: Well, that will not be interfered with.

Mr. DONNELLY: It will, I submit, because wheat cannot be shipped in an American bottom to Buffalo and come from Buffalo to Montreal in an American ship.

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman said that most of the grain went in Canadian bottoms. That will not be interfered with.

Mr. DONNELLY: We were given to understand that last year most of the grain went from Buffalo to Montreal in American bottoms, but I contend that most of it went in Canadian ships. This competition is the only competition we have had—the competition furnished by American ships from Buffalo. That is the only competition we have depended on in order to secure low rates. We have been getting low rates because of the fact that grain has come from Buffalo to Montreal in American bottoms. Will the minister tell us how much Canadian wheat going either from Duluth or Chicago to Montreal was carried in Canadian bottoms? We have not had any statement in that regard. Some of the wheat going down the lakes, from Duluth and Chicago, goes down in Canadian bottoms. What I want to know is how much wheat during the past year was carried in Canadian ships.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend said that this bill would wipe out the competition so far as Buffalo is concerned. It will not wipe out that competition. It is true it will eliminate part of it but there is still the competition furnished by Canadian ships carrying grain to Buffalo. That competition will continue, and it applies to all grain going on to Montreal or going out the other way. There is still also the competition from the shipping of grain in American bottoms to Buffalo. A man shipping from the head of the lakes may ship in a Canadian bottom to Buffalo, or by an American bottom through an American port, and there is still competition to that extent. The hon. gentleman is correct to this extent, that competition is eliminated with respect to that proportion of the grain that may have been carried to Buffalo in American ships and then carried on to some Canadian port. The fact remains, however, that all competition is not wiped out, because there still remains a good deal of it.

[Mr. Donnelly.]

Mr. DONNELLY: The only competition we have had for years has been in connection with wheat going to Buffalo. Is not that a fact?

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. DONNELLY: Well, what other competition has there been?

Mr. MANION: As regards wheat going to Buffalo—

Mr. DONNELLY: Let the Minister of Trade and Commerce answer the question. What competition have our Canadian ships had to face?

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman asks a question and wishes to answer it himself.

Mr. DONNELLY: The Minister of Trade and Commerce answered my question. He said no, and I want to know why he gives that answer.

Mr. MANION: I say that there is still competition to Buffalo inasmuch as the American ship can take the grain to that port and it can be shipped right through anyway. So that there is still that competition in the shipping of grain from the head of the lakes. The only point is that once it has gone to Buffalo in an American ship it cannot come back to Canada at Montreal, but it can go through Portland, Boston, Philadelphia or New York.

Mr. DONNELLY: The statement I made was this, that for the last few years the only competition Canadian boats have had to contend with was in connection with grain going to Buffalo, and I said, "Isn't that so?" And the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, "no". Then the Minister of Railways got up to reply to that question I asked. Did he reply to it?

Mr. MANION: Yes.

Mr. DONNELLY: I don't think you did. I repeat, the only competition that Canadian boats have had to put up with in the carrying of wheat has been in connection with wheat going to Buffalo. That is all.

Mr. MANION: And it can still go to Buffalo.

Mr. DONNELLY: I asked whether or not it was so and the Minister of Trade and Commerce said it was not; I was not right. Well, what other competition has there been? None whatever. That is the only competition, and that competition to-day is curtailed to a certain

extent because you cannot ship wheat to-day by an American bottom to Buffalo and then on to Montreal; under this bill it cannot be done, so that the competition is curtailed to that extent.

Mr. MANION: There would have been no argument if the hon. gentleman had said curtailed in the first instance. I understood him to say that the competition had been wiped out. It is true that it will be curtailed to some extent by this bill, but there is still the Buffalo competition by Canadian boats and on by Canadian boats to Montreal.

Mr. YOUNG: The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that there were a dozen routes by which we could ship from the head of the lakes to Montreal and that only one of them was being interfered with, and that one not completely. That is true, but the one that is being interfered with is the one in which there is competition, and it is the one in which we have lower freight rates. The freight rates to Buffalo are lower than the rates on the shorter haul to bay ports. It is the one in which we have American competition, the one in which we get lower rates; and the result of this interference will be to eliminate the competitive factor which reduces these rates. The minister suggests, further, that there is competition inside the combine—competition among themselves. I say there is not. James Stewart, who is head of the combine, sits in his office and allots the tonnage to the various vessels. He says to one, "You go there and get so many tons", or he may order the ship to tie up and stay where it is. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce will read the by-laws of the company he will appreciate what I am saying. The minister says that there are some lines that are not in the association. Yes; I know one steamship company that refused to be coerced into it because they said it was a direct violation of the criminal code and they would not make themselves liable in that regard. If that is not a combine I do not know what is.

Mr. STEVENS: When the hon. gentleman talks about a combine, it reminds me of the time, fifteen years ago, when almost every speech in this house contained references to combines, mergers and so forth. If the hon. gentleman means that certain business groups are working under an arrangement among themselves for the orderly handling of business, and if he suggests that this constitutes a combine, he may interpret the act in that way. But I would point out that there is a definite legal interpretation of the word combine.

Mr. YOUNG: Yes, in the criminal code.

Mr. STEVENS: In the combines act. A combine exists where there is a combination of business interests in restraint of trade to the detriment of the community as a whole, or affecting other persons' affairs; and under the statute it is competent for any six persons—those who have spoken right in this house—to lay information if they so desire and have an investigation. Such investigations have been held; we have had two or three since the house met. But if my hon. friend talks about a combine in that sense, I say there is none so far as I know. But even in the narrow sense in which he interprets it, I submit that out of forty steamship companies in the business there are twenty-two that are not in the association and eighteen that are, and if we wanted any evidence, if there were any desire to obtain evidence of the ineffectiveness of any combination of interests we have had that evidence in the last two years so far as the welfare of the shipping companies is concerned. We have seen ships tied up, companies going bankrupt, ships not able to get cargoes, and strenuous efforts being put forth to obtain business—keen and bitter competition. There never was a time on the great lakes when there was more competition than there has been in the last year or two. My hon. friend, therefore, should not speak of combines unless he is prepared to make a statement under the act and charge that there is.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

DISCOUNT AND LOAN CORPORATION OF CANADA

The house in committee on Bill No. 110, to incorporate the Discount and Loan Corporation of Canada—Mr. Sullivan—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

On section 5—Loans.

Mr. POULIOT: I have no particular objection to this bill provided that the promoters of the company do not sell any shares in my constituency.

Section agreed to.

Sections 6 and 7 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. SPENCER: Before you report the bill, we did not hear who was in charge of it and we have had no explanation from the sponsor. I would like to ask what percentage of interest it is proposed to charge.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Seven per cent. Originally the charge was 12 per cent. We have reduced it to 7, or 5 per cent less.

Mr. SPENCER: Does that include all the various charges that are made?

Mr. SULLIVAN: It carries everything.

Bill reported.

Mr. SULLIVAN moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPENCER: On division.

Motion agreed to on division, and bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

On subsection 935—British ships only may engage in coasting trade.

Mr. DONNELLY: Just before six o'clock I was asking the Minister of Trade and Commerce to tell me how much Canadian wheat had been carried by Canadian bottoms to Montreal and how much Canadian wheat that was in Buffalo had been carried by Canadian bottoms and how much by United States bottoms to Montreal. Has he the information for me now?

Mr. STEVENS: I have no additional information.

Mr. DONNELLY: Just before six o'clock the hon. member for Weyburn brought up the matter of the alleged combine. The minister tried to assure us that there was none. Yet he says some eighteen companies were in some sort of association and there were twenty-two companies that were out of it. That does not give us much information. Would he tell us the amount of tonnage in the association, the amount out of it and also the amount of tonnage interested only in the transportation of wheat. Many boats on the lakes will not engage in the transportation of wheat and therefore might not be in this estimate that he gave. As was said by the hon. member for Weyburn, it is well known that James Stewart, who organized this association and is the head of it, receives as his share one-fortieth of a cent a bushel for every bushel that is shipped. If he had received his full amount for what Canadian wheat was shipped last year, he would have got in the neighbourhood of $100,000. The wheat growers of western Canada are paying this. To-night's paper shows that the lake freight rate on wheat has fallen to four cents a bushel, this being probably due to what took place in the house yesterday. There is some alarm over this legislation. We know very well certain companies thought seriously of going into this association or combine and when they consulted their legal adviser in connection with the matter, he advised them to stay out of it because he said that they would be subject to section 498 of the criminal code which states:

> Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $4,000 and not less than $200, or to two years' imprisonment, or, if a corporation, is liable to a penalty not exceeding $10,000, and not less than $1,000, who conspires, combines, agrees or arranges with any person, or with any railway, steamship, steamboat or transportation company,
>
> (a) to unduly limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article or commodity which may be a subject of trade or commerce.

On account of that section, the company to which I have referred was advised not to go into this combine. It is an assured fact that a number of these people are working together for no other purpose than to raise freight rates, that is the only reason they would get together. The only thing which enables us to keep down the prices is the competitive price to Buffalo and under this bill the competition of United States boats going into Buffalo with Canadian grain would be done away with to a great extent. Can the minister give me the information regarding the amount of grain going to Montreal?

Mr. STEVENS: As regards the question of tonnage of companies in or out of the association, I have not figured that out at all, but I suppose it could be done without any great difficulty. When I used that argument, I did make the statement that the Canada Steamship Lines, one of the largest companies, was, I understood, in the association. But I said that there were those twenty-two companies outside, operating independently. I could not give my hon. friend the precise tonnage, but I can say this, that this was in connection with companies engaged in the grain carrying trade.

In regard to the other question asked, namely, the quantity moved from Buffalo to

Montreal in Canadian vessels and the quantity moved in United States vessels, I made inquiries, but I have not any definite, final figures on the matter, I have not, however, the slightest objection to my hon. friend, for the sake of his argument, assuming what he has or others have asserted, namely, that the bulk of it is carried in Canadian bottoms. I am not objecting to that at all. I am placing no argument against it. I am not able to give my hon. friend precise figures. When he and other hon. gentlemen ask regarding the amount of grain exported to Great Britain via American ports and that earned the preference, I have told him and others that there is great difficulty in getting those figures. I tried yesterday and the day before to get them, but I have not been able to do so. One of the difficulties, as I pointed out this afternoon, is that frequently, and indeed very commonly, grain is exported both via Montreal and American ports consigned to the United Kingdom, because that is the best and the largest market, and then frequently after it has left the seaboard it is reconsigned to some other destination. I stated this afternoon that one of the difficulties we have experienced in the compilation of Canadian export statistics is the redirecting of wheat or grain on the high seas after it has left Canadian ports. I am sorry that in the short time available since this question was raised during the last few days I have not been able to secure the information, although I have asked for it. I am sorry it is not available. It is not a simple but a comparatively difficult matter to work out.

Mr. DONNELLY: We know that there have been two shipments of Canadian wheat through foreign ports to Great Britain, and that neither received the preference. We have not heard of any such shipment that did, and therefore we assume, and I believe correctly, that no Canadian wheat so shipped to Great Britain has received the preference in that market. So why beat about the bush? Why not come out openly and say plainly: "We do not know of any such shipment that has received the preference." We have heard of none. We know that two shipments tried to get the preference and did not get it. That is all we have heard about it. On the other hand, it is of vital importance that we should know how much American wheat is taken to Montreal in Canadian bottoms. We hear so much about Canadian wheat going to Buffalo in American bottoms that I think it is only fair we should be told how much American wheat is taken to Montreal in Canadian bottoms. A very large amount of wheat goes out of Montreal every week. How much is Canadian and how much is American?

One more word with regard to this combine. The minister knows very well that this association was started last June, and he also knows very well that at that time the rate from the head of the lakes to Montreal was 4·1 cents. It was the understanding of this association that they would endeavour to put up the rates from Fort William to Montreal half a cent a bushel a month. And how did they succeed? In the month of June the rate from Fort William to Montreal was 4·1; July, 4·5; August, 5·2; September, 6·4; October 6·7 or almost 6·8, and at the very time those rates were being raised by half a cent a bushel a month the rate from Fort William to Buffalo remained steady; it practically never changed at all. Here are the rates from Fort William to Buffalo for the same months: June, 1·56; July, 1·57; August, 1·54; September, 1·52; October, 1·52. So the rates from Fort William to Buffalo practically never changed; and yet the rate from Fort William to Montreal rose from 4·1 in June to almost 6·8 in October. How does the minister explain that, except by the fact that there was some kind of association or combine among the boat owners to raise the rate from the head of the lakes to Montreal? If the minister does not give us any answer we must assume that there was a combine, and I think it is up to the minister and the government to look into that matter.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not gather that my hon. friend wanted me to deal with that question again because I have dealt with it already half a dozen times. I have done my utmost to demonstrate to the committee, and I think I have done so to the reasonable satisfaction of hon. members who desire to be fair in the matter, that leaving aside this one rate of four cents which was brought to my attention while I was on my feet, the prevailing rates to-day from Fort William to Montreal are exceedingly reasonable. They are substantially lower than the rates that have prevailed for the last ten years. I gave the rates in detail over a period of ten or twelve years, showing that the prevailing rate of six cents was low. I also pointed out in my previous remarks, but I will repeat it for my hon. friends, that the rate of four cents a bushel is an exceedingly low rate due to distress competition; there is no question about that at all.

I have also pointed out, so far as the alleged combine is concerned, that personally I do not think there is a combine in the sense in

which that word is used, namely, a combine in restraint of trade. I have also pointed out that the law respecting combines is simple and clear, that any six persons who feel there is a combine in restraint of trade can put the act in motion. The act has been invoked in a number of instances in the last few years, and in a very simple manner. It is not my business to invoke it. It is open to any six citizens who feel in any way aggrieved in that respect to do so.

Mr. DONNELLY: Suppose six citizens put the act in operation to see if there is a combine. We saw something last year of the effect of that when we had an alleged combine in the coal trade investigated, and we heard nothing more about it.

Mr. STEVENS: That is not correct.

Mr. DONNELLY: Practically speaking. We cannot get the information, anyway.

Mr. STEVENS: It is now in the hands of the authorities of Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. DONNELLY: We would get no better results from an investigation in this case. What I want the minister to explain is how those rates went up. What was the cause of the Canadian boats—and the grain can only be carried in Canadian bottoms—raising the rates from Fort William to Montreal from 4·1 in June to 6·8 in October while the rate from Fort William to Buffalo remained exactly the same during all those months? There is no other reason whatever except the existence of a combine or working arrangement among our Canadian boats to put up the price.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is not stating the case correctly. Wheat can be carried right up to this moment in American bottoms on the first leg of the journey. My hon. friend said that the rise in the rates was due to the fact that the wheat could only be carried in Canadian bottoms. But I say it can be carried in American bottoms. This competition is in existence now and has been in existence. So my hon. friend is not correct in that statement, for there is the full force of American competition at play.

Mr. DONNELLY: That is just what I wanted the minister to explain—what caused the rise in the rates.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to a phase that has not so far been discussed. It must be a relief to him to hear something that has not been discussed several times. Subsection 4 of clause 935 reads:

> Any goods so transported shall be forfeited as being smuggled goods.

The law is going to forbid a foreign vessel from taking goods or passengers from one port in Canada to another, and it provides a severe penalty for violation of the law, $500 in the case of freight, and $500 for each passenger in the case of passengers. That may be all right for the big shipping companies and the big shippers who know what the law is, but I submit that to forfeit the goods so transported as being smuggled goods would be very unjust to what is known in some cases as the innocent purchaser. If a man has a horse stolen he can recover it from anybody who has obtained it in an illegal way, but if it is found in the hands of an innocent purchaser who has bought it not knowing it was stolen, and has paid a fair price for it, he cannot recover. Here is a case I should like to place before the minister. Being a business man he may think only in terms of big shipping interests, but I am thinking of the smaller people. I engage his attention, because his local knowledge will enable him to follow me.

We will suppose there is a man at Alert Bay, which is a point one hundred and eighty-three miles north of Vancouver. This man is out of a job, but has a chance to gain employment at Campbell River, a point say, one hundred miles south. He, his wife, his family and household goods are on the wharf at Alert Bay. A steamer comes to that point. He does not ask to see the ship's papers to ascertain where it comes from. Why would he, being a man ignorant of such matters? He goes on board, and when the ship is three or four miles away from the wharf the purser comes along. Of course the purser should not carry the man under those conditions, but chances are he will take him then. A heavy fine may be imposed for this infringement of the law. But I am thinking of the man out of employment. We find that when he gets to Campbell River he is liable to have his household goods forfeited, due to the fact that they are regarded as being smuggled. That is not fair. He has been a perfectly innocent man.

Let me give another instance. A hand logger has been working in a little cove for a period of six months employed getting out logs. He, too, is ignorant of our coastal law. His work is about completed, and he is looking for a tug to tow it to Vancouver, or elsewhere. The cove may be located in a sheltered bay to which tugs would come. Finally he will get

a fair price from some tug, and that tug is given the work. It is afterwards discovered that he has employed an American tug, and he is liable to forfeit his whole winter's work. It may be argued that this instance would not come under the law, because a tug is not a ship. In answer to that argument I turn to page 10 of the large bill amending the shipping act which, although not yet passed, will no doubt come before us. I find under the definition of a ship that a ship includes "every description of vessel used in navigation, not propelled by oars." Either a tug boat or a gas boat, under that definition, would be a ship. If the man who, in the course of ordinary business, could not be expected to ascertain the exact registry of this tug, does not do so, then he is liable to lose his whole winter's work. That would be the result because of ignorance for which he could not be held responsible. Would it not be sufficient punishment if the ship were fined $500 and a further fine of $500 for each passenger, without confiscating the goods? It seems to me excessive punishment.

Mr. DURANLEAU: This legislation has been on our statute books for years, and no exception was ever taken to it. There is no change whatever in this clause so far as the points raised by the hon. member are concerned. Clause 935 of the statute reads:

1. No goods or passengers shall be carried by water, from one port of Canada to another, except in British ships.

2. If any goods or passengers are so carried, contrary to this part, the master of the ship or vessel so carrying them shall incur a penalty of $400; and any goods so carried shall be forfeited as smuggled.

We have not brought in any new legislation on this point. If the hon. member wishes to read clause 936 he will find that it, also, is fair legislation. The cases suggested by the hon. member are most extreme, and I do not think that such circumstances would ever arise. If they did, I am sure a good lawyer would surely save the goods subject to confiscation, and the owner of the ship would be protected.

Mr. NEILL: I am afraid for the innocent passenger or shipper, not for the owner of the ship. The minister states that this legislation has been in the statutes for years, but never has been enforced.

Mr. DURANLEAU: It has always been enforced, but no complaint was ever received against it.

Mr. NEILL: That is equivalent to saying that in a case such as I have indicated it has never been enforced. If it has never been enforced this would be a good time to eliminate it. I believe it is good policy to eliminate faulty legislation when we are making a general revision. If it cannot be defended more successfully than the minister has defended it, I suggest my contention holds. The minister has stated that I have referred to extreme cases. I say that they are not extreme, but are common cases in the area in which I am interested, and are likely to occur at any time. I cannot definitely point out any cases in which the law has been enforced, but it is not wise to have useless legislation on the statute books. However, if the minister will not listen to me I shall not waste the time of the committee.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Merchant Shipping Act 1894, not affected.

Mr. NEILL: I have only one last word to say to the minister. On this bill which contains only two sections there has been a discussion lasting about three hours and a half. This lengthy discussion has been brought about because the bill was not sent to a committee where it could have been discussed around a table. I have in my hand the original bill which no doubt will be introduced again next year. This bill containing amendments to the shipping act consists of eight hundred and twenty-one sections, and by a simple process of arithmetic I have ascertained that if we are as long proportionately in the discussion of that bill as we have been on this one, about ten months' continuous sitting will be required. I submit to the minister, and to the Prime Minister, who, I suppose, is in some measure responsible for the present bill being brought before a committee of the whole instead of before the special committee, that they would do well to allow the bigger bill to go to the committee on marine and fisheries. I believe it is within the knowledge of every hon. member who has followed the progress of bills, such as the pension bill, that legislation is passed much more quickly if in the first instance it is discussed before the smaller committee.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I can say to my hon. friend that the matter will be considered then. I do not think so much time will be required for the study of the full revision, because a great many of the sections are merely a repetition of sections in force at the present time. Some parts of the bill may be contested, but many of them will be accepted as being the law in force at the present time.

Section agreed to.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have an amendment which I shall ask my colleague to move.

Mr. STEVENS: The government has decided and the minister is now asking me to move an amendment which the Prime Minister suggests should be added as a third section at the end of the bill, as follows:

That subsection 12 of section 1 of this act shall come into force on a date to be fixed by proclamation of the governor in council published in the Canada Gazette.

Mr. BENNETT: What it is intended to do is to add a section providing that subsection 12 of section 1, which reenacts section 935 regarding British ships only engaging in coasting trade, shall come into force only on proclamation. It will be a new section 3.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time on division and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROPOSED SATURDAY SITTING—REDISTRIBUTION BILL—ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, shortly after three o'clock this afternoon I indicated that the notice standing in my name on the order paper might stand until eight o'clock. That notice is of a motion that the house sit to-morrow from eleven to one o'clock and from three until six, and probably not in the evening. I have just been conferring with the right hon. leader of the opposition, who takes the view that it is perhaps undesirable that we should sit to-morrow. I am prepared to sit to-morrow and start consideration of the redistribution bill. The first seven sections of it I fancy could be passed without difficulty, and I then propose to commence at page 34 of the schedule and take the ridings in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, in Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta, leaving Ontario and Quebec only for further consideration. I am entirely in the hands of the house in the matter, and will be guided largely by the views that are expressed.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if we had been fortunate enough to reach an agreement that was at all general with respect to the redistribution measure I would see some advantage in going on immediately with the bill. But if, as I understand is the case, no agreement has been reached between the different parties in the house with respect to the constituencies generally, I think possibly it would be just as well to conclude everything except the redistribution measure and start afresh with it on Monday morning.

The Prime Minister speaks as though it is going to be an easy matter to pass the bill, but I may say to him at once that if what has been accomplished in the last three redistributions, namely effecting a redistribution by agreement, is not to be accomplished at the present time, I am afraid we will have to take as strong a position as we can in this matter, and while we may be in the minority we will do the best we can to protect the rights of the minority and if need be fight to the finish. If the choice is to lie between a redistribution to be effected by joint agreement of the different parties in the house and one which is to be put through, as the Prime Minister said the other day, by "what is sometimes called the brute majority," we will just have to see how long we can resist the brute majority. We certainly are not going to see the constituencies of this country unjustly redistributed at the will of the administration just because they know they have the majority behind them to put any redistribution through. I had hoped that it might be possible to effect a redistribution in the different provinces of the dominion that would be recognized as fair, but apparently that is not the case, and in the circumstances I would say—having in mind that we have done our best this week to make progress, we have for some time past been sitting morning, afternoon and night—that we might very well adjourn until Monday next and begin on the redistribution measure then. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to begin at once with their brute majority, let them go ahead.

Mr. BENNETT: All of which, Mr. Speaker, sounds well, but we are dealing with actualities. A very earnest effort has been made for weeks to find an accommodation with respect to these ridings. If there has been disagreement with respect to at least one of the provinces it is because we know that they never intended to agree; they have been good enough to so express themselves privately, at least, if not publicly—privately in the sense that it was not said on the floor of this house, but nevertheless publicly so far as the purport of it was concerned. I have no desire that there should be placed upon the statute book an unfair redistribution, but I will not become a party to an unfair redistribution being put on the statute book by the will of the minority.

An hon. MEMBER: We never asked that.

Mr. BENNETT: That is exactly what is asked, and nothing else. It has been said, for instance, that the difficulty is with regard to agreement. There is no disagreement about New Brunswick; it loses one member. No county boundaries have been disturbed; nothing has been done except to drop one member from Saint John. In the province of Nova Scotia, because of the desire to maintain county boundaries as they exist at present, one of our own members finds himself living in a constituency that has fifty thousand people. He has made sacrifices in that direction which he says will legislate him out of the House of Commons. That does not look like jerrymandering. In the province of Prince Edward Island there has been no change at all. At least fifty of the seats in Ontario have been agreed upon beyond all question, and at least seventy-five seats have been agreed upon in a reasonable way.

It has been pointed out that many changes have been made in Quebec. Why? Because for the first time in the history of this dominion we have the urban population constituting a majority of the people. The burden cast upon those responsible for redistribution has been correspondingly great. Need I point out that the island of Montreal contains practically ten per cent of the population of this country; if it received ten per cent of the seats it would have twenty-four members. That brings about a great difficulty, and the city of Toronto stands in somewhat the same position. With respect to Manitoba an agreement has been arrived at; no one is complaining, so why should not the schedule be adopted? In Saskatchewan there were two proposals submitted, one by those who had given much thought and attention to the figures and the other by hon. gentlemen opposite. Finally the matter resolved itself into smaller differences. A great agitation was carried on because the seat of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) was being taken away. As a matter of fact the majority of the members of the committee said, "We will yield that point and be done with it, rather than waste time." But as soon as that was done something else cropped up. We will never be able to do business in that way; that is certain. There were some differences in Alberta, one of them because an hon. member has moved his place of residence, and he wants the place where he now lives to be included in the constituency which he represents. He might move again to-morrow. Should the constituency be changed again in that event?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is absurd.

Mr. BENNETT: It was absurd, I quite agree; it was absurd for many reasons, some of which I shall be glad to discuss in this house when the time comes. Then there was the province of British Columbia, where there were two or three minor differences, one being the question of whether a portion of the territory on the mainland should be included in the constituency of Comox-Alberni or in another constituency. There were also some differences in regard to the city of Vancouver, and that territory was divided according to the boundaries established for provincial constituencies. Since the lists are made under circumstances with which the house is familiar it does seem to me that this was not an unreasonable way of dealing with the situation.

Personally I am bound to say that I have not followed the details of this redistribution question, though this afternoon I made myself perhaps more familiar with them than I have been heretofore. I was of the opinion that if we adopted the schedules with respect to the other provinces we might be able, in connection with Ontario and Quebec, to arrive at an accommodation that would more nearly represent what everyone, including our opponents opposite, would feel was reasonable. But it is difficult; no one who has not been through this matter understands just how difficult it is. Twenty years ago I was a member of the committee that dealt with redistribution when Sir Robert Borden was in power. I recall the difficulties and the differences that manifested themselves at that time, with members finding themselves out of their constituencies, and I am bound to say that it was not until the last two or three days that we finally managed to have matters disposed of. At that time, however, the rural population was more numerous than the urban population and the difficulties were not so great as they are now. Perhaps the very conditions under which we live, world conditions of depression, tend to create a certain state of mind on the part of members of the House of Commons who sit opposite a government as well as on the part of those who sit on the government side; that may be responsible for part of it. If it is thought that it will conduce to a fair and reasonable discussion of these matters I shall not press that the house sit to-morrow. Personally I think it should, but in this instance as in many others I am willing to yield to what the opposition may think desirable in the national interest.

I do not wish to speak at length with regard to this matter; I have only one further word

to say. In the very nature of things, when you have had one party completely dominating the position in a province or provinces for many years you are bound to have difficulties when you come to the question of redistribution, when the voice of what is still the minority in those provinces but which constitutes a part of the majority in parliament is heard. The very fact that it is a minority voice in those particular provinces but is a part of the majority voice in parliament makes the position doubly difficult, and in my judgment a frank recognition of that fact is desirable. If a peaceful solution of our problems can be found, well and good, but I think that peaceful solution will be found more readily by proceeding with the bill and meeting the difficulties when we come to them, endeavouring to dispose of them as men should at such a time.

I desire to add only this, that it is always the privilege of a minority, or the opposition in parliament, to keep the house in session just as long as it reasonably can. During the short time I have been here I have made it a rule to be neither deterred by threats nor influenced by promises in the conduct of the business of this house, and I say to hon. gentlemen that I shall not be deterred from doing what I conceive to be my duty with respect to redistribution either by the threat of being kept here or the promise that if I do not do my duty we will not be kept here. We shall continue along the course we have mapped out, and carry forward a fair and equitable redistribution of the seats in parliament.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, being a man of peace, as my right hon. friend from Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) knows, I do not wish to add fuel to the flame by discussing the fairness or unfairness of the proposals contained in the bill as it has come back from the committee. I do not think it is desirable that we should do so this evening.

May I say that I think it is always very desirable, if it is at all possible, to have an agreement between the parties in this house as to the redistribution scheme which will be finally carried out, but I desire to say to my right hon. friend that it will be impossible to proceed with this bill as he suggests. The right hon. gentleman suggested that we might adopt the first seven sections of the bill and then consider some of the schedules as to which there does not seem to be much disagreement. We cannot accept section 3; that is the whole point of contention. Section 3 reads:

> The said provinces and territory respectively shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts, and be represented as provided in the schedule to this act.

Those who object to part of the schedules cannot vote for this section; certainly the whole discussion will be made on section 3 of the bill. As to the other sections, I agree that they are not contentious, but we cannot discuss section 3 unless every possibility of agreement has disappeared. So far as I am concerned, I shall not be able to leave my place in the house while this bill is being considered. I have been summoned to attend this evening a meeting of what have been called the elderly statesmen. I am proud of the last word, though not of the first, because it is not right as applied to myself. But I could not attend that meeting if this bill were being considered by the committee. I urge upon the Prime Minister the advisability of accepting the suggestion of the right hon. the leader of the opposition, so that we might try to find out definitely whether we can agree, as every one hopes we shall, and then if we cannot we can discuss the bill on Monday. May I point out that some of us are rather tired at the close of this week. Speaking for myself, and I know that the same is true of others, we have all done pretty strenuous work this week and I do not think it is fair to ask that we should begin the consideration of the bill to-night.

Mr. BENNETT: In that event I would move that the house do now adjourn.

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Acadia): I understand that the Prime Minister was just about to move the adjournment of the house. Unfortunately, when this question was brought up, I was waiting upstairs for the special committee of this house to meet, but I believe that the leader of the opposition suggested that the house should not meet to-morrow, his reason being that we might have the week-end to explore the situation further in the hope of arriving at some reasonable conclusion. I must confess that my experience of this committee has been a unique one. I have seen party strife at play to the greatest extent one could imagine, but, notwithstanding that, I consider that the committee had made splendid progress. Unfortunately to-day

the committee was able to meet only for a short time; because of other duties intervening we were unable to meet this afternoon. I am quite confident however that if the major parties of the house agree to restrain themselves and be calm on the subject we can arrive at a fairly satisfactory solution of the problem which will be beneficial to all concerned. I merely rose to say to the Prime Minister that I think he would be well advised to move the adjournment of the house over the week-end for the purpose of having further parleys with a view to arriving at a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. BENNETT: I move that the house do now adjourn until Monday at eleven a.m.; the motion is seconded by Sir George Perley. Possibly there is very much in what has been said, namely, that the expression to-night of strong views and the rousing perhaps of latent passions in connection with a matter of this kind could serve no useful purpose, and we might be further ahead on Monday morning than if we proceeded to-night.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think so.

Motion agreed to and the house adjourned at 8.55 p.m.

Monday, May 22, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate acquainting this house that the Senate do not insist upon its amendment in lieu of its first amendment made to Bill 71, an act to amend the criminal code, but do insist upon its first, second and third amendments originally made to the bill, for the following reasons:

1. Because the provisions of subsection (3) of clause 3 involve a principle which may not be advisable to sanction in an act of parliament.

2. This amendment is consequential.

3. Because the words struck out should never have been included.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

WAR DISABILITY PENSIONS

Mr. SPEAKMAN:

1. What was the total number of new war disability pensions awarded during each of the fiscal years (a) 1931-32; and (b) 1932-33?

2. What is the total annual expenditure involved by reason of these new pension awards during each of the periods stated?

3. In how many cases were decreases made in existing war disability pensions during each of the above fiscal years?

4. By how much was our annual expenditure decreased by reason of the above mentioned decreases in pension?

5. In how many cases were increases made in existing war disability pensions during each of the above fiscal years?

6. By how much was our annual expenditure increased by reason of the above mentioned increases in pension?

7. In how many cases was the payment of a war disability pension stopped entirely during each of the above fiscal years by reason of (a) cancellation; (b) death?

8. By how much was our annual expenditure decreased by reason of pension payments having ceased in each of the above classes?

Mr. MacLAREN:

1. 1931-32, 3,091; 1932-33, 1,912.

2. 1931-32, $552,256; 1932-33, $347,727.

3. 1931-32, 791; 1932-33, 2,129.

4. 1931-32, $162,343; 1932-33, $470,923.

5. 1931-32, 4,023; 1932-33, 2,865.

6. 1931-32, $780,692; 1932-33, $558,023.

7. 1931-32, (a) 305; (b) 845; 1932-33, (a) 529; (b) 874.

8. 1931-32, (a) $49,721; (b) $563,558; 1932-33, (a) $104,718; (b) $545,183.

REVERSAL OF PENSION TRIBUNAL DECISIONS

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland):

1. What are the respective percentages of reversal decisions by the pension appeal court of each member of the pension tribunal?

2. In considering the appointment of any members of the pension tribunal to the suggested pension reorganization, is it the intention of the government to take into account the percentage of unsound decisions rendered in the past by these commissions?

Mr. MacLAREN:

1. No statistical percentages of reversals of decisions have been kept.

2. In making all appointments due consideration is given to the possession of the proper qualifications.

BEARBROOK DRAIN, CUMBERLAND TOWNSHIP

Mr. CASSELMAN:

1. Was an application made in 1930 to the Minister of Public Works for a special grant in connection with the construction of the Bearbrook municipal drain in the township of Cumberland?

2. If so, by whom?

3. Have similar applications been made between January 1, 1921, and December 31, 1930?

4. If so, by whom?

5. What answer was given to each application?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Yes.

2. A. Goulet, M.P.

3 and 4. Yes, one from Mr. W. E. Faubert of Leonard, Ont., which was forwarded by the Honourable Chas. Murphy, in 1923.

5. The answer given to the Honourable Mr. Murphy was that the improvements requested pertained either to the provincial government or the municipality. The estimates for 1930-31 did not include any provision for this work.

RADIO STATION CHRC

Mr. LAVERGNE:

1. When was a licence granted to radio station CHRC at Quebec?

2. Were any complaints lodged against this station and will such licence be renewed when it expires?

Mr. DURANLEAU:

1. Annual licences to CHRC have been granted since April 1, 1926. The last licence is dated April 1, 1933, and expires October 31, 1933.

2. No complaints have been lodged with the Marine department. I am unable to state at this time what licences will be granted when the present ones expire.

HAY FOR EXPORT CATTLE

Mr. BARRETTE:

1. Has any person been appointed to inspect the hay shipped as fodder for the cattle shipped at the port of Montreal to United Kingdom?

2. If so, what is his name?

3. Who signed his appointment and what is his salary?

4. When was he appointed, and what are his instructions and prerogatives?

Mr. CAHAN:

1. The inspectors of live stock shipments at Montreal are required by the regulations respecting the shipping of live stock from Canada, approved by order in council dated the 3rd day of May, 1909, to satisfy themselves as to the quality and quantity of hay supplied as feed for cattle shipped for export.

2. James O'Grady, Hector Delorme.

3 and 4. Mr. O'Grady was appointed by order in council dated October 26, 1905; his salary is $1,620 per annum, less 10 per cent. Mr. Delorme was appointed by order in council dated January 9, 1903; his salary is $1,620 per annum, less 10 per cent.

Their duties and powers are as defined in the regulations respecting the shipping of live stock from Canada.

[Mr. Casselman.]

PREVENTIVE SERVICE—NEW BOAT

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. Did the Minister of National Revenue recently authorize the purchase or construction of another boat for use of the preventive service?

2. On what date were tenders asked for in this connection?

3. How many tenders were received?

4. What was the price in each case?

5. To whom was the tender awarded?

Mr. DUPRE:

1. No. The construction of the boat referred to was authorized by order in council of April 15, 1933, P.C. 649 on the recommendation of the Honourable the Minister of Justice.

2. Tenders were called for on February 23, 1933, the closing date for receipt of tenders being April 1, 1933.

3. Thirteen. Four other firms declined to tender.

4. The Gidley Boat Co., Penetanguishene, Ont., $57,390; The Davie Shipbuilding Co., Lauzon, P.Q., $57,840; The Collingwood Shipyards, Collingwood, Ont., $67,250; Birmal Boats, Southampton, England, $47,355; Canadian Vickers, Ltd., Montreal, P.Q., $53,000; The Manseau Shipyards, Sorel, P.Q., $47,265; Yarrow & Co., Ltd., Glasgow, Scotland (delivery at Glasgow), $32,214; The Burrard Dry Dock Co., Ltd., North Vancouver, B.C., $62,500; Halifax Shipyards, Halifax, N.S., $59,500; J. Samuel White & Co., East Cowes, England, $51,240; J. I. Thorneycroft & Co., Southampton, England, $50,820; Boeing Aircraft, Vancouver, B.C., $59,700; For Yarrows Ltd., Canada (See Yarrow & Co., Glasgow).

5. Manseau Shipyards, Sorel, P.Q., at $47,265, delivery at Halifax.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

SOREL SHIPYARD

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What was the total amount of estimates for the government shipyard in Sorel during 1932-1933?

2. How many men were employed in the Sorel shipyard (a) on March 15, 1933; (b) on April 24, 1933; (c) on May 1, 1933?

3. What is the average cost per cubic yard of excavation in the St. Lawrence ship channel by government dredges in 1932?

4. What is the average price, per cubic yard of material excavated, paid to the general dredges under contract in the said channel?

5. Has the Department of Marine recently purchased a winch from the Sorel mechanical shop?

6. If so, what was the price?

7. Were tenders invited?

8. What does the department intend to do with the said winch?

9. Is the Sorel mechanical shop owned or subsidized by the government?

MOTION FOR PAPERS

COURT OF ADMIRALTY, QUEBEC CITY, REGISTRAR

Mr. GOBEIL:

For a copy of all complaints lodged against M. A. Lachance, registrar of the Court of Admiralty, Quebec City; also a copy of all correspondence concerning the said Mr. Lachance, received and sent by the Department of Justice, since June 1, 1928.

CONFERRING OF TITLES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question which grows out of the reply made to a question by the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier) with respect to titles conferred on Canadians. The reply indicates that the promotion in the case of the Right Hon. Sir George Perley to the order of Knights of the Grand Cross was made—and this is the part to which I wish to direct attention:

> In conformity with established constitutional practice, it being the considered view of His Majesty's government in Canada that the motion, with respect to honours, adopted on the 22nd day of May, 1919, by a majority vote of the members of the Commons House only of the thirteenth parliament (which was dissolved on the 4th day of October, 1921) is not binding upon His Majesty or His Majesty's government in Canada or the seventeenth parliament of Canada.

The question I would ask the Prime Minister is whether the statement that is made there with respect to constitutional practice is intended by the government to apply to resolutions of the House of Commons generally or only to the resolution that relates to titles. As I read the statement the substance of it is that a motion in the nature of a resolution adopted by a majority vote of the House of Commons in one parliament does not bind His Majesty or His Majesty's government in Canada or another parliament. Does the Prime Minister present it as the view of the government that a resolution of the House of Commons is not binding upon His Majesty, or His Majesty's government and is binding on parliament only during the parliament in which it is passed?

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I will read what the right hon. gentleman has said, and give an answer at the next sitting.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is another question that I would like to ask the Prime Minister. Is it intended by this reply to imply that an opportunity will not be granted the House of Commons to discuss the whole question of titles before any further titles are conferred? As the resolution now stands it would appear that in the government's view the resolution of the House of Commons which we had thought was still binding is not so binding. If such is the case I wish to express to the Prime Minister the view that this house ought to have an opportunity of discussing the whole question of titles before any further titles are accepted by Canadians.

Mr. BENNETT: I will deal with the matter, Mr. Speaker, at the next sitting.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before you leave the questions, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if it would not be possible before prorogation to have an answer to question No. 2, standing in the name of Mr. Butcher, relating to an inquiry under the Combines Investigation Act.

Mr. BENNETT: I shall speak to the Minister of Labour about it.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house in committee on Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett.—Mr. Gobeil in the chair.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not wish to cast a reflection upon the hon. member who has just taken the chair, but as he has been a member sitting on the committee which has dealt with the whole matter of redistribution, I am wondering if all hon. members would consider him competent now to act impartially as leader of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): I am at the disposition of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: The Speaker should name a member.

Mr. McINTOSH: You want to hold it yourself, do you?

Mr. SPEAKER: In view of the objection, I ask the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling) to take the chair.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is better.

On section 1—Short title.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I think it desirable to point out immediately the unfairness of the government having left consideration of this most important measure until the very end of the session. That fact of itself, it seems to me, is prima facie evi-

dence of a desire on the part of the administration to exercise its power as a majority to press through this bill under circumstances which are most unfair to the minority in the house. I would point out that the government has known from the time it came into office that at this session a redistribution bill would have to be introduced. In the speech from the throne delivered on October 6 of last year an announcement was made by the administration that a redistribution measure would be brought in during the session. The bill was introduced on October 13, and was given first reading on that day. Second reading took place on November 25, at which time the bill was referred to a joint committee of the house for purposes of consideration, and if possible, arriving at an agreement with respect to what may be described as the redistribution map. These essential preliminaries were simply for the purpose of quickly getting the measure to the stage where hon. members on both sides of the house and of all parties in the house might confer together with respect to the defining of the boundaries of the constituencies embraced in the redistribution map. At the time the bill was given second reading, as leader of the opposition I suggested it might be advisable for members of the redistribution committee to convene before we adjourned at that stage of the session. Hon. members will recall that the adjournment took place last fall in the month of November. I suggested that advantage be taken of the recess to discuss the map so that at an early stage after resuming the house might have an opportunity of considering the measure in a regular and orderly fashion and not in a hurried fashion. When we resumed on January 30 of this year, apparently the committee had had no meetings at all. As time went along and the committee had had no meetings and no progress whatever had been made, I asked the Prime Minister if it was the intention of the government not to proceed at this session with the redistribution bill, and the Prime Minister said that it was the government's intention to proceed. A little later on my hon. friend and colleague from Quebec East again asked the same question of the ministry, pointing out that the general committee had not been called together, that the Quebec members on the committee had not been called into conference, and that no opportunity had been given for the discussion of the measure. That was as late as March 23. On the following day the committee was called together for the first time.

From that time forward until just a week or two ago it was only on rare occasions that members of the committee were brought together. In fact, the impression became general throughout the house that hon. members opposite had determined not to proceed with the bill at this session. It now appears that evidently what has been in the mind of the administration all along has been to have its followers leave the matter until the very last moment, and then bring in a bill fashioned pretty much by the administration itself to be driven through the house in the dying hours of the session.

In that regard may I say there is an ominous parallel with what occurred on the last occasion gerrymandering of constituencies took place in this parliament. As hon. members well know the practice fifty years ago, namely in 1882, was for the government itself to frame and to bring in a map. Then, with the aid of its majority it pressed that map through the House of Commons. That practice was followed again under a Conservative administration in 1892. On both occasions there were what have come to be known as odious gerrymanders. In 1892 Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then leader of the opposition in this House of Commons, drew attention to what was in the mind of the government with respect to the gerrymandering of that time. His words were these:

> The very fact that this measure has been postponed and put off until, I may say, the dying hours of the session, is in itself sufficient to deserve the most severe censure of this house.

These words are to be found in Hansard of May 31, 1892. He stated further:

> I protest against this system too long indulged in by this government, of delaying their most important legislation until the last days of the session when members are naturally anxious to get away to their own business.

I say there is an ominous parallel between what was said by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that occasion and what we on this side of the house are compelled to say to-day. This government also has adopted the practice of waiting until the end of the session to bring in its most contentious measures. It has deferred until the very end the measure with respect to the salary of the chairman of the tariff board, the measure with respect to radio broadcasting, and the contentious measure concerning shipping, the debate in connection with which was concluded only a day or two ago. Now, after the order paper is cleared of everything else, and it is over seven and a half months since parliament assembled for

the present session, it brings in for discussion the redistribution measure. I say it brings the measure in; as a matter of fact, speaking technically the report of the committee was made to the house on Wednesday last. At that time the bill which is now before us was presented. Realizing how little was the opportunity for full and complete discussion at this stage of the session I suggested at the time that an effort still be made to have the committee continue its negotiations with a view to finding out whether or not an impartial measure, one which would appeal to the sense of fair play in all quarters of the house might not be reached. That overture was accepted. A committee composed of some of the senior members of the house was appointed to review the situation as it had developed up to that time. The committee met on Thursday and again on Friday. But on Friday night the Prime Minister asked the house to proceed immediately with the bill, notwithstanding the fact that a call had gone out to the members of the committee to meet again that very evening. What I fail to understand is why that committee did not meet again. What was the purpose of indicating to members of the committee that they should come together on Friday night and possibly continue their discussion on Saturday, if all the while the intention was that the committee should not meet at all?

May I point out that the Right Hon. Sir George Perley, a member of the committee, stated in this house on Thursday that he believed the committee was making headway with respect to the matter which had been referred to it. I quote his words as they appear at page 5198 of Hansard:

> Sir George Perley: Mr. Speaker, some of us who have been discussing the difficulties in regard to redistribution have made some progress to-day, and we would like to have to-morrow morning to meet and go further into these matters in an effort to arrive at a conclusion.

"In an effort to arrive at a conclusion," showing that in the mind of the right hon. member for Argenteuil not only had considerable progress been made but that there was a prospect of the committee reaching a conclusion. The hon. member for Acadia, who was also on the committee, gave his impression to the house on Friday evening, and his impression was very similar to that of Sir George Perley, namely that the committee was getting together and that there was a prospect of reaching a conclusion which would be satisfactory to all parties concerned. I quote from Hansard, page 5232:

> Mr. Robert Gardiner (Acadia): I understand that the Prime Minister was just about to move the adjournment of the house. Unfortunately, when this question was brought up I was waiting upstairs for the special committee of this house to meet, . . .

And later on the hon. member said:

> . . . I consider that the committee had made splendid progress.

That was said after the hon. member had mentioned that there had been considerable discussion.

> Unfortunately to-day the committee was able to meet only for a short time; because of other duties intervening we were unable to meet this afternoon. I am quite confident however that if the major parties of the house agree to restrain themselves and be calm on the subject we can arrive at a fairly satisfactory solution of the problem which will be beneficial to all concerned. I merely rose to say to the Prime Minister that I think he would be well advised to move the adjournment of the house over the week end for the purpose of having further parleys with a view to arriving at a reasonable conclusion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that indicates very clearly that those who were nearest to the discussions, who had the clearest view of the redistribution map, were gradually coming together on a basis of fair play and equity, and that in their minds there was every possibility of a satisfactory conclusion being reached. Why then did they not continue this meeting on Friday evening, and why did they have no further meeting on Saturday? I am told that no sooner had the house adjourned than members of the committee were advised by hon. gentlemen opposite, or by one who was a member of the committee, that there was no use in the committee meeting, that it would come to the same thing in the end, that they would make no headway, and that the committee might just as well break off. I say, Mr. Chairman, that that feature, combined with the way in which the committee itself has been dragged along from month to month and from week to week, is an indication that the government has sought by a process of attrition to tire out and exhaust the patience and energies of the members of the house so that at this stage of the session it would be possible for them to press this measure through with the power which they have as a majority.

In this regard I wish to say another word, with respect to what the Prime Minister himself has said as to the function of a majority in parliament, in connection with this measure in particular. What the Prime Minister said a day or two ago in discussing this question is highly significant at this time. At page 5074 of Hansard will be found the words of my right hon. friend:

> Having regard to the fact that this is 1933, however, I think there is great anxiety on the

part of the house that the bill should be enacted, and if we are unable to do so by consent I suppose the only other way is to invoke the aid of what is sometimes called the brute majority,—

Now listen to the words which follow. The Prime Minister says, "sometimes called the brute majority." But he goes on to give his own views as to the way in which government is to be carried on. It is as follows:

—but which constitutes the means by which under democratic institutions we carry on government,—

Brute majority constitutes the means by which under democratic institutions we carry on government!

Mr. BENNETT: That is not what is said.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is what is said. I will read the passage again and allow the house itself to judge as to exactly what is said.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

—if we are unable to do so by consent I suppose the only other way is to invoke the aid of what is sometimes called the brute majority.

Mr. BENNETT: By the opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Prime Minister now interjects "by the opposition." He did not say that when he was speaking. What he did then was to continue to give his own view.

An hon. MEMBER: You understood that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

—the aid of what is sometimes called the brute majority, but which constitutes the means by which under democratic institutions we carry on government, the history of which is very interesting but to refer to which would serve no good purpose.

In that statement the Prime Minister is I think, entirely wrong. Government may be carried on by majority rule, but it is majority arrived at as a result of discussion and argument, not by brute force in any shape or form. That expresses exactly the difference between us at the present time. The Prime Minister is putting his faith in what he says is sometimes called brute majority, and he is doing it because according to his own view as stated by himself, that is the way in which government is carried on under democratic institutions. May I point out that there are some institutions of government older even than parliament in which in deciding matters which pertain essentially to justice, the rule of the majority does not prevail. The institution of the jury is a much older institution than parliament itself, and even our present day juries decide not by a majority but by common consensus of view.

Mr. BENNETT: Not in all cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the most important cases. And may I say with respect to a question like the redistribution of seats in the House of Commons, on which the whole basis of government itself rests, that this parliament is not merely exercising its function of legislating, it is exercising the function of the high court of parliament wherein it is expected to see that justice is done to all electors in the country, those who may not be in a position to represent their own views except by the members who happen to be representing them in particular constituencies at this time, as well as those who speak through their members. I submit that there is no higher trust imposed upon a House of Commons under our constitution than that of justly redistributing the constituencies. That trust is one which must be exercised not alone in the light of what is in the interest of the sitting member or the constituency he represents, but in a wholly or impartial and broadminded way in the light of what is most just and fair to the great body of the electorate.

Mr. NICHOLSON: What about 1924?

Mr. POULIOT: Ask York-Sunbury about 1924?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if at the very beginning of this discussion we are to have interruptions and continual disorder from hon. gentlemen opposite as part of their brute majority method of procedure; or whether we are going to have this discussion carried on as proceedings in parliament are supposed to be conducted? We have heard a good deal this session about the iron heel of ruthlessness and brute majority. If that is the way in which matters in parliament are to be decided I think the sooner hon. gentlemen opposite allow the public to have some say on procedure with respect to its affairs the better it will be.

I mentioned not long ago, when we were discussing the United Kingdom-Canada agreement, that I thought it would be desirable to let the public who were being adversely affected by its provisions have some say with

respect to that measure. And what was the reply of my right hon. friend? It receives added significance in the light of what is taking place to-day. I said:

My right hon. friend says he will stand or fall by these agreements.
Mr. Bennett: Hear, hear.
Mr. Mackenzie King: I challenge him to go to the country upon this issue—
Mr. Bennett: Wait till we pass the representation bill.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There you have the secret. And the Prime Minister says "hear, hear."

I just have this further to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think we might well reserve the decision as to the designation to be given to this measure until we see what it is to include. As it reads to-day it is:

This act may be cited as the Representation Act, 1932.

That, as it stands, will require amendment to 1933. I think if we are to proceed as hon. gentlemen opposite have indicated we may in the end have to change it to read, "The Brute Majority Representation Act, 1933." However, I shall reserve until later what I may have to say further on that.

I wish at the moment in conclusion to say this to the Prime Minister: The other evening he spoke of there having been threats of delay and the like. I wish to say to him at once that we are just as anxious to get away as hon. gentlemen opposite. We are making no threats of any kind beyond indicating the position which it will be necessary for us to take in opposing injustice and unfairness. If as this measure proceeds hon. gentlemen opposite show a disposition to do what is fair and just by way of amending the measure which they have presented to us they will find us quite prepared and ready to join with them in an effort to get this bill through with as little as possible in the way of discussion. But if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to say, "We have the majority; we are here and we are going to have this bill or nothing else," they must expect that those who stand for justice and fair play towards the people of this country will have something to say before the measure is put through.

Hon. H. A. STEWART (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the special committee having charge of the preparation of the schedules for this bill I think it is appropriate that I should reply to the right hon. gentleman. Under the provisions of the British North America Act it is the duty of a government, following the taking of a census, to proceed with the redistribution of the constituencies based on the population as disclosed by that census. It is not a duty that a government seeks or goes after voluntarily; it is a duty imposed upon a government by the constitution. In approaching the discharge of that duty let me assure the right hon. gentleman that this government has as high a conception of its responsibility and as keen an appreciation of the principles upon which a redistribution should be based as has been possessed by any other government in this Dominion.

The result of the census disclosed that a readjustment was necessary in the province of Nova Scotia, which must lose two seats, as well as in the province of New Brunswick, which must lose one seat. The province of British Columbia is entitled to two additional seats and the province of Alberta to one more seat. These are the only provinces in which the numbers must be varied as a result of this census. There are, however, changes to be made in the other provinces because of increases in population in certain areas, particularly in the cities, rendering a rearrangement necessary in those provinces also.

The course adopted was the course that was followed during the last two redistributions, the appointment of a special committee representative of all parties in this house. That committee was appointed in due course; it met and fully recognized the principles which had been laid down in this house by the leaders of all parties, namely that the unit of representation in the cities should be larger than the unit in the rural municipalities, and that there should be no greater disturbance of conditions than was absolutely necessary. That committee met, recognized and confirmed those principles, and it was unanimously agreed that it would be well to subdivide the committee into committees for each province and that these sub-committees should meet, discuss the situation, endeavour to arrive at an agreement and report to the general committee.

That course was followed; from time to time I saw that these sub-committees met, They had many meetings, but there were not many meetings of the general committee; no reason existed for many meetings of that committee, because until the sub-committees had exhausted their efforts or had arrived at a conclusion there was very little for the general committee to do. However, the general committee was called together in order to find out

what progress had been made, and we were all delighted with the very substantial measure of agreement that had been reached. Let me say to my right hon. friend that the work of this special committee represents an agreement in regard to, I should say, between ninety and ninety-five per cent of the constituencies in the whole of this Dominion. There is no serious difficulty in the province of British Columbia, though a readjustment was necessary there. There is no serious difficulty in the province of Alberta. I will admit that with regard to Saskatchewan the differences seemed rather acute. There is an agreement in Manitoba. In Ontario a very substantial measure of agreement was reached, and the same applies to Quebec.

Mr. POULIOT: No.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I said a substantial measure, and I know whereof I speak. There is no difficulty with regard to New Brunswick. As for Nova Scotia, we have come to at least a fifty per cent agreement, so when it is all added up there are very few seats as to which there is any difference between us. The special committee met and received the report of the sub-committees; we were assured that there had been a very substantial measure of agreement and that probably full agreement would be arrived at. But suddenly there developed in that committee a disposition on the part of some of our friends of the opposition to delay this measure. There became perfectly clear the desire that the measure should not pass this session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all; quite the opposite.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): At every meeting of the committee towards the last that desire became more apparent. I assured the committee from the beginning that it was the desire and the intention of the government that this bill should pass during this session.

Mr. POULIOT: At the last minute.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Not at the last minute but at every meeting of the committee. I said it was in the public interest, and I believe it is in the public interest that this bill should be passed at this session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I interrupt my hon. friend for just a moment? I was asked by the Minister of Finance as to what was the wish of the opposition in this matter, and I told him distinctly that we hoped that this bill would go through during this session, that we expected it to do so, and that has been our attitude throughout.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That is quite all right on the part of my right hon. friend, but he is not speaking for others.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking for the party.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): As I say, the committee met and endeavours were made to straighten out the small items as to which there were differences. We had some rather dramatic demonstrations in the committee. We had maps torn up; we had threats and invitations to mortal combat, and all that sort of thing—everything that was calculated to delay and to prevent the bringing about of an agreement.

Now, the committee met and the schedules were laid on the table. I made a last appeal to those who were in difference to get together to see if they could not harmonize, and I left the matter open until the latest possible hour in the hope that some agreement would be arrived at. But, as I say, the opposition seemed to be frozen; it seemed to have become concentrated, and the desire to prevent an agreement being reached became more manifest as time went on.

Mr. POULIOT: Not concentrated but united.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): All we could do therefore was to report the bill, and we did report it about a week ago. It has been said that this bill should have been brought down earlier in the session. Well, we are following about the same course which my right hon. friend opposite followed ten years ago with respect to a similar bill. It came in on the 11th, I believe, and prorogation took place on the 19th. It has been usual I believe to introduce this bill as practically the last item for consideration in the session.

Mr. CASGRAIN: There was unanimous consent then.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): No, there was not.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Oh, yes.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I have the report somewhere here.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was nothing brutal about it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): If the hon. gentleman will read the report he will find

that it was not unanimous. There were differences in regard to certain constituencies in Ontario and those differences were ultimately adjusted, as some of these differences may be adjusted before the present bill passes. The fact remains, however, that that report was not unanimous, as the hon. gentleman will find in the votes and proceedings. Let me say, as chairman of this committee, that I have endeavoured to be fair, conciliatory, indulgent and patient—

Mr. DUPUIS: We don't need indulgence.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —but at the same time firm; and I have indicated, as I have said all along, that it was our intention to get this bill through this session. I hope that as the discussion proceeds the subcommittees from the different provinces will be able to explain exactly what is in dispute, because I do not thoroughly understand all the details.

My right hon. friend speaks of brute force. May I remind him that there is also brute force in an opposition, and I would point out that under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman the opposition knows perfectly how to use brute force.

Mr. POULIOT: It is the force of argument, the force of reason.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): And that brute force has been used time after time in this house.

Mr. GRAY: The leader of the opposition spoke of the majority, not brute force.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am saying that there is brute force in a minority—

Mr. GRAY: The leader of the opposition did not say brute force.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —and the minority in this parliament have used it from time to time. I do not think they can deny it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We do deny it.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): And there is also a brute force in a minority of a minority, and that minority of a minority are using it on this occasion and endeavouring to hold up the bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Specify.

Mr. CASGRAIN: When did we use that force?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Let me say in conclusion that the work of the committee represents a fair, an honest, a sincere and in large measure a very successful attempt to bring in a bill which is fair and which proposes a proper readjustment of the constituencies as provided by the constitution.

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: Will he be kind enough to give us the population of each constituency as framed by this bill, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, in order to facilitate the discussion—because he said that representation is based on population.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I have not those figures; I fancy my hon. friend could get them as easily as we can. As the discussion proceeds however I am sure the information with respect to any particular constituency will be available through the chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. JEAN-FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): I do not wish to speak at great length but I can assure my hon. friend that it is impossible for us to discuss what concerns each constituency without having the population of each constituency as framed by this bill. My hon. friend from Laurier-Outremont was kind enough to pass me his notes, which indicate the population for some of the constituencies, but there are a number of constituencies for which I have not the figures: Beauharnois-Laprairie; Chateauguay-Huntingdon; Laprairie-Napierville; L'Assomption-Terrebonne; Levis; Nicolet-Yamaska; St. John-Iberville. I have not the figures for these constituencies and I would ask the minister to be kind enough to supply them at the second sitting to-day.

I do not intend to delay the committee much longer, but on Friday last the Prime Minister said that he might be impressed by the arguments advanced in the House of Commons and that this would perhaps serve a better purpose than a meeting of the special committee of elder statesmen, so called. For that reason I wish to submit certain figures for his information. I have prepared a memorandum, and as the right hon. gentleman is familiar with French he will have no difficulty in following me.

(Translation)

I—Federal Elections

British North America Act, 1867.

40. Until the parliament of Canada otherwise provides, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick shall, for the purposes of election of members

to serve in the House of Commons, be divided in electoral districts, as follows:

Quebec shall be divided into sixty-five electoral districts, composed of the sixty-five electoral divisions into which Lower Canada is at the passing of this act divided under chapter two of the consolidated statutes of Canada, chapter seventy-five of the consolidated statutes for Lower Canada, and the act of the province of Canada of the twenty-third year of the Queen, chapter one, or any other act amending the same in force at the union, so that each such electoral division shall be for the purposes of this act an electoral district entitled to return one member.

The consolidated statutes of Canada date from 1859 and only refer to the act of 1853 and that of 1855, which are embodied in the consolidated statutes of Lower Canada. The statute 23 V, chapter 1, divides the cities of Montreal and Quebec, each in three counties, respectively. No further change.

The federal elections of 1867 and 1872 were based on the Representation Act of 1860, C.S.L.C., chapter 75, with the exception of one parish transferred from Portneuf to the county of Quebec and the three divisions of Montreal which were altered.

The same may be said of the federal elections of 1874 and 1878.

The Tory gerrymander of 1882 affected only six counties.

Chapter 75 of the consolidated statutes of Lower Canada of 1860 still served as basis, with no other change to the federal elections of 1887 and 1891, until the Tory gerrymander of 1892.

II—Provincial Elections

British North America Act, 1867—30-31 V, chapter 3.

80. The Legislative Assembly of Quebec shall be composed of sixty-five members, to be elected to represent the sixty-five electoral divisions or districts of Lower Canada in this act referred to, subject to alteration thereof by the Legislature of Quebec. . . .

From 1867 to 1886 the provincial elections of Quebec, similar to the federal elections, were based on chapter 75 of the consolidated statutes of Lower Canada of 1860.

In 1886, by the act 49-50 V, chapter 96, the province of Quebec was divided in 68 counties, "which form, for the purpose of the people's representation in the Legislative Assembly, the 65 constituencies constituted by the British North America Act, 1867."

Note.—Reference of this statute, C.S.L.C., chapter 75—Reference repeated following section 60 of the consolidated statutes of Quebec, 1888.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

III—Federal and Provincial Representations

Provided also, that all augmentations or gores of seigniories, parishes, townships or settlements, and all towns, villages or reserves for the same, not specially mentioned in this act, shall be considered as forming part of the county in which the principal portion of such locality, or in the immediate vicinity of which such town, village or reserve, shall be situate, unless otherwise specified by some existing statute for whatsoever purposes.

(16 V, c. 152-9; S.R.L.C., 1860, c. 75, s. 2.)

One must bear in mind that the federal representation of the province of Quebec is always 65 members. From 1903 to 1922, the provincial representation of this province was increased from 75 to 86, this explains the following fact:

In the dominion redistribution of 1924, in order to observe the eighty-year old divisions of the counties, dating from 1853, it was necessary to rearrange the new provincial and municipal subdivisions of the counties.

The word "county" used in the dominion statutes always signifies provincial county and the only time that this word was used in a federal statute, is in the act of 1914, when it was a question of creating the "Quebec county."

The Dominion Act of 1924 always mentions the provincial counties, for instance, Frontenac, Papineau, Lake St. John East, Lake St. John West, Matapedia, etc., to quote only the counties, the provincial name of which does not exist in the federal counties in which there has been no federal change previous to 1853 up to the present legislation:

Beauharnois, changed in 1933.
Bonaventure, changed in 1933.
Chambly-Verchères, changed in 1933.
Compton, no change.
Joliette, changed in 1933.
Kamouraska, changed in 1933.
Levis, changed in 1933.
L'Islet, changed in 1933.
Lotbinière, changed in 1933.
Montmagny, changed in 1933.
Pontiac, changed in 1933.
Richmond-Wolfe, changed in 1933.
Shefford, no change.
Sherbrooke, no change.
Témiscouata, changed in 1933.
Vaudreuil-Soulanges, no change.

Old counties, to-day joined with another county, in which there has been no change previous to the present legislation:

Maskinongé, from Berthier-Maskinongé.
Brome, from Brome-Missisquoi.

Huntingdon, from Chateauguay-Huntingdon.
Napierville, from Laprairie-Napierville.
Montcalm, from L'Assomption-Montcalm.

Contour changes, previously adhering to the boundaries of the old counties:

Beauce, in 1924.
Dorchester, in 1924.
Megantic, in 1903.
Nicolet, in 1903.
Stanstead, in 1924.
Three Rivers-St. Maurice, in 1903.

Territory Added

Chicoutimi-Saguenay, in 1882, Anticosti island; in 1914, the new Quebec. Gaspé, in 1882, the Magdeline islands; and no other change since 1853.

Counties Annexed

Chicoutimi-Saguenay, 1867.

The county of Chicoutimi-Saguenay has been changed since.

Drummond-Arthabaska, 1867.
Richmond-Wolfe, 1867.
Chambly-Verchères, 1892-1893.
Laprairie-Napierville, 1892.
St. Johns-Iberville, 1892.
Three Rivers-St. Maurice, 1892.
Chateauguay-Huntingdon, 1914.
Laval-Two Mountains, 1914.
Quebec-Montmorency, 1914 and 1924.
St. Hyacinthe-Rouville, 1914.
Vaudreuil-Soulanges, 1914.
Berthier-Maskinongé, 1924.
Brome-Missisquoi, 1924.
New descriptions of counties since 1853:
Bellechasse, 1882.
Laval, from Laval-Two Mountains, 1892.
St. Hyacinthe, from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville, 1893.

New Counties

Hull, 1914: new descriptions in 1915 and 1924.

Labelle, 1892: new descriptions, 1893, 1903, 1914, 1915 and 1924.

Lake St. John, 1924: subdivision of Chicoutimi-Saguenay, comprising the provincial counties of Lake St. John East and Lake St. John West in their entirety.

Matane, 1914: subdivision of Rimouski, comprising the provincial counties of Matane and Matapedia in their entirety. No other change since.

Rimouski, 1914: divided in two, Rimouski and Matane. The federal county of Rimouski comprises the provincial county of Rimouski in its entirety. No other change since 1853.

Wright, 1892: new descriptions, 1903, 1914, 1915 and 1924.

Changes in Old Borders

Argenteuil, Bagot, Berthier-Maskinongé, Brome-Missisquoi, Champlain, Chateauguay-Huntingdon, Chicoutimi-Saguenay, Drummond-Arthabaska, Laprairie-Napierville, L'Assomption-Montcalm, Laval-Two Mountains, Portneuf, Québec-Montmorency, Richelieu, St. Hyacinthe-Rouville, St. Johns-Iberville, Yamaska.

In most of these counties there was a gerrymander in 1892 which was redressed in 1903.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the committee any longer. I have placed before it certain facts relating to past legislation of which it can take cognizance as a preliminary to the discussion to take place on this important matter. With regard to brute force, I may say that this House of Commons is not a zoo, but one of the houses of the Canadian parliament. If there is any force on this side of the chamber, it is the force of reason and the force of argument. I shall have other facts to lay before the committee as each constituency in the province of Quebec is called. The facts I have given do not refer to the subdivisions of the city of Quebec or the city of Montreal, they relate mostly to the rural constituencies. I say to the government that we are here to defend the rights of the people. I am entitled to say that because I have presented petitions to this house signed by the heads of families. What I am doing now is simply expressing the wishes and beliefs of the people whom I have the honour to represent. I shall object to any elector being taken out of the actual limits or boundaries of the constituency of Temiscouata. I shall object whether he is a Conservative or a Liberal. Ever since I have had the honour of representing these people in the House of Commons I have been devoted to them and have tried to do my duty and I shall not let the government take one of them from me.

Hon. J. C. ELLIOTT (West Middlesex): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say a few words in reply to certain statements which have been made by the chairman of the redistribution committee. I am sure he will agree with me when I say that so far from attempting to postpone this matter until another session, on every possible occasion, both before the general committee and

before the subcommittee dealing with the province of Ontario, I urged the advisability of bringing this matter, difficult although it is, to a conclusion at this session. There are many reasons why I think that redistribution at the present time is of more than ordinary importance. We are living in a very remarkable period in the history of this country. Throughout the different ridings, the people are being subjected to burdens and difficulties which they have not had to face at any other time, I hope that my attitude both before the general committee and the subcommittee was such as to indicate a very sincere desire to see brought into being a fair and just redistribution which would cause as little grief as possible to the people in the various ridings and upset conditions as they exist to-day to the least possible extent.

There is one point which I think should be stressed particularly at this time. We find that there has been an increase in urban population over what it was ten years ago. Before this committee enters further upon its deliberations, I should like to call the attention of each member to a matter which I think should be considered very carefully. To-day we are living in a very remarkable period with a great deal of unemployment. That unemployment centres very largely in the cities and towns, and I do not believe that this is not an opportune time to increase the representation in the urban portions of this country at the expense of the rural portions. There is no question that to-day the rural ridings in many cases are much smaller than the urban ridings. But when you look at the vote that was polled you will see that very frequently a smaller vote was polled in the large urban ridings than in some of the small sized rural ridings. If I remember rightly the smallest vote polled in any riding at the last election was polled in the Toronto South riding with a large population.

For the consideration of the committee in the deliberations which are to take place, I want again to renew the appeal which I have made repeatedly, that where there is a possibility of adjusting differences they be adjusted by not increasing at the present time urban representation at the expense of rural representation.

As to the manner in which the committee conducted its deliberations and as to whether the representatives of the opposition on that committee did everything in their power to have the redistribution pressed to a conclusion, I really think that the chairman of that special committee upon reconsideration will be disposed to retract the statement he made that there was a disposition on the part of members of the opposition to delay or defer the business of that committee.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I want to be perfectly fair to my hon. friend and to say that he did not urge the postponing of the consideration of the bill. In fact, he was as keen as I was to have it passed this session. I do not charge him with anything of that kind, but I say that from other sources there did come objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I knew from the discussions we had had that the chairman would realize that he was not representing exactly what did take place in his remarks in regard to certain of the opposition members at any rate. As a matter of fact, the impression I gained from attending that committee, and there was not a meeting of the general committee that I did not attend, was that the members of the opposition were all keen to have the matter forced to a conclusion this session. In a matter that involves as intimately as redistribution does the interests of the representatives of this house and of the people whom they represent, it is quite impossible for men chosen as the representatives in this house are chosen and as the members of the committee, representing cities and towns and rural communities were chosen, to agree or even to reach a substantial measure of agreement upon matters which so vitally affect the interests of the people they represent. With the Prime Minister in his seat and with many other members of the government in their seats I do renew the argument which I have made repeatedly that at a time like this, with as many in the cities and towns on relief as there are at the present time, and with that burden being borne to a substantial extent by the people in the rural communities, the adjustments so far as possible should be made without an increase of urban representation.

What does representation in the House of Commons mean after all? What is the effect of it? The effect is to give the people who are given increased representation a greater voice in the affairs of the country, and the effect of that is to advance the things that make more attractive life in the particular communities in which these people live. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we have had demonstrated to the people of this country in no uncertain way—I do not want to get into an appeal that looks like an appeal of one section of the country against another, because I think that is bad—that life in the

city and in these large centres is more attractive at the present time than it is in the rural centres. We are spending money to bring people back to the land. That is one of the great troubles that the country is facing to-day. Do you think you are going to bring about that result by increasing the representation of the cities and towns at a time like this when that increased representation means the elimination of certain ridings that have existed practically ever since confederation? That is a point which I think should be taken into very serious consideration by the committee in endeavouring to adjust differences where they exist, and where adjustments have to be made I want to urge again upon the committee that they be made if possible at the expense of the urban representation rather than at the expense of the rural representation.

At this stage I do not propose to enter into any long discussion over the effect of the redistribution on the particular province which I represent. I do want, however, to call the attention of the chairman of the special committee to the fact that even if only ten per cent of the ridings throughout this dominion are in actual dispute, just consider what that would mean in a fairly close election, for after all no one can forget the fact that at some time in the future an election will be held in these new ridings. There are 245 ridings in the Dominion of Canada. Assume that there are changes made in the redistribution which adversely affect the opposition in this house in only ten per cent of these ridings. That means 24 ridings, and very frequently that settles the question as to which party shall have its views enforced in this house.

I do not think at this stage I shall enter into the difficulties which have confronted the members of the committee in the province of Ontario. There are 82 seats in the province of Ontario, and it is not an easy matter to delimit boundaries by which certain constituencies which have existed ever since confederation shall be wiped out. I think there were 31 of those constituencies that were not touched. Some of them are small in population, but if you affect one riding by taking townships from adjoining ridings, then all these other ridings are more or less affected so that the number of ridings actually affected becomes very considerable. The committee put a great deal of time and work on the discussions concerning the province of Ontario. I regret very much that the differences have not been solved, but I am still hoping that they may be capable of some measure of solution before the deliberations of this committee have concluded. I do not know that at the present time I could to any great advantage take up the time of the committee by further discussing these problems.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Toronto Northwest): Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak briefly concerning matters raised by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott) who has just taken his seat. I must say that the relations in the Ontario committee consisting of the hon. members for North Renfrew (Mr. Cotnam), West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott), Leeds (Mr. Stewart) and Toronto Northwest (Mr. MacNicol) have been very harmonious. I think the very fact that we agreed on at least seventy-five out of the eighty-two seats is an indication that we have considered the matter with great care. Thirty-two seats in the province of Ontario we did not disturb, but left them as they were laid out in the redistribution of 1924. In regard to twenty-two other seats the changes were insignificant. With the exception of one of the eleven Toronto seats there was no criticism. The difficulties in connection with that one seat were rectified. making those eleven seats unanimous.

At the commencement of our deliberations the hon. member for West Middlesex stated he believed we should disturb as few seats as possible. I doubt whether or not in any previous redistribution in the province of Ontario as few seats have been disturbed as in the present instance, and I doubt if in any previous redistribution there was as much harmony as was in evidence in the committee of this year. In the first instance we set out to take five seats from the rural communities. It was our intention to give three of those five seats to the urban communities and two to two rural seats which had largely increased in population. According to the recent census the population of West York in the province of Ontario is over 124,000. The population of Northeast Toronto was 106,000; Toronto-Scarborough, 87,000; the county of Welland, 83,000; the county of Nipissing, 70,000. The majority of the Toronto seats are all over 60,000, running from that figure to over 106,000. We felt some consideration should be given to the densely congested areas. In that connection we decided to give two more seats to Toronto, one more to York, one to Welland and one to Nipissing. In the latest draft of suggestions in the committee we found that if we were to have unanimity in all seats it would be necessary to drop two of those seats. A great number of seats have very small popu-

lations, and as there was no rule before the committee stating a rural seat should have a minimum population of so many thousands, an urban-rural seat so many thousands minimum, and a city seat so many thousands minimum, we had no rule to go by, with the exception of what was done in past redistributions, namely to respect as much as possible the county boundaries. That has been the plan we followed in connection with the Ontario constituencies. May I add that that has been the plan followed since confederation.

I have looked up some of the figures in connection with the first parliament of Canada and the constituents the various members of that parliament represented. It would appear from those figures that to-day we are following the same procedure. The following figures will serve to show in one instance the votes, and the others the populations of the constituencies in the session of 1867-72:

Vancouver island.. .. .. .. (votes)	239
	Population
Niagara-Ontario..	3,693
Montreal Centre..	5,264
Kingston..	12,407
North Bruce..	17,183
South Oxford..	19,923
South Perth..	21,145
South Bruce..	31,372
North Huron..	39,016
Montreal East..	55,670

It will be noted that Montreal East had the largest population. The method used at confederation has been followed since. I do not say that it is the correct one. It is not followed in many democratic countries and states. I made a careful study of the whole subject as it applied to all democratic countries of the world, and I found in most countries the rural, semi-rural and city ridings were allocated a minimum. However, that is not so in Canada.

In the state of Ohio, if my memory is correct, the population per assembly representative in the state legislature is approximately 66,000. For their congress the figure is about 281,000, and they endeavour as nearly as possible to divide their states in those proportions. In West Australia they commence with a widely extended district corresponding to our Patricia or Algoma districts. To use an arbitrary figure we will say that they start off with a population of 10,000. On that basis the urban-rural constituency would have a population of 20,000, and a city constituency 40,000. But in Canada we have no such basis upon which to work. We have followed the methods adopted in Canada in the past.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

I am sorry to say that even in connection with the present redistribution a number of ridings will be small, but not as small as they were left in the redistribution of 1924. The following are some of the figures for constituencies as provided in the redistribution of 1924:

South Perth..	18,382
North Wellington..	19,833
Glengarry..	20,518
Haldimand..	21,287
Brant..	21,970
Oxford South..	22,581
York West..	61,655
Toronto East..	63,735
Welland..	66,668
Toronto East Centre..	69,717

The latter is the largest according to my figures.

Now in the present redistribution, the smallest as far as I can see will be Brant with 21,202, Haldimand with 21,428, West Middlesex with 23,632, and the largest, Wentworth with 66,943; West Essex with 69,605, East York with 69,740, Nipissing with 74,000, and Welland with 82,731.

Unless there is some change—and there may be errors in my figures because there were many numbers to add and subtract—if you compare the figures of past redistributions in this country with those now proposed, they are not different as far as I can see. In the last redistribution, that of 1924, many county boundaries were materially disturbed. The counties of Simcoe and Dufferin were joined together, they had four seats and were reduced to three; the two Elgins were reduced to one; the two Hastings and one Peterborough reduced from three to two, the three in Frontenac, Prince Edward and Lennox-Addington reduced to two, and three seats in Muskoka and Ontario reduced to two. Five seats altogether were taken off the rural ridings in Ontario in 1924 and given, one to Essex, one to Rainy River, one to North Temiskaming and two to York. I am very happy as I said at the commencement, that on practically seventy-five seats there was entire unanimity. As far as I know now there are only two ridings to settle that is in the changes in the counties, on which we have just had some discussion. I think reasonable discussion will enable us to lay the whole 82 seats in Ontario before this house in a unanimous report. That is my hope.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just one word in answer to my hon. friend. I know he does not intend to be inaccurate, but when he states that there was agreement in regard to 70 or 75

seats, the position was that there were 82 ridings being discussed and I think he will agree that the accurate statement is that the main objections were aimed at a limited number of seats, but more than he has stated.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (West Edmonton): I suppose that redistribution carried out by a committee of the House of Commons will always be a very difficult task. I had the honour of being on the committee in 1924 and we found the task exceedingly difficult then, largely on account of the fact that the movement of population in Canada is from the rural parts to the urban centres, and that movement apparently is going to continue. We found the same difficulty on this occasion. I am not going to cover the ground that has been covered by previous speakers, namely, that the committee was subdivided into subcommittees for the various provinces. Each provincial subcommittee of course proceeded to make the adjustments or work upon them, assuming of course that if they could agree the main committee would have little or no discussion about it. In the committees it was the endeavour to hear all shades of political opinion and the fact that we nearly came to a settlement on the two western provinces is I think an indication that our work was fairly well done. It is a very difficult thing to satisfy everyone. Then in the somewhat small number of meetings of the general committee, naturally we became interested in the difficulties that were encountered as announced by the members of the smaller subcommittees dealing with those provinces in which they were not so fortunate in approaching agreement. I do not know, and I am not going to say that more meetings of the general committee would have been helpful, because I think after all disputes can be settled better by individuals chosen from the provinces working in the smaller committees. There is more hope of their getting together among themselves than if outside influences are brought to bear upon their deliberations. However, despite what our good friend the Minister of Public Works has said there was a persistent rumour going about the corridors of the house that the government were not extremely anxious about putting this bill through which I may say caused me some uneasiness at times. Indeed, I felt sometimes as though our work—a great deal of hard work—was going to result in having the whole thing put over. I for one, am extremely glad that it is to be settled. I believe that the quicker matters of this kind are settled the better for all concerned, and I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee, that I was not one of those who advocated delay. On the contrary, I felt that we should get this matter settled. I never heard any expression from any one in our group advocating delay, certainly no member of it suggested it to me.

After it became evident that the committee in at least three of the provinces could not entirely agree, it was suggested that a smaller committee selected from both sides of the house might see if it were possible to bring about an understanding between the members of the committees dealing with the various provinces. Under the chairmanship of the Right Hon. Sir George Perley we did make considerable progress. I was one of those who hoped that we should get every one of those difficulties adjusted. It looked as though in Ontario the matter could be straightened out. In Quebec we seemed to be making fair headway, but I do want to say that redistribution in Quebec is the most difficult thing I ever undertook to sit in upon and understand. I confess here and now that I do not understand it; the way in which constituencies in that province are laid out. It is to me more like a jig-saw puzzle than anything else. But I still think that if our committee had been allowed to work a little longer—

Mr. BENNETT: You know that Mr. Lapointe went away on Saturday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He was told to go.

Mr. BENNETT: Who told him?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A member of the government.

Mr. BENNETT: Who is the member?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Lapointe will speak for himself. I think he will tell you.

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly I didn't.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I was here on Saturday; I went to the meeting called on Friday afternoon at 2.30. At 8.30 I went again to the room designated but no meeting took place. The hon. member for Acadia was present on both occasions, as was the hon. member for Quebec East, but the chairman of the committee did not turn up, so of course we came to the conclusion that our services were no longer required. However, I did stay here on Friday, largely at the suggestion of

the chairman of the redistribution committee, but I received no indication of any desire for a consultation on this matter. I think if that consultation had been held under the chairmanship of the right hon. member for Argenteuil, perhaps many of these difficulties could have been straightened out.

With regard to Saskatchewan there is only one thing I desire to state. The chairman of the committee referred to some incidents that occurred during the meetings of the general committee. If that is how one should have performed, perhaps we should have all become somewhat wrathy in our expressions of disapproval; perhaps then we would have obtained more than we have been able to secure, that is, if the schedules remain as they are to-day. Evidently those demonstrations brought some results. Let me say, however, that from the very start we recognized that the government had to take the responsibility of making this redistribution, and we knew perfectly well that it would be useless for us to press for the full measure of what we believed would be an equitable redistribution. Personally I was prepared to view the matter from that standpoint and to give in to a greater extent than otherwise I should have felt constrained to do. Other hon. members may feel that they have been dealt with unfairly, and no doubt they can put up a good case. I am not here to express their point of view; so far as I am concerned the sub-committee to which I belonged came to an agreement, and I am prepared to stand by that agreement. I should have preferred some changes, and would like to see them made even yet if that can be done, but if those changes are not made I do not intend to raise any terrific row about the matter and detain the house at any great length. The government must take the responsibility for this measure, and if the schedules are within reason at all I am prepared to abide by them.

In 1924 we had to take the responsibility, and apparently that redistribution has been used as a yardstick on this occasion. Naturally when you see a constituency with 18,000 or 20,000 individuals constituting the electorate while a neighbouring constituency has three times that many it does not look like an equitable redistribution, but that has been the system pursued in the past and I doubt if we can change it very much on this occasion. I just wish to add that so far as we were concerned, as members of the opposition, we were at the disposal of the committee on all occasions, ready and willing to try our best to bring about a reasonable settlement of the problems confronting us.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. SAMUEL GOBEIL (Compton): At this stage of the discussion I should like to make just a few remarks. I had not intended to speak at this point, but in view of the remarks of the Liberal member of the Ontario sub-committee with regard to urban and rural populations I feel that I should say a word. I believe my fellow members on the Quebec sub-committee will agree with me when I say that we really never discussed that point. We had several suggestions with regard to Montreal; it was suggested that two, three and four additional seats should be given there. Almost immediately we dropped the suggestion of four additional seats. One evening I was in the room of my hon. friend from Laurier-Outremont together with several members from the province of Quebec when that matter was brought up, and I said that so far as we were concerned we would be quite satisfied if Montreal were given only two additional seats, but that if this was not felt to be fair we would also consider three additional seats. During the conversations I suggested that neither party should have to take the responsibility of deciding whether two or three additional seats should be given Montreal, and I proposed that we make a joint declaration to the newspapers as to any decision that might be arrived at. At all events, Mr. Chairman, with practically no controversy we agreed to recommend that three seats be added to Montreal, and we worked on that basis. Personally, as a rural member, I would have been agreeable to only two additional seats being given Montreal, but it was thought that this would not be fair. That is about all I wish to say at this stage, except to make a reference to my hon. friend from Temiscouata, who said he was not furnished with all the information he required. I believe that was only an oversight, and the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont has informed me that the hon. gentleman has been furnished with the information required.

Mr. J. A. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): At the outset I should like to say that the relations between the members of the Quebec sub-committee were most agreeable, but I should like to say just a word in order to show exactly how we proceeded. I do not want to betray any secrets; I do not think I am doing so, because it became a matter of public knowledge that room 272 was being used by the government members of the committee for their meetings. I want to say that I was extended every courtesy in that room, and that other hon. gentlemen on this side were likewise admitted, though perhaps not so often as I was, which is only natural. After we began meeting in this room we were shown a map

which had been drawn by some man who seemed to know his business. When this map was submitted to me, representing the minority on the Quebec sub-committee, I neither approved nor disapproved of it. I was told that this map represented the government proposals with regard to Quebec, and we discussed the matter on that basis, but later on changes were made. At one time the east end of the island of Montreal was to be joined to the county of L'Assomption, but we raised strenuous objections to that proposal, arguing that more than one-half of the population of Montreal would be included in a rural district. That proposal was abandoned, and other changes were made following discussion. The counties of Beauharnois and Vaudreuil-Soulanges were to be joined according to the original map. This would have meant that the riding would be divided not only by the St. Lawrence river but also by a lake several miles wide, with no communication between the different parts. I understand there is a ferry that runs in the daytime, but at night, to get from Beauharnois to Vaudreuil-Soulanges, one would have had to go to Montreal, a distance of fifty-five miles and return.

So far as representation in the city of Montreal is concerned, there are now three seats in that city and I have no excuses to offer in giving Montreal three seats. The increase in population in that city in the last ten years was twice as large as the population throughout Quebec, and on the map as first submitted the idea was to have two seats in the island of Montreal. Discussions took place and it was finally decided that there should be three new seats in the city of Montreal, one in the west end, one in the east end, which would be respectively Liberal and Conservative, and another seat in the west end comprising Rosemount, which was supposed to be fair fighting ground for both parties, and that was agreed to. The gentlemen representing the government benches were up in my room, as suggested by the hon. member for Compton, and they thought that the plan we submitted was fair and equitable. And that, as far as I understand, is the plan which is to go through now.

I wish to go on record however, as a representative of the city of Montreal, as saying that we were entitled as a matter of fact to more than three seats; but seeing that three are given us we are going to take them, and I do not want to accept any blame for that. I am representing the city of Montreal in this house and I took it upon myself to get as much as I could for that city.

Our committee discussed this matter very thoroughly. I do not think there are other committees that worked harder than we did. We worked far into the night on many occasions, and when it was thought that it might be advisable to get some of the wiser heads, or presumably wiser heads, to form a new committee, we, as representing the province of Quebec, were called in as technical experts or advisers, and through the courtesy of the members of this new committee we assisted at all their discussions. We were called upon to give our opinion, which we did, and I might say that the difficulties that existed when our committee was disbanded, or when it was superseded by this other committee, exist at the present moment.

Now this map of the province of Quebec, as has been said by the hon. member for West Edmonton, certainly resembles a jigsaw puzzle, and there is much concern in that province as to the result of this redistribution. On the part of the public and in the press there seems to be a pardonable curiosity as to the necessity of such wholesale readjustment. Nothing of the kind was done in previous redistributions for the reason that Quebec, with its fixed population, served as the unit of representation; and if acute criticism has not arisen at the present time, so far as redistribution in the province of Quebec is concerned, at least the curiosity of the public is excited and the question is being asked—What are the reasons for all these changes in Quebec?

The opinion of the members from this side of the house, so far as Quebec is concerned, was expressed in a letter to Mr. Dorion, the chairman of that committee, on April 27, when we suggested that the province of Quebec should be left as much as possible as it is. But there were certain changes that had to be made. It must be borne in mind that the counties of Yamaska, Beauharnois, Laprairie, Napierville and L'Islet were to disappear owing to their not having the required population, and in Bonaventure, Stanstead, Lake St. John, Sherbrooke, Shefford and Brome-Missisquoi there were no changes whatever to be made.

I suggested therefore, in a letter to the chairman of our committee, that so far as the wiping out of certain counties was concerned, when that did occur the adjacent, contiguous counties should be put together as an integral whole and should not be divided up. I also suggested in that letter that owing to the increased population in Montreal the representation should take place on the principle, which we started off by laying down,

that there should be increased representation in Montreal in the west and east, as I have indicated.

We discussed these matters as long as we could. We could not agree, and it is not my intention now to go into details. I understand that when the items in the schedules come up each of the members representing the counties affected will have his say in the matter. I certainly cannot understand however why only nine seats out of sixty-five in the province of Quebec have been left undisturbed.

Mr. A. F. TOTZKE (Humboldt): At this stage of the proceedings I do not intend to discuss the individual troubles we have had with regard to the constituencies in Saskatchewan, but I wish to make a few general remarks more in reply to the remarks of the chairman of the committee.

At the outset, let me say that I hope that the remarks which I shall make at this time and later on in the discussion of this bill will be such that the Prime Minister may not again be called upon to refer to me as one of those who are arrogant and almost insolent.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say any such thing. If the hon. gentleman applies the remark to himself I certainly did not.

Mr. TOTZKE: He referred to the members of Saskatchewan.

Mr. BENNETT: Just look at the record.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why were those words used at all?

Mr. BENNETT: Because it represented the attitude of mind which hon. gentlemen were taking.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But they must apply to somebody.

Mr. BENNETT: Surely—to those who accept it. Let the hon. gentleman read what I said; I stand by it.

Mr. TOTZKE: I have it here. At page 5076 of Hansard, on May 16, the Prime Minister, in reply to certain remarks made by the leader of the opposition, had this to say:

> My right hon. friend opposite knows from long experience—and he has had a longer experience of the responsibilities of the head of a government than I have had—that there is a point always reached where you cannot expect men who belong to the majority to be told that they must subordinate entirely their views to the will of a sometimes arrogant and almost insolent minority.

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

[Mr. J. A. Mercier.]

Mr. TOTZKE: But prior to that, the right hon. gentleman had said:

> My advice to-day is, and I have inquired carefully, that certainly the map which our friends from Saskatchewan insist upon is practically their map or nothing.

And immediately after that he made the remarks which I have quoted with respect to the insolent minority.

Mr. BENNETT: I was discussing another point; I was dealing with another phase of the matter. I said that there was always a point reached where majorities could not subordinate their views to a minority—a sometimes arrogant and insolent minority.

Mr. TOTZKE: I am sorry if I misinterpreted the remarks of the right hon. gentleman. I have only this to say, that at no time during the discussion, in the committee or elsewhere, have I—certainly not knowingly—been insolent or arrogant. Now, apparently in the difficulties which the special committee of the house and the special committee of elder statesmen have met, all criticism is directed at the province of Saskatchewan. I have been told at various times that if we could come to an agreement the whole matter could be ironed out, that Saskatchewan seemed to be the stumbling block in the whole procedure. If that is true, the only thing I can say is that perhaps it is because Saskatchewan has been treated worse than any other province in the dominion in the matter of redistribution.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. TOTZKE: Somebody says "no." As an example, I cite the case of the hon. member for Melville. He is one of the oldest and the most respected members of this house. For over a quarter of a century he has been one of the leading figures in political life and agriculture in western Canada. It was decided deliberately to do away with the constituency of Melville and put the hon. member who now represents this constituency in with another hon. member of this house.

Mr. TURNBULL: Will the hon. member permit me to interrupt? I may say that since the hon. member for Melville's seat has been restored I have been asked from the other side of the house to move the boundary line back and eliminate it again.

Mr. TOTZKE: The hon. member says that he has been asked to restore the original plan; that is not correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TURNBULL: The hon. gentleman must take my word for it; I made a statement and my hon. friend has no right to say that it is not correct.

Mr. TOTZKE: The hon. member has no right to say that I asked him to put it back.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not say that.

Mr. TURNBULL: I did not say the hon. member had asked.

Mr. TOTZKE: You said you had been asked.

Mr. BENNETT: From the other side.

Mr. TURNBULL: I said I had been asked from the other side, and I ask the hon. member to accept my statement.

Mr. TOTZKE: I accept the hon. member's statement. At this stage I may say that I am speaking for the members from the province of Saskatchewan as their representative on the special committee dealing with redistribution. What was asked of the hon. member in connection with the restoration of his original plan was that instead of restoring the original lines, the town of Melville and certain other townships in that vicinity would be amalgamated with the proposed constituency of Touchwood, the new constituency to be called Melville. That is what was asked for from this side of the house. I am sure the Prime Minister will not disagree with what was suggested as the rearrangement of another constituency in Saskatchewan. I refer to the constituency of Prince Albert, represented by the leader of the opposition. This constituency was so arranged that with a normal vote the leader of the opposition would be in the minority by seven or eight hundred or perhaps a few more votes. But that was not the worst feature. The lines of the constituencies of Prince Albert and Melfort were so arranged that the boundary line would run through the farm of the present Minister of Agriculture. To my mind that shows a deliberate intention on the part of hon. members supporting the government from the province of Saskatchewan to force the leader of the opposition out of the constituency of Prince Albert and allow the Minister of Agriculture to run in that constituency.

It is difficult for anyone coming from the province of Saskatchewan to preserve the utmost decorum in the remarks he makes with regard to the redistribution of that province. I must say that all my dealings with the hon. member for Regina have been very decorous. We have been very agreeable and there has been nothing between us personally which would lead to acrimonious feelings or difficulties of any kind. With regard to the chairmain of the committee, the Minister of Public Works, I must say that he always has been courteous to me. He has been most agreeable and ordinarily I would say he has been very fair. But the fact remains that whenever I went to discuss the question of the redistribution in Saskatchewan with the chairman of the committee or later on with members of the committee of elder statesmen, I was always told that if I did not agree to the proposals made by the hon. member for Regina the bill would be forced through in spite of everything. It seems to me that that did not offer much chance for negotiation in connection with the redistribution of that province.

Mr. POULIOT: That is a strange kind of conciliation.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Tory conciliation.

Mr. TOTZKE: I should like to quote a few of the remarks made by the Prime Minister when dealing with this matter on Friday last. At page 5230 of Hansard he said:

> I have no desire that there should be placed upon the statute book an unfair redistribution, but I will not become a party to an unfair redistribution being put on the statute book by the will of the minority.

I have no objection to that statement and I heartily agree with it. I believe the Prime Minister was sincere in making those remarks. Later on he said:

> There is no disagreement about New Brunswick; it loses one member. No county boundaries have been disturbed; nothing has been done except to drop one member from Saint John. In the province of Nova Scotia, because of the desire to maintain county boundaries as they exist at present, one of our own members finds himself living in a constituency that has fifty thousand people. He has made sacrifices in that direction which he says will legislate him out of the House of Commons. That does not look like gerrymandering. In the province of Prince Edward Island there has been no change at all.

If that procedure had been followed out in the province of Saskatchewan there would have been no difficulty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And in Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT: It could not be followed out in Quebec.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it could.

Mr. TOTZKE: There has been no change in the representation of Saskatchewan, and I have maintained from the start that all that

was necessary to be done in that province was to make minor adjustments to the various constituencies in order more nearly to equalize the population. But we find that not only has the matter of the equalization of population not been given particular regard but that various members now sitting in the house and representing certain constituencies have been forced out of their own into other constituencies.

Mr. BENNETT: May I ask the hon. member a question? Is it not correct that during the past ten years there has been a substantial move northward of the population?

Mr. TOTZKE: I agree with that and I will take it up later.

Mr. McINTOSH: And a good deal of it will go back south in the next few years.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. TOTZKE: When the committee rose at one o'clock I had been referring to the remarks made by the Prime Minister with regard to redistribution in the maritime provinces and had said that if that idea had been followed in Saskatchewan we could very easily have come to an agreement. I had referred to the constituencies of Melville and Prince Albert and had said that other members were being put out of their constituencies. The Prime Minister then interjected a question whether it was not a fact that the population was moving northward in the province of Saskatchewan and I agreed that it was. I am sure that the Prime Minister will not think me discourteous to him if later on in my remarks I refer to that matter.

I had referred to the members who had been put out of their constituencies or had been put into the same constituency with another member. I had referred to the constituency of Melville where the sitting member had been deprived of his seat in Melville and had been put in the same constituency with the member for Touchwood. The hon. member for Regina then interjected the remark that we had agreed later on to the restoration of his original plan. I stated at that time that we had agreed tentatively to the restoration of his original plan for the Touchwood seat provided that the town of Melville and certain other territory was included therein and that the constituency should be called Melville. But I want to say on that point, that while we agreed to that, it was on the understanding that it would lead the way to further adjustments in various other seats of the province.

Under the redistribution as it appears in the schedule to the bill now before the house the hon. member for Yorkton is put in the same seat with the member for Touchwood. I submit that if the seat of Melville is restored to its original position as suggested by the committee at the present time, there is no necessity for the amalgamation of the two seats of Yorkton and Last Mountain. If the original Melville seat is restored it breaks down the argument that there is any necessity for the amalgamation of two seats in that part of the province.

Then there is the constituency of South Battleford which under the present plan is eliminated. A portion of it is put into the constituency of Kindersley, throwing the sitting member for South Battleford into the constituency with the present member for Kindersley. The constituency of North Battleford is in part thrown into the old constituency of South Battleford, and to my mind this is one of the most glaring instances of gerrymandering in the whole province. They take the seat of North Battleford and the old town of Battleford, and put them into the same constituency across the north branch of the Saskatchewan river. Certain portions of the old constituency of North Battleford are put into the new constituency which is to be called Battleford. Up to the present time the boundary line between the constituencies of North Battleford and South Battleford has been the Saskatchewan river. The citizens of Saskatchewan in that part of the province lying north of the Saskatchewan river have very little in common with the people on the south side of the river. The people of North Battleford and the people of the old town of Battleford have been at loggerheads ever since the new city of North Battleford was created, and I charge that this is a deliberate gerrymandering to throw the new seat of North Battleford in with the old town of Battleford.

Besides that, the seat of Redberry, as it is called in this bill, is a ridiculous sort of constituency no matter how you may look at it. It runs from the Saskatchewan river to the limit of population as at present, one hundred and fifty miles to the north. Besides that it runs to the west, north of the constituency of Battleford as it is now called, for some one hundred miles from the city of Battleford.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that we are on clause 1, the title of the bill.

Mr. TOTZKE: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but this discussion has been going on all morning.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not want to be discourteous to my hon. friend—

Mr. TOTZKE: Previous speakers have introduced all the material that I am now using, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: They should not have done so.

Mr. TOTZKE: I shall appeal to the house.

The CHAIRMAN: If my hon. friend will allow me just a moment, we are now on clause 1, which reads:

This act may be cited as The Representation Act.

Mr. BENNETT: On that section, Mr. Chairman, discussion has taken place of the whole question of redistribution, commencing with the leader of the opposition and carried on continuously. I think there is no reason why the discussion should not now be allowed to continue.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection, certainly. I apologize to the hon. member. I was simply trying to follow the rule.

Mr. TOTZKE: I am sorry you interrupted me, Mr. Chairman, because now I am off the track.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry.

Mr. TOTZKE: I was talking about the ridiculousness of the present proposal regarding the constituency of Redberry. It makes it necessary for the returning officer, if he happens to live in the city of North Battleford, which I imagine he would, having to go around the north side of the constituency of Battleford for one hundred miles to the west. Then as far as the present population is concerned he goes one hundred and fifty miles north of the city. But that is not the end of the constituency. The constituency goes right to the northern part of the province. In the northern part of that constituency there lies a good quantity of arable land which at the present time is unsettled but which likely will be settled in the future.

Mr. BENNETT: I suppose it would have to be put in some seat.

Mr. TOTZKE: Yes, and I have made a suggestion which I am sure the Prime Minister will agree is very much more reasonable than the one now proposed. I agree that the constituency of North Battleford has a very large population and should be divided, but when they throw in the constituency of South Battleford with it I say that the division is ridiculous and is clearly a case of gerrymanding. I say that the population of those two seats should be divided in an entirely different way. I say that the constituency of Battleford as now proposed should go north to the boundary of the province, just as does the constituency of Redberry. I say that North Battleford and South Battleford should not be put together in the same constituency. They should be divided.

Aside from those constituencies from which sitting members have been thrown out or thrown together into the same constituency, there is the case of my own constituency. I am a little diffident about speaking of it because at the very outset of the negotiations I had made the remark, and I still say, that they can do as they wish with my seat. But they have thrown me into an entirely new seat, and the thing I object to in connection with my seat is that they have thrown me into a seat at the expense of my leader. In a deliberate attempt, and I say it advisedly, to gerrymander the leader of the opposition out of his seat, they have put the best portion of his seat into the constituency in which I now live.

This morning mention was made of the fact that the constituency of Melville had been restored as a result of the agitation that had been carried on by the members from the province of Saskatchewan. It is true that that seat has been restored. It is also true, as I said a few moments ago, that we agreed to a certain restoration of the original plan of the hon. member for Regina, who was a member of the special committee on redistribution. I have also said that if, as proposed in the bill, the seat of Melville was restored practically to its orginal size and boundaries, the argument for the amalgamation of any seats in that part of the province fell to the ground. I submitted to the hon. member for Regina and to the special committee of elder statesmen of the house, who were supposed to act as mediators between the members of the special committee and try to reach an agreement, a map showing that it was not necessary to amalgamate the two seats of Yorkton and Last Mountain as at present proposed.

In the restoration of the constituency of Melville we had a long, narrow seat lying to the north side of the Qu'Appelle river. Prior to the proposals made by the hon. member for Regina the constituency of Qu'Appelle was located south of the Qu'Appelle river. I had no objection to the location of that constituency except that I did say it

constituted a very flagrant example of gerrymandering, because the southern boundary was not lying straight as it had been formerly, but was made to jog, running up and down for a distance of six miles, crossing and recrossing the railway, with no apparent reason whatever except to throw out Liberal votes and place Conservative votes in the Qu'Appelle constituency. I said there was justification for the restoration of the Melville seat to the north side, because the same principle applies there. The Qu'Appelle river is a natural boundary, and it is only just that the constituency of Melville should extend along the natural boundary formed by the Qu'Appelle river and with the lines of railway in both Qu'Appelle and Melville constituencies, and running their entire length. I say however that there is no justification for putting in another long narrow seat, and I suggest my map was entirely justifiable. I am sure hon. members who have studied the matter impartially must agree with my contention.

Suggestion has been made that my attitude and the attitude of other hon. members before the special committee was unreasonable, and that we had taken the position that we would accept our map or nothing. Every time I went to speak to the hon. member for Regina in connection with redistribution in the province of Saskatchewan he asked me if I would agree to the amalgamation of the two seats and the building in of a new one. I always said, "I cannot accept that." I did not see any necessity for it. Immediately the remark was made, "Well, what is the sense of us discussing any further? If we cannot agree to that we cannot get anywhere." I am not blaming the hon. member for Regina for the attitude he has taken. I realize he was in a position where he had come down from Saskatchewan with a map he was told to put through, and he had no alternative.

Mr. TURNBULL: I deny wholly that statement.

Mr. TOTZKE: I accept the hon. member's denial and I will say that if he was not tied perhaps I should say that I was more or less tied not to accept that proposition.

Mr. MANION: That is a different thing.

Mr. TOTZKE: But I still think I was right in what I said. I tried to argue before the select committee of elder statesmen, the question as to the amalgamation of the two seats and the building in of a new one, but I did not have the opportunity. After the restoration of the Melville seat was proposed I went before that committee and tried to make the explanation I am now giving to the committee. Of course I was heard, but after speaking I was told that if I did not agree to the proposition suggested by the hon. member for Regina, with the possibility of very slight variations in boundaries here and there, the matter would be put through by force and in spite of me. That was the attitude I met all the way through negotiations from the chairman of the committee, from government members, and from the select committee of elder statesmen. Always I was more or less threatened with the suggestion that if I did not agree to the proposals made by the hon. member for Regina they would be put through anyway, and possibly would be worse than before. Finally, in an attempt to have some agreement before the matter was brought into the house or into this committee I prepared another map. I went to present it to the committee of elder statesmen, but found that only the two Liberal members on the committee and the leader of the group in the corner of the house were present. I laid the matter before Mr. Turnbull, and he said to me, "Is that the least you will take?" I said, "Substantially, yes." I did not have the opportunity of arguing the matter before the committee of elder statesmen, and I suggest I was placed in the position where anything I proposed was given no consideration until I accepted almost in entirety the proposals of the hon. member for Regina.

I wish to say only a few more words in outlining the position I took throughout the negotiations. On March 16 I received the first map from the hon. member for Regina. In the covering letter he made the following observations:

> I gave considerable thought to your suggestion that the boundary lines should be moved to the north and found that in actual practice it was rather difficult to make a general application of that principle. In some cases the boundary line has been moved north on my proposed plan. In others, it has been extended south and in one instance, sufficiently to take in part of the territory south of the Saskatchewan river. I know this is contrary to the idea that natural boundaries should be recognized, but I can only point out that communication at the point in question is not difficult, and that there are either five or six ferries across the south Saskatchewan river in the area in question.

As I have spoken some time, I shall try to curtail my remarks. After receiving that letter I submitted to the hon. member for Regina a contra proposal in the form of a map. The covering letter, of which I wish to read a part, is dated March 27, and is as follows:

> I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the twenty-fifth instant, and wish to submit the following in reply.

You will recall that my first statement to you in connection with the redistribution of the constituencies in Saskatchewan was, that as there was no change in number of the representation from that province, the only excuse for making any alterations in the present boundaries of the various constituencies was that there should be a more equitable distribution of population among them. I also said that it was an accepted principle, and in this I am supported by the statement of the chairman of the committee, the Hon. H. A. Stewart, that the unit of population should be considerably larger for urban districts than for rural.

In preparing the map which I submitted to you, this is the principle I have followed, although I admit that in one of the northern constituencies, namely Melfort the population was left a little above the unit. The other two seats, namely Prince Albert and North Battleford, while above the unit of population, each contain a city and thus may be classed as urban constituencies. However, I submit that adjustments to the boundaries shown on my map could very readily be made to take care of any discrepancies in distribution of population without too radically disturbing the present boundaries.

I admit at once the comparatively large percentages of increase in population of the northern constituencies, but I submit that considerable of this increase has come from districts in the dried out areas in the southern part of the province, and the majority of these people, to my mind, will return to their former homes when conditions return to normal, as I am sure they will.

Perhaps I was not quite correct in that particular, because the census was taken in 1931, and quite a large number of the people who moved to the northern part of the province went up after it had been taken. However I still maintain a considerable number went up before, and a good many of them will return to their former homes. My letter continues:

There is also no doubt in my mind that certain areas in the northern constituencies, now occupied, cannot maintain their population and will of necessity have to be abandoned.

Then I included a list of the constituencies showing the percentage of increase in population in the last ten years. I do not think it necessary to burden the record with this information. Then my letter continues:

Now the increase in population for the province is 21·6 per cent, and this must be borne in mind when considering percentages of increase in the various constituencies. I shall draw to your attention only those districts in which there are marked discrepancies, and which do not bear out your claim in the matter of adjusting populations.

This letter refers to the first map submitted by the hon. member for Regina:

Touchwood had an increase in population of only 7·2 per cent, and so perhaps should be a little larger than the unit for the province, but as the unit works out at 43,861, and will be considerably smaller when allowance is made for larger urban units, it seems to me that the population in this district is far too large.

Maple Creek had an increase in population of 13·7 per cent, considerably below the average, and yet the population has been decreased under your plan.

Moose Jaw had an increase of only 0·02 per cent in population. This is an urban riding, but under your plan, the population has been decreased.

Qu'Appelle had an increase in population of 8·8 per cent—very much below the average, and yet has a decrease in population under your plan.

Saskatoon had an increase in population of 48·9 per cent it is true, but this is an urban district and should have a considerably larger population than you give it. The new district, Hague, which you propose around Saskatoon, has only 1,077 less of a population.

Yorkton is an urban district, but the city of Yorkton has only about one-eighth the population of Saskatoon, and yet you make the district considerably larger in population than Saskatoon.

Now, if you will study my map, I think you will find that in the majority of the seats the population has been fairly placed, having regard for the unit of population which making allowance for the larger population allowed urban districts I would place at about 42,000.

Willow Bunch is a little high, and some of it could be put into Moose Jaw, which is considerably too low.

Long Lake is a little low in population, and some could be added from Humboldt, which in turn could take more territory from Melfort, and possibly Prince Albert, which would more nearly equalize the population all around.

Rosetown also is below the unit, and here population could be taken from North Battleford to make adjustments in both seats.

The difficulty I found with the hon. member for Regina and the Saskatchewan members on that side of the house was that they claimed that if my proposals were followed the population which was taken from the other seats and put into these seats which they were trying to preserve would mean the defeat of their candidate. In reply I said I admitted that was substantially correct, that they could not go out of these districts into the area around them without getting a population which was more or less predominantly Liberal; but I said at the time that I was not concerned particularly with the evenness of the population in the constituencies. I pointed out that in other provinces they had in certain constituencies a very small population and in others a very large population. I also said at that time that I was quite willing to go back to the present map of Saskatchewan and make alterations here and there which would more nearly equalize the discrepancies in the population, and that there

was no necessity for an entire new gerrymander of the province. To continue:

Now may I make some remarks regarding your plan in general. To my mind your map does not recognize the fact that the only changes required in our province are adjustments to more nearly equalize population. You are not, for example, consistent in the recognition of natural boundaries. For example, in Qu'Appelle you retain the Qu'Appelle valley as the northern boundary, yet in Kindersley, South Battleford, Long Lake and Hague, apparently no attention to natural boundaries has been given, yet the Qu'Appelle valley is more easily crossed than the Saskatchewan river. Then again, no apparent attention has been given to railway transportation in some districts, and, as everyone knows, in the wintertime and during wet spells this is the only way one can get around his constituency.

I must say that I cannot help but come to the conclusion that your proposal is a deliberate gerrymander, which is confirmed by the fact that a number of the sitting members are forced out of their present ridings into new ones.

With regard to your remarks as to the probable trend of population in the future, I am sure you will admit that there is little likelihood of any very large increase in our population during the next ten years, and hence our adjustments may fairly be made on present population.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at this stage of the proceedings, I do not know that I have any more remarks to make. When we get into the schedules I intend to go over the districts one by one, and shows just the attitude I take in connection with each. But before I take my seat I wish to bring to the attention of the committee the one constituency which I think is the worst of all in Saskatchewan, that is the constituency of Long Lake. This constituency has been a little low in population, it is the only constituency in the whole province where a decrease of population has been shown during the last ten years. But it is bounded on all sides by natural boundaries, on the one side the Saskatchewan river and the Qu'Appelle river. On the east side is Last Mountain lake. As I said before, the Saskatchewan river can be crossed at various points by ferry, but on the west side of this particular constituency is this Last Mountain lake which is sixty or seventy miles long and there is no way of crossing except by rowboat or motorboat, there are no ferries on the lake. So if the member for the constituency lived on one side or the other of this lake he would have to go around the end of the lake to visit his constituents on the other side. And at the same time any constituents who wished to visit their representative would have to do the same. At present it is all right, the representative lives in Regina and he can start out and go up the east side and down the west side, but in the case of a member residing in the constituency this could not be done without a great deal of inconvenience and loss of time.

[Mr. Totzke.]

Then I also want to draw attention to the city of Regina whereby this proposal the hon. member for Regina suggests that only the city of Regina be in the constituency. It is true the population of Regina is large enough for a constituency, but I submit that the annexes and suburbs should not be thrown in with the rural area. There is what is known as North Regina, having about 800 population, I do not know the population of the other part. But I submit that in this case the suburbs of Regina should go with the city. The same applies to the city of Saskatoon, I say more of the surrounding parts should be taken into that constituency. The people of the city of Saskatoon are thrown into the new constituency of Hague under this proposal, it is very inconvenient. Having nothing in common with the people to the north of Saskatoon, they should be taken in with the city.

My time is up, and I will reserve my further remarks until the schedules reach the committee.

Mr. F. W. TURNBULL (Regina): I do not propose at the present moment to discuss the details of all the constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan, but merely to present to the house as well as I can the general problem with which the committee was confronted, the general plan which was adopted to deal with the problem, and the guiding of principles by which I was governed in coming to the conclusions to which I came. My hon. friend from Humboldt made one or two remarks which seemed to me to explain clearly the whole situation. At one stage of our negotiations he said he was not concerned very much with the populations, but, to use his own words, he was willing to go back to the old map of Saskatchewan and leave it as it was; there was no necessity for a new gerrymander.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): A new one is good!

Mr. TOTZKE: That was not my statement.

Mr. TURNBULL: If my hon. friend will consult Hansard he will find that what I say is correct.

Mr. TOTZKE: I wonder if the hon. gentleman will accept my word as I accepted his.

Mr. TURNBULL: Not as to what you said in the house. I will leave it to Hansard.

In 1924 when the last redistribution took place in Saskatchewan, there was not a Conservative member from that province in the house. There was only one Conservative mem-

ber from the northern part of the province here when the redistribution before that took place. But whatever took place in 1914 did not much affect the matter because the map of Saskatchewan was terribly altered in 1924. On that occasion the subcommittee for Saskatchewan consisted of the hon. member for Melville, who was then representing the city of Regina, and Mr. J. Fred Johnston, who then represented the constituency of Last Mountain. At that time this terrible natural boundary of Last Mountain Lake, which should be observed very strictly to-day, was in the centre of the constituency of Last Mountain.

Mr. TOTZKE: Not in 1924.

Mr. TURNBULL: Until 1924. In that year it was necessary to provide for new seats in the province, and the error was made in building those seats. With regard to the area immediately south of the South Saskatchewan and Qu'Appelle rivers, which includes eight of the present seats, there has been no great difference between myself and the hon. member for Humboldt; in fact our agreement has been so close that the press reporters attending the committee meetings have said there is no difference between us on that point. With regard to this boundary line of Qu'Appelle, to which my hon. friend referred a few moments ago, and which is in this southern portion, all I can say is that I understand that the boundary line is satisfactory to the hon. member for Assiniboia and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, who represent the adjoining constituencies, and I see no very great reason why we should waste the time of the house in trying to disturb it.

Mr. TOTZKE: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. TURNBULL: Taking the six seats immediately north of the Qu'Appelle and South Saskatchewan rivers, which include Yorkton, Melville, Last Mountain, Long Lake, Rosetown and Kindersley, these seats presented an entirely new and difficult problem. In the first place, prior to the 1924 redistribution that territory was largely included in the three constituencies of Saltcoats, Last Mountain and Kindersley; it is true that the larger portion of the constituency of Yorkton was not in that area. By this arrangement made between the Liberal member for Regina and the Progressive member for Long Lake, of the new seats to be built into Saskatchewan three were built into that area, and the result of the 1925 election there should be observed after this—well, I should not call it an old gerrymander because I have not used that term, but in contrast with the new gerrymander we will call it a redistribution. As a result of what took place there the constituencies of Yorkton and Melville returned Liberal members, and remember that Melville was the constituency built in there by the then hon. member for Regina, who immediately forsook Regina and went to the new constituency, where he was returned in 1925 with a majority of over three thousand and in 1926 with a majority of over four thousand. The hon. member for Last Mountain was also elected by majorities greater than 1,500, while the new constituencies of Long Lake, Rosetown and Kindersley returned Progressive members to the house, this being practically the only area from which Progressive members were returned. Qu'Appelle and Mackenzie were the other two seats. With further reference to the redistribution of 1924, it will be recalled that in the parliament of 1921 there was only one Liberal member from the province of Saskatchewan. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that the results of the following elections proved their fairness or unfairness in that redistribution. In the first election after 1921 there were fifteen Liberals returned to the house instead of one.

Mr. VALLANCE: You lacked $750,000 in that election.

Mr. TURNBULL: When we come to discuss that we will discuss how much you got out of the Jacques Cartier cheque and how much you got out of the cheque from the Department of Public Works in Saskatchewan, to which the hon. member referred in this house the other day, and which he tried to make out was a cheque of the Saskatchewan relief commission.

Mr. VALLANCE: I rise to a question of privilege. As the records of the province of Saskatchewan show—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. VALLANCE: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I object to the statement made by the hon. member for Regina. He lives close to the seat of the provincial government in Saskatchewan, and the statement I made on the floor of this house can be verified by the papers which have been tabled.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must state his question of privilege.

Mr. VALLANCE: The question of privilege is that the hon. member has accused me of receiving a bribe from some source,

which is absolutely untrue. Must I submit to that sort of thing? The hon. member for Regina knows that all the papers which have been tabled in the legislature prove the truth of what I stated the other day.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member rises to a question of privilege, and I should like him to state it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was a most vicious attack.

The CHAIRMAN: I want to understand the privilege the hon. member claims, and I should like him to say which words he wants withdrawn. I cannot listen to a speech on these matters.

Mr. VALLANCE: Will you allow me to tell you? I thought you were listening. When the Minister of Labour was putting through his estimates having to do with unemployment I stated in this house that a certain member of parliament who now sits in the House of Commons received a cheque, diagonally across which was marked "Relief No. 1." I was that member of parliament, and I stated to the house the conditions under which I received that cheque. Then I directed a question to the minister as to how much of the money spent for unemployment relief in the province of Saskatchewan had been used for like purposes. This money was paid to me through the relief commission in lieu of land which they expropriated for road purposes, but now I am accused by the hon. member for Regina of receiving moneys to which I was not entitled.

Mr. TURNBULL: I never said that.

Mr. VALLANCE: Now I demand that the hon. member, who knows as well as anyone does the facts in the case, retract the statement he has made, because he knows it is untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: In all fairness I must hear the hon. member for Regina.

Mr. TURNBULL: If I had said that the hon. member for South Battleford had received—

Mr. VALLANCE: You did say it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. VALLANCE: I will not sit down.

Mr. TURNBULL: If I had said that the hon. member for South Battleford had received a cheque to which he was not entitled I would withdraw that statement unhesitatingly, and if the hon. member is under the impression that I did make that remark I here and now relieve him of that misunderstanding. I do not think I ever made that statement, and I believe Hansard will bear me out. In any event I do not know of any cheque the hon. member ever received to which he was not entitled. What I did say was that he had received a cheque from the department of highways in Saskatchewan, which was marked "Relief No. 1" and which he then led the house to believe had been issued by the Saskatchewan relief commission for the purchase of land instead of for relief. The hon. member now says—

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. VALLANCE: No, I will not. I rise to a question of privilege.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member for Regina has the floor, and I think in all fairness he must be allowed to state his position. Then the hon. member for South Battleford may reply.

Mr. TURNBULL: A few moments ago the hon. member said he got the cheque through the Saskatchewan relief commission. That cheque was for the purchase of soil, which was taken off his land to make a fill in a relief highway passing his farm. He was absolutely entitled to that cheque.

Mr. VALLANCE: Then why bring it up?

Mr. TURNBULL: Why bring up the $750,000, which has nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. VALLANCE: I was entitled to this money.

Mr. TURNBULL: It was taken to cover another excavation.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member tell me what words he wants the hon. member to withdraw or retract?

Mr. VALLANCE: I want the hon. member to withdraw something he has just said also. The records of this house will show that when the Minister of Labour was putting through his estimates I stated the position very clearly; I told him of the cheque I had received from the department, diagonally across which was written the words "Relief No. 1." I directed a question to the minister in that regard, but he had no information. Now I want the hon. member for Regina to withdraw the allegation or the insinuation that I received that money from some source other than the source from which I said I received it. That is the point.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member knows he must accept the word of a colleague.

Mr. TURNBULL: I have no recollection of having said at any time that the hon. gentleman got it from some source other than that from which he himself said he had got it.

Mr. VALLANCE: Does the hon. gentleman accept my word as to where I got it?

Mr. TURNBULL: If the hon. member says he got it from the department of highways that will be correct; but no matter where he says he got it, I will accept his word if he will get up and say it. As I was saying before this irrelevant interruption came, the fairness of redistribution according to the leader of the opposition, must be tested by the results it brings; that is what he says. The right hon. gentleman argues that because we elected eight members in Saskatchewan in 1930 the redistribution in 1924 must have been fair. Well, if that is the case, may I ask what happened in 1925 and 1926 when we did not elect any? Where was the fairness of the redistribution then? However, I am not going to discuss that question at the moment except to make this observation; whether in error or otherwise, more seats were built into the country immediately north of the South Saskatchewan river than there should have been in 1924. If it was an error, well and good, and if it was intentional that does not make the position any better.

That was the first problem. I may remark incidentally that when these seats were made in 1924 as I have described, the population was then 18,000 below the unit of population, and that in a part of the country that was not growing. One of these seats has actually decreased in population since then, while all others have increased slightly, particularly at the eastern end; so that in 1931 those six seats were between 51,000 and 52,000 below the 1931 unit of population, which unit of population had increased, between 1921 and 1931, from 36,283 to 44,186. It was obvious therefore that in this area there were too many seats—quite obvious.

In the northern part of the province another problem presented itself. There were three seats there, Melfort, Prince Albert and North Battleford, which were away above the unit of population—seats which had grown enormously in the ten years between one census and the next. The population of North Battleford, according to the 1931 census, was 53,708, or an increase of 55.8 per cent; the population of Prince Albert was 50,896, or an increase of 30 per cent in the ten years; and the population of Melfort was 52,688, or an increase of over 71 per cent in the ten year period. There was the second problem, that across the northern part of the province were three seats much too large, and in an area which was rapidly growing. There were six seats in the centre, much too small, in an area which was not growing rapidly, if at all, and there were three seats in the northern part of the province which, as I say, were much too large and in an area rapidly growing. This is the area which the hon. member for Humboldt says will fill up with settlers in the next ten years, and from which the hon. member for North Battleford tells us settlers will be leaving in a year or two.

Mr. McINTOSH: I will attend to you when I am speaking.

Mr. TOTZKE: I think the hon. member for Regina misunderstood me. What I said was that the North Battleford area contained a good deal of arable land which would lend itself to settlement. I did not say however that there would be settlers there.

Mr. TURNBULL: If my hon. friend is correct, the hon. gentleman from North Battleford is running true to form.

Mr. McINTOSH: Like my hon. friend.

Mr. TURNBULL: The hon. member for Humboldt says that there is considerable arable land in that area. Now, having faced that situation, I conceived the idea that the proper way to remedy the error was to remedy it at the place it occurred, and accordingly I was of the opinion that, too many seats having been allotted in this area in the first place, and that the area having been represented by one member too many in the last ten years in comparison with the rest of the province, the right thing to do was to restore it to its proper representation, which could be done only by combining two or more seats so as to reduce the number.

The northern end of the province presented the exact converse of that situation. It was going to be too large for three seats, and I thought it would be better to make an extra seat where an increase in population had taken place. Another idea I had in mind in laying out the boundaries was that, the northern seats being placed where, in my opinion at any rate, growth of population would be most likely, and having some regard to the trend of population except in that area I have indicated, it was fair that the northern seat should start below the unit of population. That is not a new principle. My hon. friends, in making the 1924 redistribution, recognized the principle themselves and started the seats

of North Battleford, Prince Albert and Melfort, 4,556 in population below the unit at that time. With their growth of population they increased 24,714 above the unit, or an average of over 8,000 each higher than the unit of population. I therefore adopted the same principle followed by my hon. friends in 1924 with respect to the northern seats, believing that they should be started off fairly well below the unit of the province.

Having decided this, I had reached the conclusion in my own mind that a seat had to be removed from the central portion of the province and a new seat built in the northern part, and my map was prepared on that basis. The fact that the southern part of the province is satisfactory is, I think, some evidence at least of the fairness of the map I drew in the southern part.

Mr. TOTZKE: Will my hon. friend pardon me? The southern part is not satisfactory, but I said I was willing to come to some understanding if other matters could be adjusted.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members may not interrupt without permission.

Mr. TURNBULL: Well, if it was not entirely satisfactory down to the last section or township or range, at least there was no great dispute about it; there was nothing that could be regarded as being in the nature of a deliberate gerrymander or frameup. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I may say that the expression deliberate gerrymander, apart from the fact that members are not allowed to impute motives, has been a stock phrase with my hon. friend from Humboldt. The first communication I had from him with reference to the first map I submitted as the basis of the negotiations that had so far been carried on was that it was a deliberate gerrymander, and the hon. gentleman has used that phrase in all discussions since. As I told him then, and as I repeat now, such expressions do not add to "the comity of nations"; rather, they tend to prevent agreement. My hon. friend from Humboldt had his own ideas as to how these matters should be fixed up. As I understood him, he came here with somebody else's ideas which he intended to carry out. In any event, his idea was that the proper thing to do was to perpetuate the error, and in order to retain these seats, which should never have been there in the first place, it would have been necessary to move all the boundaries northward, discommoding all the seats north of them. We should have had to do that if we were going to perpetuate the error committed in 1924, and because I could not agree that this was the right thing to do there was, as he has said, a deadlock from the start. He would come into my office and ask, "Have you given up the idea of amalgamating these seats and moving them northward?" I would reply, "Certainly not", and we would then agree that there was no use discussing details until that general principle had been settled. If at any time in the course of the negotiations I had abandoned my plan and accepted the plan put forward by the opposition, we should probably have got together later on with respect to the details. But I could not see that I was bound to do this in order to be fair. I did not accuse my hon. friend of being unfair or of trying to bring about a deliberate gerrymander merely because he did not adopt my plan, and I had hoped that he would not suggest any such thing because I did not adopt his. Apart from the fact that we have differed on this general principle, however, I may join with him in saying that our negotiations personally have been kindly and cordial, and if we do not part in agreement at least we part friends so far as redistribution is concerned.

That covers the general problem and practically the whole dispute which has been in existence between my hon. friend and myself with regard to the province of Saskatchewan. I said that these should be amalgamated, my hon. friend said that they should not; I said that a new seat should be built into the northern part of the province, my hon. friend said it should not. From the first day we met until the day the bill was brought into the house there was no recession by my hon. friend from that position. At no time during the whole proceeding did he offer one single concession. This matter came up very early in the course of the proceedings and in order to make my position clear, the question of the seat of the hon. member for Melville having arisen and I having amalgamated it in such a manner that the seat of the hon. member for Melville was divided into two parts, as was Yorkton; this question having arisen and the proposal having been objected to by the hon. member for Humboldt and I being accused of trying to gerrymander the hon. member for Melville out of his seat, I put myself on record in a letter dated April 27, 1933, reading as follows:

Mr. A. F. Totzke, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.

Re: Redistribution

Dear Mr. Totzke,—

I understand that the principal objection to the redistribution map prepared by me is that it involves the disappearance of Melville as a

separate seat, and thereby seriously affects Mr. Motherwell. I have no desire to do anything that would look like being unkind to Mr. Motherwell, or any other member on either side of the house.

If, therefore, you can find some way of preparing a map that will not be unfair, and will provide for the retention of Melville seat, I will be quite prepared to reconsider the situation.

That has always been my attitude, expressed both verbally and in writing to the hon. member for Humboldt. I may say that a map in compliance with that letter has never been submitted to me. My hon. friend says that when you come to draw a map there should be no regard for politics or anything but the rights of population, and with that theory I agree absolutely. That was one of the reasons that led me to refuse the map prepared by the hon. member for Humboldt. Member after member from both sides of the house came into my office. I discussed this map with them and member after member told me they had never looked at the vote to see whether the map they were proposing was good or bad. If that is so, my hon. friends who presented me with the map were singularly fortunate from a political point of view in where they placed their lines. The result of that map was apparent to anyone.

Some statements have been made with regard to attacks made by me on two former ministers, but there has been nothing of the kind. I have been adopting the principle laid down this morning in the house by the leader of the opposition. He said that a map should not be drawn in the interests of the sitting member or in the interests of constituents, it should be drawn in the interests of the electors of the whole dominion. If it was a crime to disturb the seat of one of these right hon. gentlemen so as to make his chances of election less sure than it was before, then what about the proposed map of the hon. member for Humboldt? According to that map, the present Minister of Agriculture would have been out of his seat entirely so far as the vote at the last election was concerned. If my hon. friends say that they never looked at the vote, I say again that they were singularly fortunate in having placed the lines where they did.

Mr. TOTZKE: I do not think it is right to say that any map I put forward would have put the Minister of Agriculture out of his seat.

Mr. TURNBULL: Another criticism which was made of the map was that the boundary line between Prince Albert and Melfort passed through the farm of the Minister of Agriculture and left it open to him to run in either constituency. I do not know where the danger to the leader of the opposition lies, but perhaps there is some. In the map made in 1924 an area at the forks of the South Saskatchewan and North Saskatchewan rivers, running twelve miles on the north bank of the North Saskatchewan river and twenty-four miles on the south bank of the South Saskatchewan river was interjected into the constituency of Melfort. The area in question was some six miles wide and included between the forks of the river. In order to get to the southern portion of his territory from the northern portion, the candidate for Melfort had to pass through the territory which had been interjected into his constituency. I eliminated that by drawing my line straight north and south past the forks of the river. That line happened to run through the farm of the hon. member for Melfort but that was not the factor in the placing of the line. It may have been a coincidence, but that was all. Perhaps the hon. member who drew the map in 1924 did not look at the votes, but again I say he was singularly fortunate in where he placed his lines. These things are coincidences when my hon. friends do them but when we do them, they are deliberate gerrymandering.

The hon. member for Humboldt says that if we had pursued the same course in Saskatchewan as was followed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick he would have been quite satisfied and there would have been no trouble at all. We dropped a Conservative member in Nova Scotia and we dropped one in New Brunswick and I suppose if we had dropped Conservative members all along the line we would have got agreement. My hon. friend criticizes because members are being put out of their constituencies, but I wonder if he knows how many members in the province of Ontario were put out of their constituencies in 1924? I wonder if he knows how many members are being dropped to-day through constituencies being joined? In deciding boundaries should we not do what the right hon. the leader of the opposition says should be done, not decide them with regard to the sitting members or with regard to the constituencies but with regard to the larger interests of the electors of the Dominion of Canada.

My hon. friend complains that South Battleford and North Battleford have been put together. I do not see any great crime in that. They were put together provincially by my hon. friend's friends in the province of Saskatchewan and they remained together provincially under my own friends in that province. After an experience of ten years they are evidently satisfied to stay together. Why should there be any crime in keeping together people who have lived in such friendly relations provincially during that period? My hon. friend proposes that South Battleford

should be continued northwards to the northern limits of the province. He has told us at great length of the hardships the returning officers are put to in reaching the northern parts of the province, and he referred to the great hardships to be faced by the candidates. Why duplicate that? If one returning officer has to go up to look after North Battleford, why send up another to look after South Battleford? If two or three candidates have to go up to the northern territory to cover one constituency, why send up two or three more to cover another? It seems to me that the smaller number of candidates that will have to traverse the northern section of the province by canoe or dogteam, the better it will be for everyone concerned. I cannot see any justification for extending the boundaries to the northern part of the province. I may be charged with being inconsistent because of the extensions made in the constituency of Mackenzie, but the northern portions of that constituency can be handled from The Pas. If the candidate for Melfort has to handle that territory he will have to go to The Pas as best he can to reach the same territory as the candidate for Mackenzie.

Proceeding to amalgamate some of the seats in the central area and having observed that the growth of population was greater in Rosetown and Kindersley than in the seats east of there, I decided that the amalgamation should take place in the eastern rather than in the western end of that area, and I did take the four seats of Long Lake, Last Mountain, Yorkton and Melville and draw a map so as to convert these four seats into three. To do that I extended Long Lake east of the Last Mountain lake where it had been in days gone by, and I divided what was left of the other three seats by a boundary line running north and south. That boundary line was satisfactory to at least one member involved. With regard to another member I never heard any complaint. With regard to the third member there was long and loud complaint till at last there was that dramatic scene, absolute stage play, in the committee room when my hon. friend from Melville with the assistance of the hon. member for South Battleford mutilated the map of the hon. member for Humboldt in that scene which was intended to be dramatic and was intended for the press. That is one of the troubles of democracy in a country like this. You cannot always do what you think is absolutely the right thing if the feelings of the public are to be worked up by a stage play of that kind. I am still of the opinion that the boundary line as drawn north and south and having no regard to whoever lives there, is the right line, the proper boundary line to have made for that constituency. But my hon. friends opposite were vociferous through inspired messages to the press and through their speeches in the committee which were made for the press, that a great injustice was being done, and we had the same old cry, that this was the seat of an old, long established member of the house, and that sympathy cry was played to the utmost limit. So following that, on Monday the fifteenth, I addressed another letter to the hon. member for Humboldt which reads as follows:

Mr. A. F. Totzke, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Mr. Totzke,—

I am sorry that I cannot arrive at any conclusion other than that the six seats lying immediately north of the South Saskatchewan and Qu'Appelle rivers, in view of the fact that they are deficient in population by 55,000—

That should be 51,000 or 52,000:

—and in view of the further fact that they have grown very little in the last ten years, should be reduced in number by at least one.

In the last map I submitted to you, a certain area has been included in the two seats of Touchwood and Yorkton-Melville with the boundary line placed north and south. Although nearly all of the old provincial constituency of north Qu'Appelle, formerly represented in the provincial house by the Hon. Dr. Motherwell, was included in the seat in which his farm is situated, objection is taken that the change deprives Dr. Motherwell of a constituency. While I cannot see the force of that objection, as he is still living in a constituency which is familiar territory to him, I am, nevertheless, prepared to go a considerable distance and to sacrifice some of my own views in order to promote an agreeable compromise.

I am, therefore, suggesting that this territory be divided by an east and west line, instead of north and south. In order to get a fair balance of population, the east and west line might be described as follows:

"Beginning at the eastern boundary of the province and following the old boundary between Yorkton and Melville to a point six miles east of the old boundary between Yorkton and Last Mountain, then north six miles, then west along the township line to the boundary between Touchwood and Long Lake (as shown in my present map)."

That would give Dr. Motherwell a territory well served by railways, convenient to get at, well known to himself, and would appear to me to be an ideal seat.

With regard to Prince Albert, I will be prepared to make the southern boundary of that seat approximately on the line suggested by you.

I hope that this suggestion will settle the whole matter, in so far as Mr. Vallance and others in the committee on Saturday declared that if a change were made that would leave Mr. Motherwell approximately his old seat, they would withdraw all opposition. In any event, I understand that your objections now are as follows:

1. With regard to North Battleford, South Battleford and Kindersley.

2. With regard to the fact that Last Mountain Lake is a natural barrier that has not been recognized.

3. The combining of a large portion of Melville with a large portion of Yorkton; which objection will be removed if the proposition now submitted to you is agreeable.

In order to promote prorogation, I would be glad if you would agree with me in a definition of the matters still in dispute between us.

Prior to the writing of that letter the hon. member for Humboldt had been in my room, and we had discussed the situation in Prince Albert. We had discussed the southern boundary for that seat, and either I in his presence or he in my presence drew a line, or we drew it between us, which still remains on my map, as the line he thought would be fair to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. TOTZKE: The hon. member does not want to be unfair. He will recollect that I also asked for the eastern boundary of Prince Albert to be restored the way it was, taking off the portion that was put in from Melville.

Mr. TURNBULL: I will not contradict my hon. friend, but I do not recollect it, and the line is not on the map. In any event I made the offer that is contained in this letter, agreeing to place the southern boundary of Prince Albert on exactly the line that my hon. friend from Humboldt indicated. I had thought then that all the matters in dispute between us had been settled. Lest they might not be I asked my hon. friend. I outlined in the letter those things which might still be in dispute between us and asked him if he would agree with me in defining the points in dispute so that we would know where our settlement came. Later he called me or I called him, or at any rate we got into conversation on the phone, and I asked him if the proposition contained in my letter was agreeable to him, and he said, "No, it is all off." I think those were his exact words. He said that the hon. member for Prince Albert would not buy any concession for himself at the expense of anybody else in the house. A perusal of my letter will show that there were no concessions asked on behalf of anybody else. An offer was made, and it was hoped that it would be accepted—that it would narrow, if not entirely remove, the issues between us. In any event the written offer was refused, and having been refused I did not feel that I could very well change the map that I had with the lines that had been agreed upon. That is the situation as it stands to-day with respect to the constituency of Prince Albert. If my hon. friend wishes to see an example of a constituency at all like what my hon. friend has referred to he should look at the constituency of Maple Creek on an old map of Saskatchewan. It is true that there the unit of population is smaller, but on the other hand Maple Creek is a constituency that covers a very great area and it is a very hard constituency to handle. It is a country with a comparatively sparse population, and in view of that I did not see that there was any particular harm in making the unit a little smaller than for other seats.

Mr. JOHN VALLANCE (South Battleford): As one of those whose constituency has been eliminated in the new electoral map as presented in the schedules to this bill, I should like to say a few words. I am also one of those unfortunate individuals of whom the hon. member for Regina speaks who lives only two or three miles from the boundary of his constituency. May I point out to the hon. member for Regina that in the twenty-six years that I have lived on that same piece of land I have been moved around with every redistribution bill, so possibly I should not have any kick because I am being moved once more. The hon. member, if he goes back twenty-six years, will remember that the old constituency of Battleford took in all that portion of western Saskatchewan as far south as the Saskatchewan river. That was in 1907. Then after the next redistribution bill I was placed in the Rosetown constituency. With the next redistribution I was placed in Kindersley, and then again in South Battleford.

As regards the 1924 redistribution bill the hon. member for Regina has pointed out that the hon. member for Melville and the hon. member for Last Mountain were two of the members from Saskatchewan on that committee. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Humboldt, in spite of all the gerrymandering that was supposed to have taken place in 1924, and in spite of us, in 1930 it was possible to elect eight Conservative members and two Tory Progressives. True, as he has said, in 1925 we were able, under the redistribution of 1924, to elect seventeen members, and we were able to support the late government on that redistribution. I believe he will also agree however that it was not because of the redistribution that those results were made possible. At that time in the west there was an agitation against a certain political group which had been in existence since 1921, and on that ground and that ground alone the members who were elected in Sas-

katchewan in 1925 came to parliament in the session of 1926.

After the hon. member for Humboldt and the hon. member for Regina had been deliberating for a very considerable period they found themselves at a deadlock, and it was suggested from some source or by some individual that a new committee not officially appointed might be set up to arrive at a conclusion. The hon. member for Melville and myself were chosen by the Saskatchewan group to sit in on the newly elected committee along with the hon. member for Saskatoon and the hon. member for Moose Jaw. The hon. member for Melville and myself along with the hon. member for Humboldt in the office of the last named hon. member drew up a new map, and in it laid down certain principles which we thought we should follow in arriving at a conclusion. I shall be quite frank with the committee by stating that the first principle we admitted was that we would not disturb any sitting member from the province of Saskatchewan, irrespective of his place in the house. We thought if we could redistribute the population with as little disturbance as possible of the boundaries new set out, we would be doing well. The second principle we laid down was that we would take rural constituencies, namely those constituencies one hundred per cent rural but containing small villages and hamlets, and set the population at from 40,000 to 44,000, a figure which we considered fair. For those semi-urban constituencies, namely those containing small cities or large towns, such as Moose Jaw, Swift Current, Yorkton, Battleford, and the larger centres of population other than large cities, we set anything from 44,000 to 46,000. And for the two larger cities of Regina and Saskatoon we set the figure of from 50,000 to 56,000. With those points in mind we set to work and presented a map in the office of the hon. member for Melville upon which occasion two hon. members opposite were present. At that time we were told very distinctly that it was impossible for them to accept the map. There was no further argument, and the committee never met again.

In the meantime I met the hon. member for Regina, upon which occasion he pointed out to me that the map which we had submitted would eliminate four Conservative members now sitting behind the government. I hastened to assure him then as I do now that it was not our intention to do any such thing. As has been pointed out by the two previous speakers, the constituencies throughout the centre of the province were lacking in population, while three of the northern constituencies had too large populations. We attempted to redistribute by moving gradually south that excess population in the northern part of the province without creating any undue disturbance, or creating any new seats in the northern part of the province.

If hon. members would look at the constituency of South Battleford they would find that that portion which is and was predominately Liberal has been moved from the constituency of South Battleford and placed in the constituency of Kindersley. May I tell you, Mr. Chairman, and this committee through you, that immediately after the last election the Conservative candidate made the statement that if the southern end of South Battleford, namely that portion in which I live, was eliminated from the riding the Tories could win. Therefore I was not at all surprised when, upon the presentation of the redistribution map, I found that South Battleford had been eliminated, and that the portion which had been predominately Liberal had been put into Kindersley constituency. In the original map there was another rather peculiar feature, namely, that the newly proposed seat of Kindersley went down across the South Saskatchewan river, thereby taking in a portion of the present Swift Current constituency. Upon going through the vote for the last election to find out just where that portion of Swift Current stood in that election I found to my amazement that there was about 800 of a majority of Liberal votes. But the next time I looked at the map I found that that portion of Swift Current had been eliminated. The hon. member for Kindersley agreed with me this morning that it was eliminated on his suggestion.

Mr. TURNBULL: It was opposed also by your member on the committee.

Mr. VALLANCE: I believe the hon. member is correct, in the first instance. The reason he opposed it was that our first attitude was that natural boundaries should be maintained. The hon. member is quite correct there. But it was not at his instance it was removed. It was removed because of representations made by the sitting member for Kindersley.

The hon. member for Regina has given the date of a certain meeting of the redistribution committee which the hon. member for Melville and myself attended, and at which we probably played a rather important part. He has accused the hon. member for Melville and myself of putting on some stage play, and suggests that it had all been rehearsed. I can state truthfully that no such arrange-

ment was entered into between the hon. member for Melville and myself. Undoubtedly the hon. member for Melville had well prepared that which he was going to say, and I think the very results would indicate that he had well in hand the matter which he had under discussion that day. I hasten to assure the hon. member for Regina, however, that it was not on any agreement between the hon. member for Melville and myself that the events he has described took place.

Quite naturally I discussed the 1924 distribution with the hon. member for Melville who at that time was the only Liberal member west of the great lakes. He represented the Liberal party in Saskatchewan during the 1924 redistribution. Despite what the hon. member for Regina has said, the hon. member for Melville took his map to the late Senator Willoughby who was then residing in the city of Moose Jaw and with only a few very minor changes the senator agreed that the map was very fair. Having in view the fact that the province of Saskatchewan is not entitled in 1933 to greater representation than it had in 1924, it seems to me that the situation is rather tragic. Our whole representations were on the ground that we had no increase in our number of representatives and that with very little trouble we could have redistributed the excess population throughout the existing twenty-one constituencies, without to any appreciable extent disturbing either the boundaries of or the members now representing those constituencies. That is all I wish to say at this point, but I shall reserve my rights to speak again at a later stage.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Melville): Mr. Chairman, I do not desire with the other members for Saskatchewan to monopolize the whole time, but it does occur to me that Hansard would read more intelligibly if we made out initial statements consecutively. Let me at the outset assure my good friend the Minister of Public Works that I have left my cane and any desire to use it just now in my room, possibly to remain there until the next redistribution period comes around.

An hon. MEMBER: Too bad!

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Unless it is required, you know. But I have no desire today to engage in a controversy with anybody with regard to this matter. I think the fact that I am well out of my teens possibly accounts for the fire going out of my blood a little and the heat out of my tongue, especially after the long six months we have been engaged here during this session. Whatever else comes, I am going to try to be moderate to-day.

At the outset may I say that as far as the constituency of Melville is concerned I am quite satisfied with its present boundaries as outlined in the bill before the house. Of course there is a very conspicuous protuberance from it just opposite the village of Lebret that might possibly be whittled off, but that can be attended to when we come around to it. I am willing to take it the way the government gives it nothwithstanding that protuberance if they object to the change.

After all I do not think this is a very satisfactory way to settle this knotty question. We have had it discussed over and over again already, and now we are going over it so many times more, and then again we are to go over it by provinces. Is there not some more excellent way of settling this difficult question? We are now well on into May, outdoors is delightful, the fields are a glorious sight, the resurrection of spring brings new life to vegetation, the trees are bursting into leaf and bloom, the birds are mating, and here we are indoors disputing over a matter that in my estimation should be delegated to some impartial body that has no interest in the elections: Especially does that apply in those provinces in which there is disagreement. As a matter of fact in all previous redistributions during this century the various subcommittees were able to come together and agree, and putting it through the house was only a matter of form. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it is due to the cantankerousness of the opposition that we cannot agree this time, or is it because we have a government that has brought down an arbitrary and most unfair arrangement of constituencies? I remember quite well the redistribution of Sir Robert Borden's government in 1912, I think it was; we never knew there was a redistribution going through, it was never mentioned during the following election. The same is true with regard to the preceding one of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and as far as I know, there never was any word regarding the matter during the election that followed the redistribution of 1924. We never heard of it in our province, everyone was satisfied. Surely the desire for a scrap has been well worked out of us this year, without prolonging this session just for pure cussedness on the part of any of us.

No, Mr. Chairman, with all respect to others that is not the reason. We believe that a very serious injustice is being done, not only in Saskatchewan but elsewhere, by the provisions of this bill. Some might think that as my own seat has been conceded—at least

as far as the legislation is concerned; it can be changed of course if the government so desire; I do not desire it—that I should be satisfied. Well, that would be a very small, narrow attitude for me to take. Shall I be satisfied when my brother, my fellow members who are less fortunate, are still dissatisfied and believe they have a right to be, and I also believe they have a right to be? Can I be a piker and withhold my help while my fellow members continue to suffer? Surely that would not be a proper attitude. Yet in justice to the government I must express my appreciation of what they have done for my constituency. I certainly will convey to my constituents my appreciation of the simple act of justice that the government has done to the constituency of Melville. I do that quite freely. I do not know to whom particularly to convey my appreciation, three or four are claiming it now, I am willing to accord it to them all. I catch the eye of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir), I understand he had quite a bit to do with restoring this constituency. If so I want to thank him. The hon. member for Regina thinks he as a member of the subcommittee had something to do with it. If he had I want to thank him. But down deeper than all that, in the bottom of my heart I have a feeling that the Prime Minister had something to do with it. I appealed to Caesar for simple justice, and not in vain.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I did not interfere with the committee.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, there are a good many ways of getting a thing done by the Prime Minister without doing much interfering.

Mr. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I had no communication at all directly or indirectly from the Prime Minister.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, anyway, I feel so appreciative that I am willing to spread it all over the whole government and its followers. It is immaterial to me as long as I do justice to the situation by expressing myself thus.

I am not going into the controversial side of the redistribution situation; I am under orders not to be too boisterous or belligerent, nor too long. Something has been said in regard to the redistribution of 1924. I think if the hon. member for Regina knew the facts he would not have made such statements as that arrangements were made whereby this one and that and the other got such and such a majority, including myself. Why, Mr. Chairman, even this government could not have arranged things to get a seat in Saskatchewan at that time. The policy of the then leader of the Conservative party was such that if all the angels in heaven had come down into Saskatchewan they could not have elected a Conservative. Think of the policy of the Conservative party with regard to the Crowsnest pass and the tariff and the Hudson Bay railway at that time. That is why, regardless of redistribution, regardless of boundary lines, there was not a Conservative elected in that province. In fact for nineteen long years there was not a single federal Conservative elected in Saskatchewan. It has been stated who the members of the subcommittee of 1924 were. There were at that time six provinces of the dominion which had not a Conservative member. So we had some difficulty in trying to get proper representation on some of the committees. In the province of Saskatchewan there were, I think, fifteen Progressives and one Liberal, your humble servant being the lone Liberal pelican upon the housetop at that time. Well I could not go to work and make a Tory member just to go on the redistribution committee. So we did the next best thing; when the Progressives and the Liberals arrived at an agreement as to the map—I think we had five new seats to place, making twenty-one, and that added to the difficulty—when we had arranged the map as we thought reasonably and as it would commend itself to the major committee, I then, as intimated by the hon. member for South Battleford, was instructed by the major committee to take our map to the late Senator Willoughby. He was then, I think, the leader of the Conservative party in the upper house. He had also been for many years leader of the Conservative opposition in the Regina house. I knew the late Senator Willoughby very well and quite favourably. I went to him with the map and said it did not seem quite right that they should not have a voice in its formation. The fates seemed to be unkind to the Tory party for a number of years, but I did not anticipate that it would always be so, and my anticipation has been proven correct. Therefore I said we would feel more comfortable if he would take our map and look it over. He asked if he could keep it and I said yes, that he might keep it three or four days in order to consult with whatever colleagues he chose. If I remember correctly I mentioned Senator Calder, but I am not sure; at all events I left it to the late Senator Willoughby to consult with whatever Conservative colleagues he had in Saskatchewan, and I am sure he had at least

two or three. At the expiration of the three or four days I went back to his office and asked if there were any particular changes he would like. He mentioned two, the first of which we the subcommittee had already considered and met his wishes. It was a trifling matter, and is not worth mentioning now. I asked what the other change was, and he said he would like six townships taken out of the riding of Qu'Appelle and attached to the riding of Weyburn, immediately south. I suppose these six ridings merely happened to have strong Liberal majorities. I said to the Senator, "Well, if we concede this change it will be decidedly in your interest, because Weyburn does not really need it while Qu'Appelle will be very glad to get rid of those troublesome townships." In this redistribution bill the Conservatives still show that desire to get rid of that Liberal area, in Qu'Appelle and many other similar areas as well. The senator replied, "Well, you do not expect me to make a recommendation against my own side, do you?" I admitted that I did not, and then I asked if those were the only recommendations he desired to make with regard to the twenty-one ridings in Sakatchewan, if all he asked was that those six townships should be transferred from the south of one riding to the north of the other, and he said that was all. I told him that so far as I was concerned he could have that change made, and I stated that I would so report to the main committee. I conferred with Fred Johnston before reporting; when we presented that suggestion to the main committee they smiled a little at our simplicity. I said, "Will it not be worth that concession to be able to say that the map was referred to the only Conservative representatives we could find?" In those days they were as hard to discover as a needle in a haystack, and we took the only course we could. I suggested that it would be worth while to be able to say that after the map had been referred to some representative Conservatives the only changes they requested were fully complied with. From a political standpoint as well as from the point of view of being right it was worth many times the loss of the six townships, so we were not quite so simple minded as we appeared. It was fair and right, and after all is not the right and fair thing the proper thing to do even in politics? You may look simple at the time for doing it, but it will be like bread cast upon the waters; it will come back some time, perhaps in a few days rather than many.

I do not know whether or not hon. gentlemen opposite believe that story; I cannot say I do not care, because I do care. If we had some sort of tribunal, however, to which we could refer these matters, when any responsible person made a statement such as I have just made we could easily call witnesses before that body. In my case I could wire for Fred Johnston and John Millar or any others who know the facts.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And Senator Willoughby?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will not wait to ask my hon. friend to repeat what he said. We could get also the hon. member for Weyburn as he has some knowledge of the matter. These are some of the reasons why I dislike the thought of spending these beautiful spring days inside in unprofitable discussion of this controversial matter, but it is not our fault. An unjust and unfair redistribution of constituencies has been offered this house by the government; we do not like it, and we are going to show our opposition in all legitimate ways. I hope the discussion will continue to be legitimate and orderly, but if it is not the responsibility must be borne by the government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I have covered what I had in mind when I made these few notes this afternoon. I feel like making an appeal to the Prime Minister; perhaps because my last appeal was successful I feel like making another. Why the haste? We started the last distribution in 1923, but it took two years. Rather than press it on some unwilling members in 1923 we deferred the decision until 1924. Was that not a better way than to scrap it out or threaten to put it through by closure? I said some pretty caustic things about the Prime Minister's experience in London at his first conference, and again with regard to the Ottawa conference. Now I want to say some nice things about his experience in Washington, where he conducted himself in a manner which made us all proud of him. Would it not be better for him to leave the shores of Canada with everything nice and peaceful on parliament hill than to have just finished a great big scrap over redistribution?

An hon. MEMBER: A bribe?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is a justifiable bribe if it is a bribe at all. I am putting it as I think my hon. friend from Parkdale would put it in his own heart. Anyone who has been at one of these great conferences knows that the person who represents Canada or any other country must have a period of quiet, rest and study to prepare therefor, and if the Prime Minister would follow that course I am sure no man at the conference would acquit himself better from his viewpoint than the same right hon. gentleman. But if he goes there with his nerves all ruffled

and his temper out of joint, after mauling us all around here and making us accept this redistribution bill, unjust as it is to so many members, in what condition will he be when he arrives in London? Even the six days of salt water will not soothe the fire that will surge in his blood and gurgle in his veins. I think the right hon. gentleman comes of Scotch and United Empire Loyalist parentage; he must have some Irish too, and perhaps a little Yorkshire. In that case how could anyone expect anything but a desire to scrap when such a splendid opportunity and such a natural cause as we have within the provisions of this bill presents itself.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How about blarney?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If hon. gentlemen opposite want to know my composition I will give it to them; it may account for some of my belligerency and indignation when I find myself put upon. I am Scotch, Irish and Yorkshire; that is enough to hang anybody, when drawn into a real fight. I should think I had really accomplished something if the Prime Minister were to say, "What is the use of pushing this through?" Let it stand till another day. There are many other unjust things in this bill in addition to the Melville constituency omission. That has been adjusted all right, but how about the ninety and nine? They must be dealt with yet, and this is neither the time nor place to do it. We cannot make any progress in the next ten days so far as I can see unless amendments are permitted. Then a race for the train; a race for the boat; a race for London, fire and brimstone breathing all across the way; and then you expect to soothe down the ruffled feelings of the nations of the world on the many knotty problems that will come up on that occasion before a thus harassed and hurried Canadian Prime Minister. I do not believe it is fair and I appeal to the Prime Minister as our Prime Minister, as my Prime Minister—the best one I can get for the present, and so long as it is by the will of the people whoever is Prime Minister, is my Prime Minister, no matter what side he is on. I would acknowledge the same if the C.C. F.'ers were in power, though I rather hope that will not occur in my lifetime. But joking aside, I think that most of us feel that while we have been looking forward for nearly three years hoping for accomplishments, nothing worth while has really been done yet. First there was the London conference, then the Ottawa conference, then the Washington conference; and now we have been told, "Hurrah, boys, the real thing is coming at the London conference on June 12th." Well, if that is to be the climax, if it is to be a case of to be or not to be, then I say, let us not spoil the setting, the home leaving for the Prime Minister by dealing with this matter at this time. That would be my invocation, that would be my last word at this stage of the debate, and I have a sort of half belief that whatever the Prime Minister may do or say in response to my appeal he would like to do as I suggest himself. But the exigencies of the situation, the possibility of an election this fall, and the desire to reap any benefit that might accrue to the governing party by reason of this redistribution all urge him to have it over first and get it off his hands, so that the government will be free to go to the people at any time. I can quite understand that. But will not that advantage be largely lost, will it not be dissipated if he drives this unjust measure through the house? The Minister of Public Works said a bib-full during his short remarks when he intimated that there was such a thing as a brute minority. Yes, there is, if we choose to exercise it. Five men backed by other speakers desirous of going the limit, and without any violence, could compel this government to abandon this bill before the conference if they wanted to.

An hon. MEMBER: Not at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, they could, and there would be no violence either;—

Mr. CHAPLIN: You have a great imagination.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: —but we don't want to do that. I do not want to give you the secret particularly, but I know how it could be done. There is nothing this government dislikes more than publicity; indeed, there is nothing any government dislikes more than publicity if it has a poor case to put up, and I am afraid that is the situation this government is in. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not need to have me tell them how desperately unpopular they are throughout the country, from one end of Canada to the other, and I would urge upon the government, while the debate is still in a state of quietude, and still showing a decided desire not to boil up, that something be done to avert the impending storm; because as sure as fate, if ever we lock horns properly there will be fur flying and wigs on the green. I do desire to avoid that if I can, and if anything I have said will bring about a better state of affairs I shall be happy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I wish that whoever is muttering would try to talk loudly for me to hear, because I cannot hear while Hansard can. I cannot express myself any more earnestly than I am doing on this subject at this time, addressing myself through you, Mr. Speaker, particularly to the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. CAMERON R. McINTOSH (North Battleford): As one of the members from western Canada affected by this notorious redistribution bill, I think I should say a few words in this house. The measure before us is described as "Bill 2, an Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons." The understanding implied by that title is that the readjustment of representation is to be brought about by a government having a fair majority in parliament and not by a government which will use in an unfair way the majority given to it by the people; not by a government anxious to make use of a brute majority in the national assembly. At the present moment we are not sure what the government is going to do; in other words, the government has not yet put its cards on the table to show how it will get the measure through the house. We shall see that by and by, but I hesitate to believe that the best thinking members on the other side of the chamber, the Prime Minister himself or any one of his cabinet members, will attempt to drive a measure of this kind through the House of Commons by means of the gag, by brute majority. I hesitate to believe that until I see it. However, if that attempt is made, the members from western Canada will explain in no uncertain terms their attitude towards any such endeavour.

May I now briefly review two or three points leading up to this measure. May I say first of all that the work of redistribution in Canada is nothing new; it has taken place periodically from 1867, over sixty years ago. Under the British North America Act redistribution is necessary every ten years, and I think it is worth while going back over past history to see how the work of redistribution has been effected from decade to decade. In 1872 there was a redistribution following confederation; there was another in 1882, and one again in 1892. During the period covered by those three redistributions the Conservatives were in power. We have been told—and I am not mistaken—at least it has been re-echoed by quite a number of Conservatives from the west, that this is their first chance, their glorious opportunity for a gerrymander. They have stated that they have not had an opportunity to carry out a redistribution to their taste for quite a long time and they therefore must take advantage of the present occasion to do their best in order to improve their chances at the polls. There we have their viewpoint as explained by themselves, calculatingly, coldly, callously.

Well, in 1872 and 1882 right up to 1892 the party opposite was in power and had charge of three redistributions, and I would point out first of all that the redistribution of 1872 was put through the house, not upon the report of any joint committee but by a brute majority; it was driven through the house. The redistribution was effected in a similar way in 1882 and in 1892. When we come to 1903 we find the Liberals in power, and the redistribution in 1903 and that carried out in 1924 were the only two occasions when the Liberals effected a readjustment of representation in the House of Commons. Both these redistributions were as fair as possible. Since confederation, of seven redistributions, five have been made by Conservatives and only two by the Liberals; in other words, the Conservatives have had more than twice as many redistributions under their charge as the Liberals have put through the house.

All redistributions up until 1903 were carried out in about the same way, not by a report of a joint committee, not in a conciliatory manner, not by cooperation, but by using the majority in the House of Commons to drive partisan redistribution measures through the house. In 1903 a change took place. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a great Canadian, was at the helm of state. What did he do? He turned his back on work of that kind, he would not accept it. He arranged for a joint committee to take up the work and try to obtain a decent solution of the problem. Things were worked out in a fair and just way. In 1911, after the success of 1903, Sir Robert Borden, another eminent Canadian, was at the head of affairs and he followed the practice launched by Laurier in 1903. If I am not mistaken the present Prime Minister was a member of that redistribution committee, and if any hon. member of this committee ought to know what was done and what ought to be done now, it is the Prime Minister. I am just fair enough to believe that before this debate continues much longer the Prime Minister will rise to the occasion and take such action as will enable the committee which was dealing with this measure, or the last elderly committee which was dealing with it, to take up the matter anew and so iron out all difficulties that the work of redistribution will be done fairly and honourably.

The hon. member for Regina said that in 1924 there was not one Conservative from

Saskatchewan at Ottawa and therefore the interests of the Conservative party were not looked after as they should have been. I am afraid the hon. member must be mistaken. Does he believe that because he was not then a member himself the interests of the Conservative party were not well looked after? Does he mean to cast disrespect upon an honoured gentleman who has passed away and who was then the leader of the Conservative party in the upper chamber? Surely if the hon. member will but give one moment's reflection to what was done in 1924 he must admit that what was done was done honourably and fairly and that the Conservative party was consulted on every move. He must admit that the hon. gentleman who was then the leader of the Conservative party in the Senate accepted in full what was done and was entirely satisfied. He was not ignored. He had representations to make; they were listened to and they were met in a satisfactory way. What more could have been done?

Let me go on. In 1887 the Northwest Territories had only a very small representation at Ottawa. The Northwest Territories were given representation for the first time in 1887 and had only four representatives, one from Assiniboia East, one from Assiniboia West, one from Alberta and one from Saskatchewan. In 1903 this representation was increased and the province of Saskatchewan was represented by six members, one for Assiniboia East, one for Assiniboia West, one for Humboldt, one for Mackenzie, one for Qu'Appelle and one for Saskatchewan. It will be noticed that the representation was growing. The population of the west was growing and the great lone land was taking on new life. In 1906 and 1907 another representation change was made and Saskatchewan was given ten members, about half the number of the present representation. There was a member for Assiniboia, one for Battleford, for Humboldt, for Mackenzie, for Moose Jaw, for Prince Albert, for Qu'Appelle, for Regina, for Saltcoats and for Saskatoon. We come now to the 1911 redistribution, and it will be found that Battleford existed as a seat from 1911 to 1917. That is six years, or the lifetime of one parliament. In 1917 another change took place, and that change has existed up to the present year. In 1917 North Battleford was given a member and South Battleford was given a member. The two names North Battleford and South Battleford were placed on the electoral map of Canada.

This brings me to the diabolical attempt being made at the present time to do away with these two historical electoral names. In the bill now before us we will not find the name "North Battleford" and we will not find the name "South Battleford"; we will not even find the name "The Battlefords," all we find is the name "Battleford." Some explanation has been given that the new riding is going to be called "The Battlefords," but if so, it does not appear in the bill. North Battleford has been destroyed and taken off the map entirely; South Battleford has been likewise destroyed and taken off the map and there is no name—and it would appear deliberate—in the measure now before the committee to symbolize that there ever were two Battlefords or that there are two Battlefords to-day. That is a nice kettle of fish, is it not?

Let me go on. When the hon. member for Humboldt was speaking he touched upon this question and referred to it as illustrative of an out and out gerrymander. The hon. member for Regina tries to tell us that it is not a deliberate gerrymander, that it is not a gerrymander at all. I am here to say and say positively that it is. I am here to say that he cannot go into northern Saskatchewan and make his argument stick with five per cent of the people—not even with the majority of Conservative electors. He knows that he cannot. He knows just as well as he knows that he is sitting in his seat that he has deliberately engineered a gerrymander move—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McINTOSH: —to destroy the name of North Battleford, to destroy the name of South Battleford and not put in their places names which will tell the world or tell the country that there are two outstanding districts in northern Saskatchewan named North Battleford and South Battleford.

The aim of any redistribution measure ought to be the equalization of population. The hon. member for Regina attempted to make out that he was following that plan, that there were too many seats made in central Saskatchewan in 1924 and that one would have to be eliminated. He claimed that the population had gone northward and some adjusting would have to be done. He gave these as the reasons why he made the changes in the two Battlefords and further south. Surely he does not expect those who know the facts to believe any such concoction of excuses.

Let me tell the committee what he and the Conservative party have done in this bill as far as the federal riding of North Battleford is concerned. They have taken two-thirds or more of that riding which they figure consists

of Liberal votes and made a new riding with the addition of a few polls from across the North Saskatchewan river at the northern end of the Rosetown riding. The hon. member for Rosetown did not want to accept those polls, and we know why. He figured that they were Liberal and he did not want them. That is the reason why he would not take them. They had no conscientious difficulty in tying up those few polls from across the North Saskatchewan river with two-thirds of the North Battleford riding, which was Liberal, and calling the new riding "Redberry." They made a new riding and called it 'Redberry." They purposely killed the name "North Battleford" by taking mostly all the Grits in the portions of the two ridings mentioned and putting them into one new voting area.

They have taken the remaining part of North Battleford, something like one-third of it, which they estimate quite Conservative, and put it with the top part or two-thirds of South Battleford, which they figure is also Conservative, and in this way they have made the new riding of "Battleford," and in this new riding they place the city of North Battleford. Just fancy such a base partisan move! May I say that I live in the city of North Battleford, and the boundary of the new riding in which they have hived the Grits, the constituency of Redberry, is only about three and a half or four miles from the city of North Battleford. I live in that city, and I am not in my old riding because I figure my old riding is over two-thirds of the North Battleford riding which has been intentionally wiped out and given a new name, having had an addition made to it—as I have explained—from the south. Fancy any representative, or fair parliamentary committee submitting to an insulting proposition of that kind! I would imagine that the very look of the thing would be extremely obnoxious and antagonistic to any man with a fair mind. But up to the present time, although representations have been made, the hon. member has made no attempt to remedy that monstrosity. The riding of North Battleford as it now exists is simply a curved geographical monstrosity. It has been cut to pieces and a third of it joined to two-thirds of the Battleford riding to make what the hon. member for Regina considers a Conservative riding. That is deliberate gerrymandering. What could one call it if not that? It is interfering with the franchise rights of the people affected. There is nothing fair or just about it. There is not an elector that I know of who will say that that is a fair redistribution either as to the top or northern part of the Battleford riding or the gerrymandered parts of the North Battleford constituency. Outside of a few Tories in North Battleford from whom the hon. member for Regina had to hear—as the hon. member told me himself—before he could make any changes, no citizen will regard this redistribution as equitable and fair. He cannot deny that.

Mr. TURNBULL: I do not think that is very fairly put.

Mr. McINTOSH: I do not want to misquote the hon. member. I have a great respect for him except in some regards.

Mr. TURNBULL: If my hon. friend will quote the rest of the conversation he will see that it is not what he said.

Mr. McINTOSH: With certain reservations I have a wholesome respect for the hon. member, but I am afraid he is slipping, dangerously slipping. I fear he is going astray. I am afraid he is destroying his own reputation in the province. I am satisfied he is destroying his own reputation in the city of Regina. I am convinced he has done something here that will be tagged to him for the rest of his life. I only spoke to the hon. member once or twice about this measure. I deliberately kept away from him. I wanted him to have has own free will about it. But I had an idea what was going on all the time, and when I did speak to him about it he said, "I will consider the matter," but I do not think he has given the consideration promised. But he did say—yes he did—that he had to hear from North Battleford before he could do anything. He was expecting to hear from a small Tory clique who were bent on manipulating votes. These men were back of my hon. friend from Regina, these and other Conservatives from the province. These men were tied to the committee in Regina that, in the main, worked out this redistribution bill. There is no doubt about it that the map which my hon. friend submitted in the first place was wilfully concocted in Regina, and is the product of a Tory clique representative of every riding in Saskatchewan.

In the month of January, during the parliamentary recess, there was a meeting held in Saskatoon, and my hon. friend from Regina was at that meeting. I ask him now to deny it if he was not. Get up and deny it if you can.

Mr. TURNBULL: That is no crime.

Mr. McINTOSH: You cannot deny it.

Mr. TURNBULL: I do not intend to.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members must address the chair.

Mr. McINTOSH: My hon. friend was at that meeting, and so was the secretary of the Minister of Agriculture, and the hon. member for Saskatoon and the hon. member for Rosetown.

Mr. LOUCKS: No, I think you are wrong.

Mr. McINTOSH: What? They didn't ask you? They had two or three representatives from North Battleford at that meeting. I shall not mention their names.

Mr. TURNBULL: They did not tie my hands as the hon. member for Humboldt had his hands tied, according to his own statement.

Mr. McINTOSH: They did not tie your hands. They certainly tied you holus-bolus. At that meeting was decided what was to be done—in regard to a Tory redistribution—in the province of Saskatchewan. I understand the Regina government was represented at that meeting.

Mr. TURNBULL: The Regina government was not represented at that meeting, and it was not decided at that meeting what should be done.

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members must not interrupt.

Mr. McINTOSH: Oh yes, it was. Let me go on. At that meeting in Saskatoon, the ground work was laid for the present gerrymandering in the province of Saskatchewan. There it was concocted and organized, and the hon. member for Regina was present and let it go on, and now he is trying to carry it out. Let me say, though, that if a few Tories in the city of North Battleford figure they can do what the hon. member for Regina and his government are trying to get away with in this bill, they have another think coming, and my hon. friend and the government will find out when it is too late what the electors of South Battleford and North Battleford think of what you are attempting to do in this bill.

May I say that North Battleford and South Battleford, as my hon. friend from Regina stated, are linked up electorally in a provincial way. We have had provincially a Liberal member representing the Battlefords and we have had a Conservative member representing the Battlefords, and I think I can truthfully say that the conclusion of both these members is that the tying up of the Battlefords is a mistake and should not be done, that they ought to be separated electorally each with its own member, when the servicing of each riding could be better looked after. Not that I have any fault to find with the estimable people south of the river. I know a great number of them. I know every person in South Battleford just as well as I do the citizens in North Battleford, and my policy on the platform and in the press has always been—over a period of twenty years—to unite the two Battlefords—to bind them together commercially. But historically they were divided years ago and they remain divided by the north Saskatchewan river to a great extent to-day. My argument is that they ought to be left separate electorally. If the government is willing to make the fair adjustments that ought to be made, these two ridings do not need to be thrown together. A fair redistribution can be made by having the dividing line north and south.

The hon. member for Humboldt said that by pushing north the boundary line of the map which was delivered by my hon. friend to the Saskatchewan Liberals the problem could be solved. So it can, and it should be solved in this way if the government wants to do the right thing. Then North Battleford would be left in its right geographical setting. It is the largest centre north of the north Saskatchewan river between Saskatoon and Edmonton. That means something and if an outstanding fact it ought to be respected

That north country belongs to North Battleford. We have done our best to give it railroad and highway service, and I for one object to taking North Battleford out of its proper electoral setting and putting it into a riding linked up with points southward and eastward, many of which are tributary to Saskatoon and other centres. The very fact that that was done indicates the motive. There could be no other motive than that of hiving the Grits in one riding and hiving the Tories in another, with the idea of gaining an extra seat in this house. If that is the intention of the hon. member and of the government I am afraid when they count the votes at the next election they will receive a surprise. I am convinced clean fair-minded people will oppose a policy of that kind; they will oppose any manipulation of ridings for the purpose of gaining votes, no matter what party does it. And they are right.

The placing of North Battleford city in a riding comprised of say one-third of the old riding of North Battleford and two-thirds of the old riding of South Battleford is admittedly a major grievance against this bill in the northwestern section of Saskatchewan. I

believe these changes have been made deliberately—not to put "The Battlefords" together but wholly because wholesale gerrymandering had been decided upon. May I say to the hon. member for Regina—and I see him pallidly looking at me—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McINTOSH: In that respect he is running true to form; he fearfully looks and looks but never acts. I say to him that what has taken place in regard to North Battleford and Battleford was in the air three years ago, namely after the election of 1930. His Tory friends in North Battleford said that when redistribution came they would disorganize the riding, that they would split it into two or three pieces, and that they would hitch it up in such a manner that the Liberal party would have greater difficulty in electing a member to the federal house. We see their pernicious policy carried out in this bill. These disorganization threats colored unfairly the representations locally made to the hon. member. That is why he is tied, so far as making any change is concerned. But I say to him for his own good that if he is basing his future upon the decision of a few politically biased men in North Battleford who vote Tory once in a while, he is on very thin ice, on shifting ground. He should give the utmost reconsideration to what is fair and just not only for the people of North Battleford but from North Battleford northward and westward, a territory that properly belongs to that northerly constituency.

The hon. member for Regina said that there had to be a new seat north of Saskatoon. We all know why that was done. We know it was done to help destroy the riding of Prince Albert; certainly that is one reason. And I will tell the hon. member another reason why it was done; it was done to effect a way of escape for the hon. member for Saskatoon. Those are the two reasons. The hon. member states that six seats were too small, that they were not growing and something had to be done. There was his problem. How did he arrive at his solution? He did it in a partisan way, in a gerrymandering way, not in a fair and judicial manner. Then he states that in the north the three seats were large and were growing. That is true. There is the problem again. How did he meet it? He met it deliberately by effecting a gerrymander. He could have done the dividing north and south, but he did not want to do it that way. He rejected every effort on our part—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am in order. I don't know how you are.

Mr. TURNBULL: I call that disrespectful.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order. You should address the chair.

Mr. McINTOSH: The hon. member should know well the meaning of the word disrespectful. May I say—and I mean it—I think enough of the hon. gentleman to address the chair. It was only an oversight.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, carry on with your good intentions.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am only too willing to do that. As I have said, in the northern part of the province the correct method would have been to run the dividing line north and south. Thereby, there would be brought about a fair redistribution of votes. Up to the present time we have not been able to have that solution. We know that the northern part of the province has been growing, and the population has been expanding. But may I say to my hon. friend that a great many of the people who have come from the south to the north will return to the south—they are going now—once crop conditions and weather conditions prevail which will make it worth their while. They will return when they have a better opportunity to make a living in the southern part of the province than there has been in the last few years. The population in the northern part has grown considerably during the last ten years, but many of those who came from the south will go back. The population will be balanced better than it is to-day. Many in the north are on farms upon which they cannot make a living, and they will have to leave for other parts. Many of them are on relief at the present time, and that condition of affairs cannot continue. They are not to blame. I suggest that to base a redistribution on such changing conditions is not sound.

I am not going to say anything further at the present time. All I wanted to do was to give the house an idea of what has been done to the two ridings of North Battleford and South Battleford. Both names have been wiped out. A new riding named Battleford has been brought into existence, and the hon. member believes it will be Conservative. Two-thirds of the old riding of North Battleford has been called Redberry. In that riding the Grits are hived. In the riding of Battleford the Tories are hived, and in that way hon. members opposite think they will gain a seat. There is a picture of what has taken

place. The city of North Battleford is only a few miles from the boundary of Redberry riding, a riding which is made up as I have described. If hon. members opposite think a measure of that kind is fair and decent, if they think it is in accordance with Conservative traditions, all I say to them is to go ahead with it, and watch the results at the next election.

Mr. TURNBULL: There are so many inaccuracies in the speech of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat that I cannot let them go without challenge. In the first place the hon. member for Rosetown was not averse to his boundary going northward. In fact, I discussed the matter with him on more than one occasion. We discussed the matter of his boundary line not only being north as far as the north Saskatchewan river, but extending north across the north Saskatchewan river, and the hon. member for Rosetown would have been quite willing to take that territory, had I decided that it should be allotted to him. In the second place this map was not concocted in Regina. There was no committee in Regina I know of that had anything whatever to do with the map. It is true there was a meeting in Saskatoon and also one in Regina. I called in those who I believed knew the territory better than I did, and got their opinions. I received no instructions from them, but merely obtained their opinions as to the situation at each point. I did the same thing in connection with south Saskatchewan. I did not believe I would be doing my duty as a member of the committee if I did not get the information which was necessary, and upon which conclusions might be based. No member of the provincial legislature was at any of the meetings nor was the matter discussed with any member of the provincial legislature. I have had no communication directly or indirectly from any member of the legislative assembly in Saskatchewan with regard to the redistribution with the exception of two, and those members wrote me regarding the redistribution as it affected territory in which they themselves lived and no other territory. In neither case were their representations accepted by me. That is the extent to which any member of the provincial legislature had control over me concerning this committee. My hands were not tied by anybody; I came to it as a free agent to make this map in the way I thought fair, and have done my duty as I saw it. Hon. members who have listened to this debate so far and heard statements such as those made by the hon. member for North Battleford and the hon. member for Humboldt as to why they could not come to any arrangement with me, must now realize why it was absolutely impossible for even the most reasonable men on this side of the house to get any reasonable settlement with gentlemen who have thus spoken, because they conducted themselves all through in the manner in which they are conducting themselves in this house now. It is true I did tell the hon. member for North Battleford that I would have to communicate with his territory in order to arrange any substantially different line of demarcation with regard to his constituency. I do not pretend to know the territory of North Battleford, I live hundreds of miles away, and would have no information on which to base a decision except by communicating with those in that part who know the territory. In order to change the boundary as requested by the hon. member for Humboldt or anyone else I would have to communicate with those who could give me the necessary information. The hon. member for North Battleford came to me in the last days of the committee's sessions, and I told him that I was sorry he had not consulted with me earlier.

With regard to the city of Saskatoon, it has grown by at least forty-eight per cent in the last ten years. It is one of the most rapidly growing cities in Canada, and it would be unfair to saddle it with a large population at the beginning of the ten year period and take a chance on what the population would be by the end of the period. The hon. member for Saskatoon has more confidence in his constituency than the hon. member for North Battleford has in his; he is not saying that people are going to leave because of inability to make a living in the constituency. I wonder if the hon. member for North Battleford will repeat that statement when he returns to his constituency.

Mr. McINTOSH: I will do all the repeating that is necessary.

Mr. TURNBULL: Then a statement is made in regard to consultation with Senator Willoughby. Before I can have much faith in the efficacy of that consultation I would prefer to know what information was given to the late senator, what material they showed upon which to base a decision, how many days they gave him to consider the matter or get in touch with anyone knowing the circumstances. The whole thing is so apparent, and now an attempt is being made to whitewash themselves into an appearance of political purity by pretending to have conferred with the Conservative party through the late Senator Willoughby.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Is my hon. friend referring to the late Senator Willoughby and his communication with myself?

Mr. TURNBULL: I have reference to what were said to be the negotiations between the hon. member and Senator Willoughby.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, it is manifestly unfair, because we did honestly try to get a representation of Conservatives in regard to that redistribution.

Mr. TURNBULL: On the words of the hon. members themselves, they brought their draft map to the late Senator Willoughby four days before the committee reported. He had no information in his hands and no material on which to suggest changes, yet they bring that forward as a fair conference with the Conservatives as to the province of Saskatchewan regarding the redistribution of 1924. The fact that that little change was the only change asked is an indication that there never was a proper opportunity given for an expression of view by the Conservative party.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There was no obligation to get any.

Mr. TURNBULL: Certainly not, but do not pretend that you did when you did not.

With regard to the boundaries of the city of North Battleford being within three miles of the boundary of the constituency for many years it has been within much less than that distance from the southern boundary of the constituency, and that did not hurt one way or the other. The northern country is still attached to North Battleford commercially and in every other way as it was before. The two Battlefords are placed together. It is true it might have been done some other way at some other time by some other person, but there is nothing unfair in the way in which they are placed. It was done according to my best judgment and I say it is fair. The attempt, and it was successful, was to do justice to the people in that part of the country.

Mr. TOTZKE: I wish to refer only to one remark which the hon. member for Regina has repeated frequently, and seems to make a striking point of it, as to my statement that my hands were tied in connection with the acceptance of his plan. I made that remark in a more or less facetious manner after the hon. member had denied that his hands had been tied in connection with the map he proposed. I want to say at this stage that my hands were not tied in any manner; I had no instructions of any kind from anyone in the province of Saskatchewan. The only instructions and the only consultation that I had were from and with members from Saskatchewan sitting in this house at the present time But as far as his proposal and map are concerned amalgamating the two constituencies and putting in a new one, certainly I could not accept that.

Mr. McPHEE: As one of those whose constituency is affected, being one of the ninety-and-nine mentioned by the hon. member for Melville, I just wish to say a few words in the hope that two injustices to the constituency I represent may be rectified before the schedules are dealt with.

In the first place the constituency of Yorkton as laid out in 1924 was a complete parallelogram extending 30 mlies north and south and 84 miles east and west, with the Manitoba boundary on the east side. Under this proposed redistribution the northern row of townships, six miles in depth, is removed from the Yorkton seat, and the constituency extended 54 miles farther west; so that now it is a district 138 miles long by 24 miles wide. The district of Yorkton as at present constituted contains approximately 39,000 people, so that in order to increase it up to the present quota of representation it is only necessary to add 5,000 people to that territory. But they take off the northern row of townships and extend the territory 54 miles farther west, almost half way across the province of Saskatchewan. But that is not what I rose to object to. I am satisfied with the constituency, but my complaint about the generosity of the hon. member for Regina is that in restoring the Melville seat to the hon. member for Melville he encroached upon the Yorkton territory.

Mr. TURNBULL: Will the hon. member permit a question? Did not my hon. friends request that change? Why not attribute it to the generosity of some of my hon. friend's friends?

Mr. McPHEE: In the last map my friend proposed and in the letter he sent to the hon. member for Humboldt he said that Melville would be restored and a portion of the Last Mountain seat would be added to the Yorkton seat, and we took it for granted that the south boundary of the Yorkton seat as at present constituted would be the south boundary right through, But the Yorkton constituency was encroached on in township 25 in ranges 7, 8, 9 and 10, and it so happens that by accident or design, my hon. friend in making his computation gave to the hon.

member for Melville a Liberal majority. I am going to ask that that injustice be rectified before we come to the schedules, and I am sure my hon. friend the member for Melville will have no objection.

The further protest I want to make is in connection with the name of the new seat. Notwithstanding the fact that this constituency contains the enterprising city of Yorkton, which is the judicial centre of the district, the land titles office and the fair association; notwithstanding the fact that this is an old district that was settled by hardy pioneers and that during this summer the city of Yorkton and district will celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of that settlement, the government and my hon. friend from Regina have called the new constituency Touchwood. I resent the indignity and the injustice that has been done, and I will put the matter fairly to the right hon. leader of the government. What is in the mind of the government; what have they against that district that makes them change the name from Yorkton to Touchwood?

Mr. TURNBULL: I am afraid I shall have to take the full responsibility.

Mr. McPHEE: These are the two principal injustices to which I wanted to refer, and I am sure the right hon. gentleman will rectify them before we come to consider the schedules to the bill.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, a number of hon. members from Saskatchewan have spoken already with regard to the province as a whole. I shall not go over ground that has been covered already, but, as the representative of one of the constituencies which is being materially altered in the schedules attached to the bill, I feel that on behalf of my constituents I should bring to the attention of the house and of the country just what is being attempted by the government under the proposed distribution. I believe this will serve as a good illustration of the sort of thing to which we on this side of the house are taking exception in the name of all that is fair and just.

It is a little difficult for one to distinguish between oneself as member for an individual constituency and as leader of a political party, but I am prepared to discuss the matter on both grounds, as to whether or not what is suggested with regard to Prince Albert is of a nature likely to commend itself to the sense of justice and fair play of the people of this country. The hon. member for Regina, who has spoken on behalf of the Conservative committee that arranged the bill so far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, said that the problem was to readjust the constituencies along lines which would serve to bring them more into accord with the movement of the population to the north, and that it was necessary to take a constituency out from the southern part and add a constituency in the north. Perhaps for that general statement there is much to be said; just whether or not any question would arise from its operation would depend entirely upon from what place and in what manner the one constituency was removed and where the other constituency was added. The constituency which is being added in the north is to adjoin the constituency of Prince Albert, which I have the honour to represent in this house at the present time. The mind of the committee, which now must be the mind of the government since its recommendations form a part of the schedules as they appear in the bill, will I think be apparent from the figures which the committee had before it at the time the propopsed adjustment was made. The unit which, as I understand it, the committee sought to maintain as the basis for constituencies in Saskatchewan was a representation of 44,186. This meant that constituencies having a larger representation should be reduced in size. Prince Albert came within that category; according to the figures before me, which I believe were before the committee, the present constituency of Prince Albert has a representation of 50,896. The problem then, in strict equity and justice, would be to reduce Prince Albert from 50,896 to 44,186, but what is the reduction that has been made? Prince Albert has been reduced to 38,469, and may I point out that it is only one of four constituencies of the twenty-two in Saskatchewan which now have units of less than 40,000.

When one comes to examine the other constituencies having representations of less than 40,000 one sees how this particular constituency of Prince Albert has been cut up in order to legislate out of his seat in this parliament the one who represents it at the present time and to help make absolutely secure at least one hon. gentleman who sits on the other side of the house. May I point out how the change that has been made, and in so doing I would say that this constituency, as redefined, is a fine exemplification of what is meant by the word "gerrymander." The word gerrymander in political parlance simply means that in redistributing a constituency the boundary lines are so altered as to do an obvious injury to one political party and give an obvious unfair political advantage to another party. According to the figures for

the last general election in 1930 the constituency of Prince Albert gave me, as Liberal candidate, a majority of 1,192. Prince Albert is an old constituency which at one time elected Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at a general election many years ago. Later Sir Wilfrid decided to represent another constituency, to which he had also been elected, but Prince Albert has a certain tradition connected with the Liberal party, and for many years it has been a Liberal constituency. When I was without a seat following a general election of 1925, some hon. members from the province of Saskatchewan, together with others from other provinces, offered to place at my disposal their seats in the House of Commons in order that I might resume my duties here. The constituency of Prince Albert was mentioned as one which in all probability would give little concern to the leader of the Liberal party, as it was one of the recognized Liberal seats. In the same way I might say that the present Prime Minister, representing a constituency such as Calgary, may feel free to go from one end of Canada to the other during a political campaign without embassassment, because he represents a safe Conservative constituency. There was considerable chivalry on the part of hon. members on this side of the house when they came to offer their constituencies to their leader.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not want to interrupt, but I think the right hon. gentleman will recall that in 1911 the only constituency in Saskatchewan which returned a Conservative member was Prince Albert. It has not that Liberal tradition to which the right hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That may have happened on one occasion, but I would point out that the representation of Prince Albert by two Liberal leaders, each of whom has held the office of Prime Minister of Canada entitles it to some place of special honour in the Liberal category, at any rate. Now let me point out what the change proposed today will mean, according to the figures of the last general election. If the last election had been fought within the boundaries proposed at present, instead of having a Liberal majority of 1,192 I would have been defeated by a Conservative majority of 618.

An hon. MEMBER: Hurrah!

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Some hon. gentleman says "hurrah"; that may be very chivalrous, but let me tell my hon. friends opposite that it is not in accord with the sense of chivalry of the people of Canada as a whole. It may be Tory chivalry but it is neither British chivalry nor British fair play.

An hon. MEMBER: Cut it out.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will not cut it out; I will say what I am called upon to say in reply to interruptions from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is a lot more to say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is a good deal more to say. Now, may I ask how this has been brought about. It is very simple Those who had charge of the map have looked over the constituency to see what portion of it gave the largest Liberal returns. They found that the southern portion did; they found that the southern portion had given a very considerable majority, and they have so altered the constituency as to take out of that southern portion a Liberal majority of 1,719, which they have placed in a constituency they have newly framed to the south. The constituency which they have newly framed to the south is now being given a unit of 46,285, while they are reducing the unit of Prince Albert to 38,469. By taking this Liberal majority out, they have made the riding even smaller than the unit is according to the redistribution at the moment. What have they done in order to make the constituency what it now is? They have gone over into another constituency, the constituency of Melfort, the constituency of the Minister of Agriculture, and taken a Tory section of his present constituency, which is to the east of Prince Albert, and added that to Prince Albert. They have not at any single place or in any single direction drawn a line which would be fair as between Liberals and Conservatives, but have taken out of and away from the south a part of the constituency strongly Liberal and to what remains they have added to the east a part of an adjoining constituency strongly Conservative. If there could be a clearer gerrymander of a constituency than that I should like to know what it is. I shall have a little more to say about this later on, but I cite what I do, as I wish to make it clear at the moment why it is that some of us on this side have found it impossible to agree to what has been proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite.

The hon. Minister of Public Works, speaking this morning of what there had been in the way of agreement among the different

provinces, said that some ninety per cent of the seats were already agreed upon. I am not admitting the truth of that, but supposing one were to admit that there is substantial agreement with respect to ninety per cent of the seats what follows: If there is injustice with respect to ten per cent, if the kind of thing that has been done in Prince Albert is repeated in ten per cent of the constituencies, it means that at least twenty-four of the constituencies are being altered unfairly through a gerrymander, in a way which will give to the government in power to-day an unfair advantage in the way of gain and the opposition the disadvantage to the extent of almost certain defeat in these constituencies. With ten per cent something like twenty-four constituencies, that represents a difference of forty-eight on a division. One can readily see wherein the will of the people is certain of defeat if the constituencies are gerrymandered in that way.

I submit that action of this sort is wholly indefensible, and I may perhaps be pardoned if I say I think it is doubly unchivalrous when it comes from a government towards the leader of the party opposing them. After all, there are some things one has a right to expect and to look forward to in public life; there are some amenities to be preserved between public men, and particularly men who have been in public life for a considerable time and in connection therewith have heavy responsibilities. I have taken the position from the start, with the members of the Saskatchewan committee, that I did not think the seat which I am representing at the present time in parliament should be brought into the discussion at all, but rather that I would look to the Prime Minister and the present government of Canada to do what they thought was fair and just by the leader of the opposition in this House of Commons, and one who, if I may be pardoned for saying so, has during the course of his leadership of his party held the office of Prime Minister for a period of nearly nine years. If they wish to legislate me out of my seat in parliament they can do it in this way. If I am to be thus prevented from coming back to continue to serve my country within the House of Commons, I have no doubt I shall outside the halls of parliament find plenty to do, to which I shall be able to turn with energy and zeal. But I believe that the people of Canada, whether Conservative or Farmer or Labour or Liberal, will resent a deliberate effort on the part of the government of the day, in virtue of its majority, to legislate out of his seat a political opponent who for many years has been the leader of his party. As I have said, I will leave to the Prime Minister and his colleagues the situation so far as this seat is concerned, and I may add that the Prime Minister cannot get away from his responsibility by saying that he knows nothing about this political map, having left it all to the hon. member for Regina to do with as he thinks best.

Mr. BENNETT: No, to the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Or to the committee either. The right hon. gentleman is Prime Minister and he has the final say in the matter. More than that, we all know that the members of the committee have been in constant conference with the Prime Minister himself.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then I accept the right hon. gentleman's word.

Mr. BENNETT: They have not been in constant communication until after the difficulties arose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope that now difficulties have arisen the Prime Minister will accept some of his responsibility in this regard.

Mr. BENNETT: He is always ready and willing to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I point out what happened in 1923 at the time of our last redistribution. Those who were on the committee will recall the accuracy of what I say. I was then Prime Minister, charged with the responsibility which my right hon. friend has to-day. I was then representing another historic constituency, the constituency of North York. I was told that the committee had reached practical agreement with respect to most of the Ontario seats, but that there was one objection which was being raised by the Conservative party, namely, that the constituency of North York as it then stood had too small a unit of representation; it was felt that the unit of representation of that constituency ought to be enlarged. Had I wished to do so, I could as Prime Minister have intimated to the members of the committee that I hoped they would keep the unit of representation of North York just where it was. I knew what it meant, adding to the representation of North York, but I asked what would satisfy the committee as to the justice of the situation. They said they would like to have two townships added to North York—townships adjoining the city of Toronto. Hon. mem-

bers know what that would mean in the way of adding an increased Conservative following to the riding. I took the position that as Prime Minister I was not going to ask any favours for myself, or expect for the constituency I represented, anything which I would not ask equally for any other constituency. I said that if it was true that the representation of North York was small as compared with the others, then by all means these townships should be added. They were added, and when the general election came I carried the old constituency of North York but was defeated by the additional majority in the added constituency.

I take no pride in having adopted that attitude, but I have the satisfaction of knowing that I acted honourably in the matter, and I have nothing to regret with respect to my attitude toward any hon. gentleman opposite. If my hon. friends opposite do not wish to recognize any obligation of fairness, to say nothing of chivalry or justice, towards the leader of the party by which they are opposed, that is of course for themselves to decide. I am not at the moment pleading for myself, but I am speaking for the people of Prince Albert constituency, which has honoured me with its representation in this house, when I say that that constituency has the right to expect a unit of population equivalent to what is recognized as the unit of other constituencies in that province, and has the right to expect that if in a redistribution a change of its boundaries has to be made it will be made fairly as between Liberals and Conservatives in the riding as it stands at the present time.

Mr. TURNBULL: If the declarations that are made now had been made when the committee started to sit some time ago they could have been taken as at least an indication of the intention to negotiate a redistribution map to a favourable conclusion. Judging from the negotiations which have taken place from the time we started until the time we concluded, in my opinion there was no intention on the part of Liberal Saskatchewan members to arrive at any concluded settlement unless it was absolutely upon their own terms.

Mr. McPHEE: That is not true.

Mr. McINTOSH: That is absolutely untrue.

Mr. TURNBULL: The right hon. member for Prince Albert is very much perturbed about the lack of chivalry due to the position of leader—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Due to any leader.

Mr. TURNBULL: —whereby he might be legislated out of his seat in the province of Saskatchewan. In the first place at one stage in the proceedings I expressed to the hon. member for Humboldt some doubt as to whether the right hon. the leader of the opposition would be a candidate in Prince Albert at the next elections.

Mr. CASGRAIN: That is not for you to decide.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that if I am not mistaken that observation was made some time ago by the Minister of Agriculture. The constituency of Prince Albert has now been so arranged as to bring his farm into it, evidently with a view to accommodating him.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): May I ask the right hon. the leader of the opposition to give the statement he attributes to me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not so very long ago I received a communication from the Liberal committee of Prince Albert to the effect that my hon. friend had said that I would not run again in Prince Albert. They wanted to know whether that would be my decision. I replied that my decision would be to abide by the wish and will of my friends in Prince Albert, that if they wished me to run I would run, and that anything that might be said by others had no bearing on the situation so far as I was concerned.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Where do I come into the picture?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was what my hon. friend said during the by-election in South Huron. A report was sent down to the constituency of South Huron that the leader of the opposition was not going to get a seat in Saskatchewan, that the next time he would not run in Prince Albert. We now begin to see what was evidently in the minds of those who were circulating the story.

Hon. ROBERT WEIR (Minister of Agriculture): While in Prince Albert I made no statement that the right hon. leader would not likely run in the federal constituency of Prince Albert during the next elections. As far as the by-election in South Huron is concerned, when discussing the matter on one of the platforms I stated that there were three questions for the electors to decide. One was the issues before the electorate, one had reference to the leaders of each party and the other concerned the candidates. I may have given the impression, which was no doubt in my mind at that time, that there would be little likelihood of the right hon. leader of the opposition running as

a candidate in the constituency of Prince Albert. I gave my reasons for that, which the right hon. gentleman did not ask me. The right hon. leader of the opposition had done considerable travelling from one part of the country to the other as the result of which he had been elected in various constituencies throughout Canada from the east to the west.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have given the reason why I was kept from North York.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): To continue, when the right hon. the leader of the opposition first ran in Prince Albert constituency he had a majority of over five thousand. He spent a day and a half in the constituency between then and the next elections, and I believe his majority dropped by a little over fifteen hundred, or in the neighbourhood of five hundred for each half day or a thousand a day for each day he was in the constituency. I am just repeating now the substance of my remarks to one of the audiences to which I spoke. Between that and the next elections his majority dropped something in the neighbourhood of three thousand, which was a little over a thousand a day for each day the right hon. member had stayed in his constituency. With these facts in my mind I concluded that there was little likelihood of the right hon. member contesting the constituency in the next elections if he were forced to spend any time in the constituency.

The right hon. leader of the opposition made one statement referring to the will of the people to which I take exception, and if the committee will bear with me for a few minutes I think I can show that he is not correct in his statement. The last redistribution made it impossible for the people in the federal constituency of Prince Albert to express their will. I have before me the results of the last federal elections and they show that poll after poll in the northern part, and especially in the city of Prince Albert and the districts in the neighbourhood of Prince Albert, returned majority after majority against the right hon. gentleman. This is what happened in the Anglo-Saxon and French speaking part of the constituency and the only thing that enabled him to carry the election were the votes of a large block of people of German descent who had been left in the southern part of the seat in the last redistribution. I am not making any inference that these people should not be given every opportunity to exercise their franchise. They are of German descent. I had the privilege and pleasure of working throughout that whole district for years as a school inspector. Under the redistribution which was in force during the last elections a large block of these people in the southern end of the Prince Albert constituency and another similar block to the north of Saskatoon, totalling in all about forty-five thousand progressive Mennonite farmers by being thus divided were practically denied the opportunity of nominating one of their own people so that this very worthy part of the Canadian population would be unable to express its opinion in this house. I know many of these people personally and they take second place to none, but this is what happened because of the work of scientific and highly specialized political racketeers. I do not think it was the work of the leaders of the Liberal party as we like to think of Liberalism. I believe it would have been a distinct gain it we could have as a member one of these people of German extraction who had made such a success. But that was made impossible because of the block left in Prince Albert constituency, evidently just to affect a vote of the people in the northern part of the constituency. By doing that, both these peoples have been practically disfranchised. The right hon. the leader of the opposition and his followers have therefore made it impossible for these people to express their will.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TURNBULL: When I was speaking before six o'clock I was referring to the situation in Prince Albert. Until after the committee had reported, owing to the fact that there was a deadlock between the hon. member for Humboldt and myself regarding the method of redistribution rather than as to details with respect to seats, I received no information regarding what was wanted in Prince Albert other than the offer which I referred to in the letter which I read this afternoon, which offer was made in accordance with a conversation between the hon. member for Humboldt and myself. The hon. member for Humboldt says this afternoon that as well as delineating the southern boundary for Prince Albert he had stipulated that an angle south of the south branch of the Saskatchewan river should also have been removed from the Prince Albert constituency. As I said, I had no recollection of that, and my letter was written when the matter was very fresh in my memory and it contains no statement of that kind. In the reply made by the hon. member for Humboldt it was not mentioned as an essential feature of the offer, but

he simply said that the offer itself was wholly unacceptable. So there was no further discussion as to whether that feature had been eliminated or not.

That offer was refused, and I heard of no further offer until after the redistribution committee had reported, when I was presented with a map which retained the old boundaries of Prince Albert intact, and accompanying it was a request to divide the three constituencies of Yorkton, Last Mountain and Melville by a line running north and south instead of a line running east and west, thereby setting up the old seat of Melville again very close to the original plan; also a map subdividing the constituencies of North Battleford and South Battleford and sending South Battleford to the northern portion of the province. On that map the boundaries of ten constituencies were altered from the map that I had submitted. It is quite true that some of those alterations were minor alterations and were consequent upon the three major alterations to which I have referred in the Melville area, the Prince Albert area and the Battleford area. In that stage of the negotiations it was a rather big demand. I asked the hon. member for Humboldt to consult with his friends and come back to me and say what the minimum of his demand was in order to get a complete compromise on the Saskatchewan map. He came back and said that the reply was practically all that he had asked for in respect to these seats, and I replied that at that stage that was an impossible request from my point of view.

The right hon. leader of the opposition complains that in applying the principle of reducing the population of Prince Albert, which he now says was properly applied—and in the map presented by the other side of the house the population was also reduced but not down to the minimum between 45,000 and 46,000—I reduced his population too far, making it between 38,000 and 39,000, and he protests that it should have been left at at least 44,186. I submit that the leader of the opposition is not showing the acquaintance with his district that he ought to have. Quite a considerable number of people have gone into that constituency since the census of 1931 and that the addition of these people will bring the figure much more closely to the 44,000 unit than might be expected. It is further suggested that in arguing that the unit should not be below the average, no allowance is being made for the trends of population. Now the population in Saskatchewan as a whole, as is generally known, did not move north. That was not the cause of the maladjustment that I was attempting to remedy. The population in the southern part of the province grew just about as fast as it grew in the rest of Canada, but the population in the northern part grew very much faster. There was no great removal of population from the south to the north of the province prior to 1931. It was the excessive growth in the northern part of the province itself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will my hon. friend allow me to make a correction, if it should be a correction. The figures that I gave as to the population of Prince Albert at present and the figures the committee had before them were based on the last census, not the figures that obtained at the time of the last election.

Mr. BENNETT: The census figures?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The census figures, yes.

Mr. TURNBULL: I do not think there is any dispute between us as regards that. The census gives 50,896 as the population in 1931. The population as proposed by the map submitted to me by the hon. member for Humboldt on the new basis would be 45,986, or within 14 of 46,000. The population I submitted was 38,469, and if the offer I had made in writing before referred to had been accepted, it would have added something like 6,400 or 6,500 to that population. But to ask now that the population of Prince Albert, or its boundaries shall remain intact, is not only to leave a population of nearly 51,000 in Prince Albert constituency but seriously to affect the adjustment in Melfort constituency as well. It would mean the transfer of 4,800 from Prince Albert to the Melfort district.

My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition says that I have apparently added insult to injury by carrying into his constituency from Melfort an area which gave a Tory majority at the last election. I am sorry if I have done that injustice to the Minister of Agriculture, because naturally he would feel very badly if he had lost any Conservative votes to the constituency of Prince Albert. My right hon. friend is very anxious lest we should legislate him out of his constituency. He talks a great deal about chivalry, with probably more heat than light. Out in our part of the country we merely call that "fanning the air." It does not weigh very heavily with the voters in Saskatchewan. I submit that there is not very much necessity to legislate the right hon. gentleman out of his seat. If he loses as many supporters between 1930 and the next election as he lost between 1926 and the last one it will take no legislation to remove him from Prince Albert.

In connection with these questions of chivalry, and chivalry especially to leaders of great parties in this country, it is well to remember what happened in the constituency of Portage la Prairie in 1924. Some additions were made at that time to the seat held by the then leader of the Conservative party. It is true that by superhuman effort in 1925 the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen carried the seat. But it was one of the hardest seats in the province of Manitoba to get at, one of the hardest seats to work, and one which was calculated to defeat the right hon. leader of the Conservative party at that time—although in 1925 that purpose was not achieved. In 1926 it operated very much better, because not only did the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen lose his seat, but he abandoned his membership in the House of Commons. The people who did that are the people who in 1933 are talking about chivalry.

Apart from all the talk about fixing up a seat in Prince Albert for the right hon. leader of the opposition, let me say that the situation there is not entirely in line with anything which has happened heretofore. In the first place, that seat is not ordinarily the one held by the right hon. leader of the opposition. He came there more or less by political accident arising out of the previous election. He came there to find a safe refuge in the Prince Albert seat. Let me remind the committee that it would not have been a safe refuge, had it not been for the redistribution of 1924. The fixing of the boundaries of that constituency in 1924 made what was normally a seat with a fighting chance for both parties into an absolutely safe Liberal seat. The seat the right hon. gentleman represents was made safe by the redistribution of 1924. If we had been responsible for that redistribution we would have been accused of deliberate gerrymander. But for my right hon. friend it was merely a rearrangement of boundaries to suit the general welfare of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope my hon. friend will make it clear that the seat was one which had been carried by a Liberal member who resigned in my favour. It was not as the result of arrangement of any boundaries with a view to making a seat for myself.

Mr. TURNBULL: Quite true, the right hon. gentleman was not a candidate in that constituency at the general election. I thought I had made that clear. The seat was won by Mr. McDonald by a very large majority, and after the redistribution of 1924. What I was trying to say was that by reason of the delineation of boundaries which took place in 1924 Prince Albert became a safe Liberal seat, and because it was a safe Liberal seat it offered a refuge for the right hon. gentleman when he lost his election in an Ontario constituency. Since the right hon. gentleman went to Prince Albert as a result of a political misfortune in another province, there is no guarantee that at any time it will be a permanent seat for him. He is not in the same position as is my right hon. leader in the city of Calgary. Calgary has been his home for many years. Again, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen had been for many years a resident of Portage la Prairie. It might be, if Prince Albert has been fixed up as now suggested, that at the time of an election the right hon. leader of the opposition might find a seat in Ontario or Prince Edward Island, and we would be faced with the proposition of placing another Liberal candidate in Prince Albert, a seat made safe by reason of operations which took place in 1924.

If time permitted and if I considered it worth while I could point out seat after seat in the province of Saskatchewan which was fixed up in 1924, even though the late Senator Willoughby was consulted. The map speaks for itself. There is no question about it, that whether it was intended or not the result of the redistribution of 1924 was to make that province much safer for Liberals than it had been before the redistribution. I do not quarrel with my hon. friends for that. I merely ask them, knowing what was done in 1924, not only in the province of Saskatchewan but in other Canadian provinces, not to trouble us with their mock heroics regarding misfortunes which they say they are suffering in 1933. There are plenty other seats in Saskatchewan which are perfectly safe Liberal seats. I think there is cause to apply the same principle to the constituency of Prince Albert as was applied to other seats in the northern part of the province, that is to say, reduce the population below the unit, taking into consideration the fact that the trend of increased population is to the northern part of the province and that in the last ten years that constituency has grown up by thirty per cent. After due allowance is made for that, it is found that the population is between 38,000 and 39,000 which is ample population for that particular seat at the moment. Not only that, but the justice of what I say is shown by the maps submitted to me by the hon. member for Humboldt. I am not charging him with the responsibility for drawing the map, but I say that the map submitted to me by him removed some fifteen townships from the southern part of

the seat of Prince Albert. That is I think approximately what would have been removed had the boundary I offered been accepted. If it was a great injustice for me to move those townships from Prince Albert, what must it have been for a member of the committee on the other side of the house. Lest someone may make a mistake about a township, may I explain that townships in the eastern part are different from those in the west. Out west a township is six miles square or thirty-six square miles. Ffteen of those townships, according to the map presented by the hon. member for Humboldt, were to be removed from the southern part of the constituency. So there was not very much difference there. The Liberal map, if we may call it such, provided for a reduction of population, as well. Not only that, the redistribution of 1924 placed those three northern seats below the unit for the western provinces, and I was merely following that precedent upon this occasion.

With regard to the so-called serious trouble in Battleford, and the complaint that Battleford was not made Battlefords, the fact of the matter is that in the draft of the boundaries which went to the printer the word Battlefords appeared, but in the printing the "s" was dropped out. If it would relieve the mind of the hon. member for North Battleford I may tell him that I shall move at the proper time that the letter "s" be restored, and that both Battlefords be recognized in the future history of Saskatchewan, as reflected in this redistribution.

May I say in conclusion that I regret very much the hon. member for Humboldt and myself were from the start so vastly separated on a question of principle that I was not able to get the cooperation from him on details that I otherwise would have had. The question of a boundary line being a little too far one way or another was one which might have been ironed out, had there been cooperation between us on other points. But in view of the fact that the hon. member for Humboldt would not relent unless I abandoned the plan of cutting out a seat and putting in another which I had in view, there was no possibility of our getting together on details. We could have got together on details had I accepted his map. That was clear from the start. But I look upon that as being dictated to by the brute force of a minority, if one wished to use that term in connection with the righteous actions of the house. When it comes to a question of small changes here and there in boundaries I quite readily admit that a boundary might have been placed a mile east or west of where I would put it and one point might be as satisfactory as the other. I am sorry the admission of the right hon. member for Prince Albert did not come earlier in the negotiations to the effect that it did not matter very much whether a seat was cut out in the centre and a new one formed in the north, but it mattered where it was cut out and where the new one was added. Had that position been taken by hon. members opposite at an earlier stage in the negotiations Saskatchewan might have been much more nearly united at the close of those negotiations than it is now. May I say, however, that out of the twenty-one seats in Saskatchewan there is a pretty substantial amount of agreement in respect to seventeen. We are not so very far apart, in the end. If we were able to achieve that amount of agreement it seems to me that all the hysterics about deliberate gerrymanders and unfairness and all that sort of thing which we have had thrown at us, has not much solid basis in fact.

Mr. A. F. TOTZKE (Humboldt): Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to follow my hon. friend from Regina through all his statements. The personal and racial atmosphere was not introduced into this debate until the hon. Minister of Agriculture took a hand this afternoon. But I want to dissociate myself from the position that the hon. member for Regina has tried to put me in. He has tried his utmost to fix on me the onus of having placed the constituency of my leader in the state in which it is now found. He said I had never at any time objected very strongly to the constituency of Price Albert as proposed. He must admit, however, that every map I proposed to him showed the boundary of Prince Albert extending to the town of Rosthern. It is true that some townships were taken off the southeastern corner of the constituency, but it was done because we wanted to live up to the principle we were working on of more nearly equalizing the population. The hon. member for Regina was most emphatic until near the end of the negotiations that the southern boundary as placed on his map must stay there. He also insisted that that portion taken from the Melfort seat and put into Prince Albert should remain. He now explains that he must apologize to the hon. member for Melfort for taking these good Tory votes and putting them into Prince Albert. I know very well why it was done. To-day we have seen what was in the mind of the hon. gentlemen; they thought they were going to force the leader of the opposition out of the constituency of Prince Albert and make him run elsewhere.

My hon. friend said he had reason to believe that the leader of the opposition was not going to run in Prince Albert. He mentioned that to me once; I think it was about the time of the election in South Huron. He will remember I told him, when the rumour came from Prince Albert that the right hon. leader of the opposition was not going to run there, that my leader himself immediately made the statement that as long as the people of Prince Albert wanted him to represent them he was going to do so.

Mr. TURNBULL: Will my hon. friend permit a question? Did the line that he and I agreed upon, which was marked upon the map, include within the constituency of Prince Albert the town of Rosthern?

Mr. TOTZKE: There my hon. friend, I will not say intentionally, is again misrepresenting my attitude. We did not agree on that line. It was after the hon. member had told me that he certainly could not admit an alteration of the southern boundary that I tried to get from him an indication as to how far he would go. He said he would consider this. Every time I asked him for an alteration in the boundaries of a constituency the only thing that I could get was that he would consider it.

Mr. TURNBULL: Did you not get an offer in writing?

Mr. TOTZKE: To consider it?

Mr. TURNBULL: No, an offer of the boundary in writing.

Mr. TOTZKE: Nothing very definite. But I will say this, that every time I submitted a map to him, even when we were trying the hardest to equalize the population in the northern constituencies as he wished them, the town of Rosthern was always included in any map submitted. It is not fair on the part of the hon. member to try to hang on me the accusation that I was endeavouring in any way to limit the chances of my leader in the constituency of Prince Albert. Besides, I was not specially concerned at the moment about the constituency of Prince Albert, because I felt sure that the Prime Minister would not see an injustice done to the leader of the opposition. I had an assurance later on from a member of the government that nothing would be done to legislate the leader of the opposition out of his seat in Prince Albert. It is true that the last map that I submitted, which I could not get the committee of elder statesmen to allow me to argue before them, had alterations in some of the constituencies—the hon. member for Regina says in ten; I did not count them—but these were necessary on account of the alterations in Melville and north of Melville.

I mentioned a moment ago the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture this afternoon. He is running true to form. The first session he came down here he told us and told the people of Saskatchewan that he was not a politician, that he did not know anything about the game. That first session thoroughly proved that he was not a politician, and to-day proves it again. This is the first time in the proceedings, either here or in the committee, that the political or racial question has been brought into the debate in any shape or form. The hon. Minister of Agriculture said this afternoon that the right hon. leader of the opposition was elected in Prince Albert not by those of Anglo-Saxon origin but by those in the southern portions of the constituency which are populated predominantly by men of German origin. He said the Anglo-Saxon people of Prince Albert constituency were disfranchised—and this from a member of a government sworn to His Majesty to serve loyally and truly the people of this dominion! If any people of Prince Albert, Mr. Chairman, were disfranchised by the votes cast by the people of the southern part of the district, I would protest in the strongest language of which I am capable. He said that is the reason that the southern portion of Prince Albert constituency was taken from that constituency and put in a new one, so that they could be with their own class and would have an opportunity to elect one of themselves.

Before I make any further comment in that regard, may I say that the people of Rosthern district to my knowledge are very anxious that the leader of the opposition shall again represent them in the next parliament. The hon. Minister of Agriculture knows that constituency—he admitted that this afternoon—knows it very well. He inspected the schools through there; he inspected the schools in my own community, and when he says that the new constituency is composed of people almost entirely of the same class as those around Rosthern and that the southern portion of Prince Albert which is being removed was predominantly populated by these people, I want to call to his attention the names of many places in that district; he knows them well, and he will know the class of people who live there. For example listen to these names: Domremy, Duck Lake—you will remember Duck Lake from the 1885 rebellion days.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Those are not in the southern part of the constituency of Prince Albert.

Mr. TOTZKE: They certainly are.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): My whole point this afternoon was the solid block of Mennonites amounting to 40,000.

Mr. TOTZKE: My hon. friend knows very well that these places I have mentioned—

Mr. BENNETT: The old stuff.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Ku Klux.

Mr. TOTZKE: You remember Batoche and Fish Creek. My hon. friend says they are a bunch of foreigners. Are you going to call people who are Canadianized or were born in Canada foreigners? Are you going to call the French people who settled there many years ago foreigners? Domremy?

Mr. BENNETT: This is running true to form.

Mr. TOTZKE: St. Louis, St. Isidore de Bellevue—are those likely to be German settlements?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Those are not in the southern part.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are, every one of them.

Mr. TOTZKE: Mr. Chairman, I object to being interrupted in this way. The Minister of Agriculture is not adding anything to the debate. He simply says they are not in the southern part; I say they are.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Thompson, Simcoe): It is a matter of geography.

Mr. TOTZKE: These are French communities. Then I have another list of names which are neither Anglo Saxon nor German. Let me read this list: Blaine Lake; Petrofka, and St. Julien. That sounds French, but it is settled largely by Ukrainians. Then there is Wakaw, settled by Ukrainians and Hungarians, and we have the German settlements, Waldheim, Laird and Rosthern, and there are one or two other little places also. These are in the southern portion of the constituency of Prince Albert as it now exists. They are south of Duck lake, so that town must be in the constituency of Prince Albert also.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I very much regret that this matter has been brought into the house. I want to say, however, that I know the people in those constituencies; I have the honour of representing a number of similar people, and I am very proud to do so. There are no more loyal Canadians than these people, and I resent any imputations against their loyalty to their adopted country. They do not want to be hived by themselves; they want to take their position as Canadian citizens, and they want to assume their rights and privileges with all the responsibilities that go with them. This shows what hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to do. They are attempting to keep the Anglo-Saxons together and to put those of foreign extraction off by themselves, because they know that most of these people who have taken up residence in this country are not bound by the traditions of eastern Canada or the mother country, but have been able to figure out for themselves just what party they wish to support. I was going to remark here that if the speech made this afternoon by my hon. friend is similar to the speeches he made during the by-election in South Huron I am not at all surprised that my hon. friend from South Huron was returned with such a substantial majority.

Then there is the question of the population in the new seat, in which the hon. gentleman says these people will find some of their own kind so they will be able to get their own representation in this house. Again I say that my hon. friend knows the constituency which it is proposed to create in this part of Saskatchewan. He knows the people there; he has inspected schools all through that district, and he will recognize the names I am going to mention. How about Alvena? That is not a German community; it is settled almost entirely by Ukrainians and their descendants, and a very good class of people they are too. How about Aberdeen? That is not a Scotch settlement although many Canadians are located there, as well as a few Mennonites of German extraction. At one time there was quite a settlement of Mennonites around the village of Aberdeen, but many of those people have moved away. Now there are many of the Anglo-Saxons there about whom my hon. friend is so concerned. How about Vonda, my home town? There are very few Germans in that town; I am almost alone, but just the same I have a lot of friends there. How about Prud'homme? The hon. gentleman knows where that is, and he knows that a French settlement almost surrounds that town, while to the north is a Hungarian settlement; there are no Germans there at all. How about Blucher? How about Elstow? How about Colonsay? How about Clavet? How about Bradwell? How about Zelma? How about Young, Dundurn and Hanley?

Mr. MacMILLAN (Saskatoon): Would the hon. gentleman permit a question? Most of the towns he is mentioning now never were in the constituency of Prince Albert.

Mr. TOTZKE: I said this was the new constituency in which my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture said the people of German extraction in the southern portion of the constituency of Prince Albert would find people of their own kind and class. There is no question but that the reasons advanced this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture are not the reasons that were behind the gerrymander of the Prince Albert constituency. The reason is that the people whom they are trying to get out of the constituency of Prince Albert are strong supporters of the right hon. leader of the opposition, and hon. gentlemen opposite believe they will support him more strongly than ever during the next election. The same thing applies to that portion of the Saskatoon seat which has been removed from the northern part of that constituency. Here again we have the Mennonites of German extraction who have voted consistently against the Conservative candidate; evidently they are to be taken out now. Anyone who consistently votes against the Conservative candidate must be hived up in some other constituency so that the Conservative candidate may have a better chance in the constituency from which those people are ousted. I do not think there is any question about that, and hon. gentlemen opposite may talk as they wish about trying to get these people together with people of their own kind. They do not want that at all. The people who have come to the west from other countries and have become citizens of this country want to bear their share of responsibility; they want to be called Canadians. That is all they are looking for, and I think the Minister of Agriculture, after his experience as an inspector of schools in that very community, bemeaned himself in the remarks he made this afternoon.

Mr. T. H. LENNOX (North York): I had no intention of taking part in this debate at the present stage, Mr. Chairman, but in view of the remarks of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition I am compelled to say a word or two at the present time. I might say that I was more than amazed at the references the right hon. gentleman made to North York; I could hardly believe that he would say what he did. In order that there might be no misunderstanding I secured a copy of Hansard containing his speech, and I propose to read that now and then refer to the actual conditions with respect to that constituency. The right hon. gentleman said:

May I point out what happened in 1923 at the time of our last redistribution? Those who were on the committee will recall the accuracy of what I say. I was then Prime Minister, charged with the responsibility which my right hon. friend has to-day. I was then representing another historic constituency, the constituency of North York.

In that he was quite right.

I was told that the committee had reached a practical agreement with respect to most of the Ontario seats but that there was one objection which was being raised by the Conservative party, namely that the constituency of North York as it then stood had a small unit of representation, and it was felt that the unit of representation of that constituency ought to be enlarged. Had I wished to do so, I could as Prime Minister have intimated to the members of the committee that I hoped they would keep the unit of representation of North York just where it was. I knew what it meant, adding to the representation of North York, but I asked what would satisfy the committee as to the justice of the situation. They said they would like to have two additional townships added to North York—townships adjoining the city of Toronto. Hon. members know what that would mean in the way of adding an increased Conservative following to the riding. I took the position that as Prime Minister I was not going to ask any favours for myself or expect for the constituency I represented anything which I would not ask equally for any other constituency. I said that if it was true that the representation of North York was small as compared with the others, then by all means these townships should be added. They were added, and when the general election came I carried the old constituency of North York but was defeated by the additional majority in the added constituency.

I take no pride in having adopted that attitude, but I have the satisfaction of knowing that I acted honourably in the matter, and I have nothing to regret with respect to my attitude to any hon. gentleman opposite.

Let me ask the house to bear with me while I discuss the political complexion of these two townships which the right hon. gentleman says the Conservative desired to have added to the old North York and to which he, in a moment of weakness apparently, consented. I cannot go back prior to 1925, because prior to that, in the two preceding elections in North York, there were three candidates. I would however refer to the township of Markham, which was one township that was taken in. There was a provincial election in 1926 and the present premier of the province of Ontario, who was then Minister of Highways, was the Conservative candidate while Mr. Annis, a farmer, was the Liberal candidate. Now let us see what a great sacrifice the right hon. the leader of the opposition made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is the hon. member referring to federal or provincial elections?

Mr. LENNOX: I will deal with both. As I say, the Hon. Mr. Henry was running as the Conservative candidate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is provincial.

Mr. LENNOX: I will come to the federal; don't worry. This is the township which the right hon. gentleman was good enough to add to the old constituency of North York, and I find that in 1926 the township of Markham, nine months after the election of 1925, when I opposed the right hon. gentleman— the township of Markham and the village, which is a part of it, and Richmond Hill as well, including Vaughan, gave no less than 1,542 of a Liberal majority. That was the wonderful sacrifice made by my right hon. friend. Vaughan gave a Liberal majority of 236 and Woodbridge, which was in Vaughan, gave a Liberal majority of 38—that was in 1926—making a majority of 274. Richmond Hill, which was added, gave a Liberal majority of 84 and, as I said a moment ago, the total majority in these municipalities that were added was 1,542. That was the Liberal majority.

Let us now take the election of 1929, and then I shall come back and deal with the subject from the federal point of view. In 1929 there was a provincial election, and the present premier of the province, Mr. Henry, was also then a candidate, opposed by Mr. Saunders. The township of Markham, including the village, gave a Liberal majority against the present premier of Ontario of 792, and the township of Vaughan, which my right hon. friend opposite consented to have added to the old constituency of North York, gave a Liberal majority against Mr. Macaulay, the present Minister of Highways, of 150, or a total of 942. That was the position in the period from 1926 up to 1929.

Now let me refer to the election of 1925, when I had the honour of opposing the right hon. gentleman. Instead of my right hon. friend receiving 1,184 majority in the township of Markham and the village, he received 71 in the township of Markham, and he was given the magnificent majority of 16 in the village, making a total of 87, whereas nine months later a Liberal candidate received a majority of 1,542. I come now to the election of 1926. In that election—

Mr. DONNELLY: Take 1921.

Mr. LENNOX: I would go back to 1921 but for the fact that there were three candidates then. However, for the information of the hon. gentleman I may say that Mr. Maclean received only 423 votes in Markham in 1921. He was the Conservative candidate. In 1926 I was opposed by Mr. Harry Sifton, and Markham township apparently thought a great deal more of him than it did of the leader of the opposition because, instead of giving 71 of a majority, which was more than 1,400 less than the Liberal candidate received in 1926, they gave Mr. Sifton in Markham township 223 and in the village 43, making a total for that gentleman of 266. Vaughan, which was added, instead of being 150 Liberal as it was in the provincial election, in 1926 gave me a majority of 267; so that, taking Markham and Vaughan, I received a majority of 1. Then we had my friend Mr. Mulock, who came to North York in 1930 and who got a majority of 249 in Markham and, in the village, 25. In the township of Markham the majority was 274 for Mr. Sifton and Vaughan, much to the surprise of the Liberals, gave me a majority of 206.

Let me for a moment direct attention to one or two things mentioned by my right hon. friend. In the first place, he asked a question as to what had happened in 1923 at the last redistribution. He said there was one objection which was being raised by the Conservative party and that was that the constituency was too small, the desire being that these two townships should be added. I was not in the house in 1923, but it seems to me a most remarkable thing that the Conservatives of North York were anxious to add to the old riding of North York two townships that gave an adverse majority of nearly 1,600. The right hon. gentleman went on to say:

> Had I wished to do so, I could as Prime Minister have intimated to the members of the committee that I hoped they would keep the unit of representation of North York just where it was. I knew what it meant, adding to the representation of North York, but I asked what would satisfy the committee as to the justice of the situation.

And he goes on:

> They were added, and when the general election came I carried the old constituency of North York but was defeated by the additional majority in the added constituency.

Let me say for the benefit of this committee that I have had ten elections and the largest majority I ever had was against the right hon. the leader of the opposition. I have never had a very large majority but I had a majority of 494 against him. When the

right hon. gentleman says that he carried the old constituency I want to tell him that his memory is very poor. If it had not been for the assistance he received from the new municipalities which were added, instead of having a majority of 494, I would have had a majority in the old constituency of 681. The right hon. gentleman says that these new townships adjoin the city of Toronto. I am rather surprised that he is not better acquainted with the geography of a riding which he represented. As a matter of fact, Markham and Vaughan, which were added to North York are not within ten miles of Toronto. There are three townships between Toronto and the new riding, the township of Scarborough, the township of York and the township of North York. As I say, the shortest distance between the new riding as provided for by the redistribution of 1924 and the city of Toronto is ten miles. I only say this in view of the statements made by the right hon. gentleman, for whom I have the very greatest respect, although he does not speak to me. If the statements he made with respect to Prince Albert, his own constituency, are as incorrect as those he made with respect to North York, I do not think they should impress any hon. gentlemen in this committee. I am not at all acquainted with conditions in the west but I suppose it would not be doing anyone a very great injustice were I to say that the right hon. gentleman would have no more reason to be accurate in his references to Prince Albert than to North York.

I had no intention of speaking at this stage but I might just say that so far as changing the constituency is concerned, I do not think that anyone will accuse me of being politically selfish in this matter, having won the last three elections under present conditions and against three of the most formidable opponents, the leader of the opposition, who was then the Prime Minister and the representative of North York, Mr. Harry Sifton and Mr. Mulock. I will just say that my whole aim with respect to North York is to have the boundaries the same as they are for provincial purposes. It is no doubt within the memory of hon. gentlemen that within the last two months there has taken place a redistribution for provincial purposes. A committee was appointed, the same as here. That committee brought in a report, and strange as it may appear, that report provided the same boundaries for North York as are provided by the report of this committee.

[Mr. Lennox.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: Very strange.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is a coincidence.

Mr. LENNOX: It may have been a coincidence but there are four Liberal papers in my riding; they are the watchdogs for the Liberals of North York, they do not like me any too well but I have yet to see a single word of criticism by any of them with respect to the redistribution which took place in the provincial house and which provided the same boundaries for North York as are provided for by this bill. One would have thought that if the boundaries were unfair and any injustice was being done to the Liberals in the riding of North York, there would have been some uprising, on the part of the press at least. I have not noticed a single word. So far as the provincial house was concerned, the report was adopted unanimously by Liberals, Tories and Progressives alike. In view of this, it does seem to me that so far as the boundaries of North York are concerned—I am speaking for those who will follow me and not for myself—that what was considered a just and equitable redistribution two months ago can hardly be called a gerrymander to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I think the committee will be able to judge just how hard pressed the hon. member who has just spoken was to make his point when it considers that he found it necessary to introduce into a debate dealing with federal redistribution what took place under a provincial measure in a provincial campaign and, more than that, was prepared to leave the impression, had I not interrupted and corrected him, with the committee that he was speaking in regard to a federal—

Mr. BENNETT: He distinctly said "provincial".

Mr. LENNOX: I mentioned Mr. Henry as being the leader of the government in the province.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I imagine that a good many people reading the remarks of the hon. member, if they do so, would not gather to what particular Mr. Henry he was referring. I ask hon. members who are representing constituencies here at the present time if they would allow themselves to be driven to the point where they would find it necessary to support their arguments as to the complexion of a riding federally by referring to what had taken place in a provincial election under a provincial redistribution measure.

The hon. member takes exception to my statement that these townships were lying nearer to Toronto than other parts of the riding of North York. As everyone knows, the city of Toronto is growing to the north very rapidly. For a greater part of the distance on either side of Yonge street as you leave Toronto the influence is wholly that of Toronto and any part of the township of York that is brought into a constituency further south will be brought completely under the influence of the Conservative forces of the city of Toronto. When the committee indicated to me in 1923 that what was desired was to add those townships, the ones requested were added. As I said this afternoon, this was done for the purpose of meeting the wishes of the committee upon which Conservatives as well as Liberals were numbered. I agreed in the way in which I indicated today. The best evidence that what was done was fair and just under the circumstances and was considered so by hon. gentlemen opposite is the fact that when the redistribution bill came into the house it came in without any exception being taken to any constituency in the province of Ontario. I am not going to follow the hon. member into the reasons that may have resulted in the majorities he has received in North York. He knows them better than anyone else.

Mr. LENNOX: Is this statement of the right hon. gentleman true?

They were added, and when the general election came I carried the old constituency of North York but was defeated by the additional majority in the added constituency.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the impression I have been under, that had the old riding been left as it was I would have carried it. Possibly I should have made an exception of those voters who were brought up from Toronto by my hon. friend and who voted in other parts of the constituency.

Mr. LENNOX: There were none brought up at that election.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise merely to correct a misstatement made this afternoon by the right hon. gentleman, because, to use his own words, it is always desirable that the record should be historically correct. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was never a candidate in Prince Albert. That is No. 1.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In 1896.

Mr. BENNETT: He was never a candidate in Prince Albert.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In what is now the constituency of Prince Albert.

Mr. BENNETT: No, never. Secondly, it is not traditionally Liberal. Here is the record. I thought I remembered very distinctly what the position was when I went west but I have taken the trouble during the recess to get the Parliamentary Guide and at page 278 the record of Prince Albert is given. It came into being in 1908. At the first general election Mr. Rutan, a Liberal, was elected, and he was the member for three years until in 1911 the seat was carried by Mr. James McKay, a Conservative. He remained until at a by-election the next year Mr. Donaldson, a Conservative, was elected in his place. The seat then remained Conservative until 1917, when the government candidate, Mr. Knox, was elected by a majority of 3,590. Mr. Knox was an opponent of the Liberals at that time. He was reelected as a Progressive in 1921, and the seat remained Progressive until 1925 when Mr. McDonald was elected, and he was succeeded on his retirement by the right hon. leader of the opposition, who is still the member for that constituency. A note is appended, "See Assiniboia, and particularly the reference under that head to the old electoral division of Saskatchewan."

At page 217 of the Parliamentary Guide is the record of Saskatchewan. The record with respect to Saskatchewan is as follows, Saskatchewan being an electoral division that returned one member only for the whole of the territorial division of Saskatchewan.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Of which Prince Albert was an important part.

Mr. BENNETT: No, there were several places, including Saskatoon, then an embryo city.

Mr. TOTZKE: In 1906? Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT: I am making my observations from this record, and at page 218 is the record of this traditionally Liberal seat! In 1887, at the first election, Mr. Macdowall, a Conservative, was elected by 166. He was reelected in 1891 by 283, and in 1896 Sir Wilfrid Laurier was elected by 44. But I find that he was also elected in the same election for Quebec East, and that he resigned his seat at Prince Albert and was succeeded by Mr. T. O. Davis, Liberal, who was reelected in 1900, and when he went to the Senate he was succeeded in 1904 by Mr., now Mr. Justice, Lamont, a Liberal. So it is not a traditionally Liberal seat, and secondly, Sir Wilfrid Laurier never sat for Prince Albert, and never was elected for Prince Albert.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He was elected.

Mr. BENNETT: Never was elected. He was elected for what is known as the electoral division of Saskatchewan. When I went west there were four ridings in the northwest territories: Alberta, represented by Mr. Oliver, West Assiniboia, represented by Mr. Davin, East Assiniboia, represented by Mr. Douglas and later by Mr. Turriff, and the other was Saskatchewan, which in 1896 was represented by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was succeeded by Mr. Davis when Sir Wilfrid elected to sit for Quebec East.

That is the record. I do not think for a single moment that the right hon. gentleman deliberately misstated it, but it just shows how one may for a moment have in one's mind an idea that is hardly consonant with the exact facts, just as the right hon. gentleman had with respect to his position in North York. It turns out as a matter of fact that had it not been for the two townships that were added by the redistribution of 1924 he would have been beaten by a much larger majority than he was. I am not for a moment asserting that he made the misstatement deliberately. It is just one of those accidents that sometimes happens to one's memory, and I merely correct the misstatement in order that the record may be historically correct.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is why it is done—statesmanlike.

Mr. BENNETT: To keep the record historically correct.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I should like to take a very few minutes to correct some of the misrepresentations that were made by the hon. member for Humboldt, whether wilfully or not—

Mr. TOTZKE: I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman be made to withdraw that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: He said that he did not know whether the misrepresentations were wilful or not. He qualified his statement.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): My statement was to the effect that in the southern portion of the constituency of Prince Albert at the present time there were people of German descent. I maintain that that is correct. Here are the names of some of the places: Laird, Waldheim, and Rosthern, which are practically solidly German, and then north of Saskatoon are Hepburn, Hague, Mennon, Langham, Osler and Dalmeny, practically all solid German. The statement that I endeavoured to make was that by virtue of these people being placed as they were in a block in Prince Albert, and similarly to the north of Saskatoon city, it was practically impossible for them to nominate one of their own people. As to referring to them in any way as foreigners or people who are not loyal to Canadian institutions, I went out of my way, and there is no distance to which I would not go, to uphold these people as Canadian citizens. But I do not know of any instance in my memory in which any hon. member in this house or out of it went further than the hon. member for Humboldt when he tried by the greatest stretch of imagination to suggest that I considered that the French were foreigners.

Mr. TOTZKE: I did not say that.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): If my memory is correct, those are the very words of the hon. member. There is no hon. member in this house or out of it with a higher estimation of the fine qualities of our French-Canadians and of the French in the old land than I have. Not only have I every reason to know them in the constituency of Prince Albert but I also had the good luck to meet many of them in very close association in the motherland, and I assure the hon. member for Humboldt that I could not imagine a greater difference between the broadmindedness, the love of country, the generosity and heroism of those people in their motherland, and the spirit that prompted him to insinuate what he has tried to into the remarks that I made this afternoon. I made no distinction between the Anglo-Saxon in the northern part—

Mr. TOTZKE: I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member has accused me of saying that the French-Canadians in that constituency were foreigners. I did not say that. I said he had said these people of German extraction in the southern portion of Prince Albert were being put into the new seat so they would be with people of their own kind. I made no statement as to them being classed as foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. TOTZKE: It is a question of privilege.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot correct speeches.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I made it clear I was referring to that block of people of German descent as against people in the northern part of the constituency who were French, Ukrainian, Scandinavian, and other people who lived in harmony, and are doing everything they can to make that one of the best sections in Canada.

Mr. TOTZKE: If I am not allowed to say anything on a question of privilege, I must say we are in committee and I have the right to reply.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member may answer.

Mr. TOTZKE: I wish to repeat that I did not say the hon. member had referred to French-Canadians as foreigners. I distinctly said, with regard to his remarks in connection with moving the people of German extraction from the southern portion of Prince Albert into this new seat which was being created, that it was for the purpose of putting them with people of their own kind, in order that they might be able to nominate one of their own people to represent them in this House of Commons. I was simply showing that they were not the same kind of people as those to which he had referred in the southern portion of Prince Albert. In that portion of Saskatchewan the people do not want to be put into situations of that kind. They want to live together in peace and harmony. They do live together in peace and harmony out there. They are among the best citizens of Canada, and the younger generation are growing up to love this country as their own. If at any time anything disparaging is said in this house concerning those people I for one will be on my feet to defend them to the best of my ability.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): It has been amusing to sit in this committee from eleven o'clock this morning and to listen to the words of hon. members opposite concerning that which they have been pleased to term the gerrymandering of 1932-33. While perhaps it may be very elevating to hear the expressions of high idealism from broadminded men who wish to redistribute the constituencies of Canada so that they will be perfectly fair to all members, one is led to wonder how fragile the memories of hon. members opposite must be. The hon. member for Regina referred to what took place in the constituency of Portage la Prairie in an effort to defeat the election to the House of Commons of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen. It was my privilege to go through that elongated constituency and to see for myself some of the things that were done. If the right hon. gentleman who has bewailed so bitterly what has taken place in Prince Albert would obtain a map of the province of Manitoba as it was prepared in the redistribution of 1923-24, he would see how far his idealism and chivalry to opponents carried him at that time.

To my personal knowledge the same agent who went out from the city of Ottawa to the constituency of Portage la Prairie to arrange that redistribution passed through all the constituencies in northern Ontario. I had the privilege of meeting the gentleman in my home town, although he did not know to whom he was talking at the time. He was accompanied by other political leaders of the north, members from the Timiskamings, East and West Algoma and Port Arthur. If the right hon. gentleman wishes to know where the word "gerrymander" really got its pernicious meaning he should come to northern Ontario and I will show him. I will show him what took place in 1924. If hon. members opposite want to know where the hon. member who invented the jig saw puzzle obtained his ideas, let them come to northern Ontario, and they will find out.

Mr. BRADETTE: Where?

Mr. NICHOLSON: In Timiskaming.

Mr. BRADETTE: Not in Timiskaming; I object to that.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Let the hon. member possess his soul in peace for a few moments, and I shall show him what took place in South Timiskaming in 1924. Why did a change take place? Because this gentleman who went out from the city of Ottawa had specific instructions to make the Timiskamings safe, regardless of what he did. "Make it impossible to elect a member in East Algoma. Hive the Tories in West Algoma, and make it impossible to elect a Conservative member in Port Arthur." If the committee will bear with me I will read some of the descriptions from the statute passed as a result of that redistribution. Let us first take West Algoma:

> Algoma West consisting of those parts of the territorial districts of Algoma and Sudbury . . .

Note the expression "the territorial districts of Algoma and Sudbury." We have heard some discussions this afternoon with regard to members having to go fifty, sixty or seventy miles out of their way to reach parts of their constituencies. Let me indicate what is involved in the designation I have read. We find the term "parts of the territorial districts of Algoma and Sudbury." In order for the hon. member for West Algoma to get into the district of Sudbury he has to cross the district of East Algoma. There is no point in West Algoma which was contiguous, within one hundred miles, to the district of Sudbury. And to reach the points within the district of Sudbury which were taken out of East Algoma and added to West Algoma and, in order to carry out the instruction to make it impossible for a Conservative member to be elected in East Algoma, what did the hon. member for

West Algoma have to do? He had to travel one hundred and seventy-two miles, one hundred and sixty of which were in East Algoma or in Nipissing, going southwesterly all the time. Then he had to travel one hundred and seventy-two miles northwesterly to reach that point which it was desired should be taken out of East Algoma. But there were other points in East Algoma which were to be put in with West Algoma, and in order for the hon. member for West Algoma to reach them he had to go back one hundred and seventy-two miles, travel up the Canadian Northern railway one hundred and eighty miles through parts of the district of Nipissing—South Timiskaming, as it was gerrymandered into in 1924—and East Algoma.

Let me follow that up. This is the further designation with regard to West Algoma—I shall not read the whole of it because it takes nearly a whole page in the statutes:

> . . . the township of Dowsley, thence east along the north boundary of the township of Dowsley to the northeastern boundary of the township of Ebbs, thence south along the east boundary of the township of Ebbs to the northwestern boundary of the township of Doherty, thence east along the northern boundary of the township of Doherty to the northeastern boundary of the township of Shanley but not including the village of Hornepayne.

Perhaps this is the illustration that will best indicate the chivalry and fairness that was exercised in the 1924 redistribution. The village of Hornepayne lies completely inside the township and within the district of West Algoma. But it comprised a population that it was thought could be influenced to vote Liberal, while in the rest of the township was a population that might vote Conservative. They could not get a sieve fine enough to run these two groups of people through and get the Liberals into Port Arthur and the Conservatives into West Algoma, so they picked up the village of Hornepayne and transferred it to Port Arthur. But they did not stop there. There was a part of West Algoma known as Michipicoten harbour and Michipicoten island, all within the district and constituency of West Algoma, about eighty miles by boat from the Soo, and containing such places as the Helen mine and Goudreau, by rail about 150 miles within the border of West Algoma. But there were some voters there who it was thought might be transferred to Port Arthur and influenced to vote there, so they too were transferred to Port Arthur. I will not stop to read them all. To get to that part of his constituency the hon. member for Port Arthur had either to charter a vessel and travel 350 miles down lake Superior or to travel 380 miles by rail.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? As he is discussing Timiskaming I assume he is familiar with the map as drawn at present. Is it not a fact that North Timiskaming is left exactly as it was in the 1924 redistribution, and South Timiskaming is left as it was with a very slight exception?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Either the hon. gentleman was not listening or I succeeded very badly in making myself clear. I was referring to South Timiskaming, East Algoma, West Algoma and Port Arthur. These were the four constituencies about which specific instructions were issued and to which special agents were sent right from Ottawa in 1924. Let me come back to that point about Michipicoten harbour and island, with about 180 voters that were transferred from West Algoma to Port Arthur—why? In the hope that a Conservative member could not be elected in Port Arthur; and they were taken out of West Algoma in order to increase the majority of my hon. friend the present member for West Algoma. As I stated, the member for Port Arthur had to travel 380 miles by rail to reach these points, of which the last 130 miles were through the territory of West Algoma.

Now I will just come to South Timiskaming. First of all the description starts:

> —consisting of that part of the territorial district of Timiskaming . . .

And then further down:

> —and that part of the territorial district of Sudbury—

Now, what is it necessary for a member representing South Timiskaming to do in order to get into that part of the territorial district of Sudbury, and why was that change made? Nipissing in 1921 had a majority of almost 6,000 for the Liberal candidate. Timiskaming was a closed constituency.

Mr. BRADETTE: It was a new riding.

Mr. NICHOLSON: It was desired to make it impossible for a Conservative to be elected in South Timiskaming, but they missed their guess; they forgot that W. A. Gordon lived in South Timiskaming. But that is not the point. In order that a candidate or member could get into that part of the district of Sudbury designated here it was necessary to travel from Haileybury to North Bay, at least 100 miles, and then travel through the district of Nipissing again for another hundred miles to get into that corner of those townships that were bordering right on the city where the Liberal member lived, the city of Sudbury. That was the case with regard to

South Timiskaming; it has been corrected, I understand, although I have not checked it up.

Let me come back for a moment to East Algoma. Without reading the designation, which takes up almost a page, I will just pass along:

—the projection southerly of the east boundary of the township of Plummer Additional and running north to and along the east boundary of the said township and of the line of townships lying north thereof to the south boundary of the 21st range of townships . . .

When Algoma was divided after the 1901 census the line between West and East Algoma ran straight north from Georgian bay. But it happened that the member for East Algoma from 1917 to 1921 lived in that part of the riding where he has lived for the whole of his adult life. He happened to be interested in three fairly large saw mills employing from 1,000 to 1,500 men all the year round, and living thereabouts. Something had to be done to correct a situation of that kind. The Conservative member lived there; the Conservative candidate lived there. That would never do. So they ran this line to the south boundary of the 21st range of townships and thence east along the said south boundary to a point directly south of the southeast corner of the township of Lackner. What did they do by that? They simply took out four little towns in three townships, the town of Chapleau, in which I live, and Devon, Nicholson and Dalton, where my saw mills, or those in which I am interested, are, and where the people I employ happen to live. That is what my right hon. friend will designate as chivalry towards political opponents, the high idealism that demands that constituencies be distributed fairly and equally amongst representatives in the House of Commons. I commend the ideal, Mr. Chairman; that certainly is the attitude that should prevail, but I just ask my right hon. friend to search his memory and ask his friends who were on that committee to search their memories and recall the instructions that were given to the solicitor in the city of Ottawa who traversed these constituencies east and west and stopped off at all points of interest to see what could be done to gerrymander members out of their seats, and then make another speech and tell the house what a real gerrymander is. We used to hear of Sir John Macdonald stating in answer to Sir Richard Cartwright regarding gerrymanders that if he lived another ten years he would gerrymander him again. And I have no doubt that if my right hon. friend were to have the opportunity ten years from now he would gerrymander again. Taking the picture I know to have existed in northern Ontario and realizing what was done, Sir John Macdonald would consider himself as a gerrymanderer to be a perfect piker, to use the common phrase; he would say, "I know nothing about the task, refer me to those who committed that gerrymander of 1924."

Hon. JAMES MALCOLM (North Bruce): I am rather glad my hon. friend has turned the discussion to the province of Ontario. This afternoon and evening we have listened with a great deal of patience to a discussion of the redistribution of seats in the province of Saskatchewan. I feel that something should be said with regard to what I consider to be the greatest unfairness in representation in any province of the Dominion of Canada, that is, the disproportion of representation in the province of Ontario. The bill we are considering is the result of the meditations of a committee of hon. members of this house, who I think have worked laboriously for some time. That there is decided disagreement on the part of members of the committee none will deny, and to me the cause of that disagreement is quite apparent. From the discussion during the time the committee was sitting, as well as the discussion to which we have listened here, it seems to me that personal considerations for members of this house, as well as political considerations, have taken up altogether too much time, while the consideration of fair representation for the municipalities has not been given enough time. After all it is our duty, whether we be in this house or on a committee, to follow the British North America Act and every ten years, after the decennial census, to try to rearrange the ridings of the dominion so that the voters will have a fair say, and not so that those now in parliament will have safe seats. After this parliament is over not a single one of us will have a seat or any claim on one; the most we will have will be the right to represent some party at the polls and to ask the people for their suffrage. I am not a particle interested in whether the last distribution was as bad as this distribution; the fact remains that the committee did come to an agreement.

Mr. BENNETT: Not wholly.

Mr. MALCOLM: My right hon. friend says there was some difference, but certainly this redistribution, as I am prepared to show, is just about as bad as it could be if you are thinking of the rights of the electors in the province of Ontario. I have compiled two or three sets of figures to which I should like to refer. The average of population in the

ridings in Ontario should be about 40,000. But while it is fair that one man should have as much say in the administration of the country as another man there is another factor in addition to population which must not be ignored, and that is the number of votes polled. I believe the men who think enough of their franchise to go to the polls have a greater right to consideration than those who do not vote. There is also the question of the geographic problems in some of the very large ridings. Therefore every redistribution committee has to agree to some extent that the urban population, which does not vote in the same percentage as the rural population, should have a larger unit of population than the rural seats.

Mr. TURNBULL: Is the hon. gentleman referring only to the province of Ontario now?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am dealing with the province which I represent.

Mr. TURNBULL: That is not correct so far as our province is concerned.

Mr. MALCOLM: It has been generally agreed in the province of Ontario that a smaller unit of population in the rural districts was fair for the reason that it was easier for the candidates to work a city seat, and also because in a city riding not such a large percentage of the voters come out on polling day. Even allowing for these factors, may I point to a few cases and ask where any fairness exists in regard to the unit of population? I see my hon. friend from Lincoln sitting opposite. Lincoln takes in the town of St. Catharines and a very prosperous farming area surrounding it. The riding of Kent takes in the city of Chatham and the very prosperous country surrounding it. These ridings, along with North Waterloo—which takes in the city of Kitchener and a very rich agricultural district—each have about 53,000 electors, and they each poll in the neighbourhood of 25,000 votes. On the other hand, in the centre of this province we have two members from the county of Brant and the city of Brantford. The county of Brant polled only 9,000 votes, while the city of Brantford polled 15,000 votes. So it takes two citizens of Lincoln or Kent or North Waterloo to equal one citizen in the county of Brant. I see my hon. friend from Kingston opposite; his is a purely city riding with 26,000 electors, just half the number in some of the other seats in the province.

I must say that bearing these facts in mind this seems an unfair redistribution. I am not blaming the members of the committee at all; I am blaming every man in this house. The chairman of the committee may reply that this is what we did at the last redistribution, but that is no excuse for doing it a second time. Here we have ridings like Kingston, with 26,000 voters, polling 11,000 votes; Brantford with 32,000 voters polling 15,000 votes; Toronto East with 69,000 voters polling 19,000 votes, and Toronto South, with 46,000 voters, only polling 7,000 votes. Then we have the township of Brant with 21,000 voters polling 9,000; North and South Bruce, with 21,000 or 22,000 voters polling 10,000 or 11,000 votes. In contrast we have the district of Nipissing, in a part of Canada which is growing rapidly due to the expansion of the mining industry. Under this bill there will be 70,000 people in that constituency, and at the last election they polled 23,000 votes. I agree with my hon. friend from East Algoma that the difficulties in such ridings as the Algomas and the Nipissings are very great; the people are scattered along the railway line and candidates must travel many miles in order to get to their constituents. At the same time the Algomas have 37,000 or 38,000 people, which is a bit too much having regard to the physical and geographic problems which exist.

I have no complaint to make with regard to the taking away of a seat from the counties of Grey and Bruce, making three seats instead of four. As a result of that division the representation of these seats will be from 32,000 to 35,000. I do submit, however, this one thought: While it is perfectly fair to put the unit of representation in my county at 35,000 I am far from satisfied when I see another county smaller than mine, which a candidate can cover in two hours in an automobile left unchanged while I must travel 120 miles to cover the length of my riding, and must use horse-drawn vehicles during some seasons of the year.

I believe that this redistribution in Ontario —and I have said this to my hon. friend from West Middlesex who represented the party to your left, Mr. Chairman—should have brought about a greater change in order to give a more equitable distribution of the voting power of this province. After all I think we are doing too much counting what the results of the 1926 and 1930 elections happened to be; we are wasting too much time counting up what various townships gave in Conservative, Liberal or Progressive votes. As I see it our task is to try to get some equality in regard to representation, and as representatives of the people I hardly think it is good enough for us to be satisfied providing the redistribution suits certain members of the house and makes certain seats safe. I think if the Ontario committee had really wanted to do so it could have made ten or twenty changes which would have brought the average unit close to 40,000

instead of having the list start at the top with 18,000 in some ridings and wind up at the bottom of the list with ridings like Welland, with 82,000, and Nipissing with 70,000. It does seem to me that the public have a right to a more equitable representation than they are getting. I would say also, that the representation of a riding with five votes on the list for every vote polled would not justify putting two seats in this riding. It just happens that the ridings which in my opinion are worst sinned against are the ridings in which the people poll a very large percentage of the votes on the list.

Someone, I believe the hon. member for East Algoma, was speaking a little while ago as to what had taken place in the last redistribution. I hardly think there has been a sufficiently marked change to indicate that the last redistribution could have been quite as bad as the hon. gentleman almost suggests it was. A great many of these seats in Ontario are fairly well represented; with respect to probably two thirds of them one can take no particular exception because they are as close to the unit of population as they can be while still preserving county boundaries. But I do submit to the chairman of the committee and to the house that as between, on the one hand, fully 8 or 10 seats in Ontario which are polling only 8,000 or 9,000 votes, and on the other hand 8 or 10 seats which are polling from 22,000 to 25,000 votes, there is a gulf which does not indicate very good work on the part of this or of past redistribution committees. I suggest that now this matter is before the house for consideration we should be well advised to observe county boundaries more fully than we have done, to increase representation in a good many of the districts which are overpopulated and to make some changes in those which are under-populated.

Hon. H. A. STEWART (Minister of Public Works): Just a very few words in reply to my hon. friend from North Bruce, who seems very much disturbed about the fact that a large proportion of the electorate do not go to the polls. I submit that the way to deal with such people is not by a redistribution of constituencies based upon the number of people who vote at the polls; it seems to me that any action along that line is bound to result in confusion and is entirely contrary to the principles of the British North America Act. If my hon. friend is consistent —and I am not suggesting that he is not—he ought to be in favour of compulsory voting—

Mr. MALCOLM: I am, very much so.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —and should bring in a bill. But until something of that kind is done I submit that we cannot deal with the matter in this indirect, haphazard, uncertain way as suggested by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MALCOLM: The hon. member knows that that is always taken into consideration to some extent.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The number of votes polled?

Mr. MALCOLM: That is the reason for the larger representation.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Under the law it cannot on any principle be taken into consideration. That comes under the election act.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend knows that we have a larger unit for the urban seats.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): But that is under a different principle; there are such questions to be considered as the ease with which the member can represent his constituency, the greater extent to which a city constituency is in touch with public opinion and can reflect its opinion and wishes in the house. My hon. friend spoke about the city of Kingston, which has a comparatively small population. Let me point out that in the last redistribution, when hon. gentlemen opposite got through, the city of Kingston had a population of only 24,104, but the adjoining constituency, which is rural, made up of Frontenac and Addington, had 30,696.

Mr. MALCOLM: I said that two blacks did not make a white.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): But this black is not as black as my hon. friend would have it painted. Let me tell him that when the adjustment was made in the last redistribution, so far as Kingston was concerned, we urged that part of the county of Frontenac or the whole of it be put with the city of Kingston; but my hon. friends over there would not listen to it. Instead, they combined the two counties of Frontenac and Addington, which had nothing in common, and left the city of Kingston as it was with this small population.

Mr. MALCOLM: I do not think that anyone should make a statement in this house regarding what was represented at the last redistribution in committee. There is not a word of evidence to prove what took place in the committee, and therefore no statement can be either substantiated or denied. The statement which the minister is making is not the statement that was made to me, and

inasmuch as the committee did come to an agreement I think the minister will almost admit that there was a good deal of unanimity if that unanimity was not complete.

Mr. CHAPLIN: They did not come to an agreement until afterwards.

Mr. MALCOLM: Yes; I know my hon. friend was called in at the last to try to bring things together.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): In answer to my hon. friend—

Mr. MALCOLM: I say there is no evidence.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —I may tell him that his leader has to-day been making statements as to what took place and what was urged upon the committee.

Mr. MALCOLM: I am not excusing anyone.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): And the hon. member for Melville has even been quoting the statements of a dead man. Now, let us get back to Kingston.

Mr. MALCOLM: And Brant.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, I will come to Brant. With regard to Kingston, I was observing that the two counties of Frontenac and Addington, which had nothing in common municipally, were put together, with the result that there was a large discrepancy between this urban and this rural seat. But I submit that it is not well every ten years to disturb an area in which there has been a redistribution in the previous decade, and to do anything in the city of Kingston now you would have to rearrange the whole map that was rearranged ten years ago—

Mr. MALCOLM: That is what we do it for.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): —and that would be very disturbing. Let us come now to Brant and Brantford. At the last redistribution it was urged that these might be put together, but my hon. friends would not consider it.

Mr. MALCOLM: We don't know that.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I do, and I can tell my hon. friend that I will not make any statement which I do not know to be perfectly true.

Mr. MALCOLM: But it is a matter of memory purely.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes, and my memory is good.

Mr. MALCOLM: But the other man thinks his memory is good too.

[Mr. Malcolm.]

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): My memory is good and I can substantiate what I say. Now, there never has been a redistribution that has followed exactly the underlying principles which we all say should be adopted. There never has been a redistribution satisfactory to all concerned. Take each and every one of them and you will find just as glaring discrepancies as my hon. friend has pointed out to-night.

Mr. MALCOLM: There is no province in Canada with as bad a spread in representation as Ontario, from 20,000 to 70,000.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It has a larger number of seats than any other province.

Mr. MALCOLM: Quite so, and the biggest spread.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): My hon. friend knows that the urban population has created a problem which is difficult to deal with. On the one hand we have the contention that you must not decrease rural representation, and on the other hand we have the contention that you must increase the urban representation. We have endeavoured to keep both these in mind and to give to cities an increase, though not such as they desire, while not disturbing too greatly county boundaries or conditions as we find them. Particularly have we endeavoured to avoid tearing up the map, as it were, where it had been all torn up only ten years ago and the electors in those areas which had been then disturbed had just got quietly settled down and had adapted themselves to the changed conditions. This has been described as a gerrymander, but let me say to my hon. friends that I have no confidence in gerrymanders. I do not believe either of the parties think that you can count on any definite advantage being gained in an election from a redistribution. I think the results of the last redistribution proved that quite clearly. In 1925, following the last redistribution, the advantages were certainly not in our favour. We went to the country with fifty members and came back with 117. I think it is perfectly clear that in these days and in these peculiar times you cannot count with any accuracy upon the results of a readjustment. After all, public opinion prevails. If my hon. friends think that as far as I am concerned or as far as this committee is concerned in this redistribution we have been primarily and principally concerned in endeavouring to secure some small, petty party advantage, which I think we will all agree is extremely doubtful, then they are absolutely mistaken. I ask my hon. friends to appreciate the difficulties which confronted

us. There was the difference in the size of the counties, the desire to retain county boundaries and the desire to create as little disturbance as possible. I ask them to believe that we have accomplished as good, as fair, as reasonable and as equitable a redistribution as has ever been accomplished in the history of Canada.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Toronto Northwest): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make a correction in the remarks of the hon. member for North Bruce. If I heard him correctly, he intimated that his new riding would have approximately 35,000 people.

Mr. MALCOLM: I think I gave figures for three ridings, 32,900, 35,400 and 34,600.

Mr. MacNICOL: If the riding of the member for North Bruce is carried out according to the bill it will contain a population of 29,842 while if it is carried out according to a proposal which was made, it will have a population of 27,789. I understood the hon. member to say 35,000.

Mr. MALCOLM: I gave the figures for three ridings, and the 35,000 is for North Grey in which the city of Owen Sound is situated.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member with reference to South Toronto and I shall refer to city representations generally. While the committee was in session it was mentioned on many occasions that the two Brants should be put together. One of the reasons for this was that that county containing 53,000 odd contained the city of Brantford with a population of approximately 32,000. As a city member I know that the hon. member for Brantford City works very hard. A great deal of his time is taken up with correspondence in connection with the great industries located in that city. If my memory is correct, Brantford is the fourth largest manufacturing city in Canada. Having some fifty to sixty industries in my own riding I know full well what he must have to do to look after the requirements of the industries in his. A lot of people seem to think that a city member has nothing to do but my own experience is that I have to be here at nine o'clock in the morning and usually do not get away until twelve o'clock at night. If other city members work as I assume they do, they have lots to do.

The reason might be advanced that city voters do not vote. If my memory is correct, during the last elections approximately fifty per cent of the voters on the list in my riding voted. I represent a riding containing over 70,000 people. Many of these people say, "What is the use of going to the polls? The Conservative candidate will be elected anyway, and he does not need my vote." That is one of the reasons why the vote is frequently small in the cities. However, on the whole Canada stands up well with any nation in the world in the percentage of voters who vote. Something was said a moment ago about compulsory voting. I am opposed to compulsory voting and if it is ever brought up in the house I shall be prepared to advance many facts as arguments against such a method being adopted in this country. In the last general elections eighty-six per cent of the voters in North York voted. The percentage in the riding of Stormont was eighty-seven; in Kings eighty-nine. I see the hon. member for West Middlesex is checking these figures very carefully and I shall have to be careful because he agreed that if any constituency in Canada voted ninety per cent he would buy me a dinner. The percentage in the riding of Stanstead was ninety.

Mr. ELLIOTT: At this stage I think my hon. friend will admit that he is too high in his percentages.

Mr. MacNICOL: I do not think I referred to these ridings before. I ask the hon. member to check them up as I may be a fraction too high. The percentage for Laval-Two Mountains was ninety and for Laprairie-Napierville, ninty-one. The percentage for the whole of Canada for the elections of 1930 was 76.1; for the elections of 1926, 70.1; for 1925, 68.7, and for 1921, 70.3. They have compulsory voting in Australia, the voters being fined when they do not vote. In the last general elections in that conutry, the vote ranged from ninety-one to ninety-four per cent. I think the people of Canada deserve a great deal of credit for the interest they take in elections and for the way they turn out to register their votes.

The hon. member referred to the last redistribution and seemed to think that nothing should be said about it. Under this redistribution, there will be no riding in Ontario as small as some of the ridings under the redistribution of 1924. The 1924 redistribution left South Perth with a population of 18,382; North Bruce, the hon. member's own riding, with a population of 20,872; South Bruce, with 23,413; North Wellington with 19,833; Argenteuil with 17,165; Bagot with 18,035 and Beauharnois with 19,888. The population of the constituencies ranged from the above to 76,858 in Jacques Cartier and 69,717 in Toronto East Centre. I noted carefully the hon. member's remarks in reference to the com-

mittee on Ontario, and as a member of that committee I have a right to defend myself against any unjust attacks. The smallest ridings laid out in the province of Ontario so far are the county of Haldimand with 21,428, and the county of Brant with 21,202. The ridings range from those figures up to 61,800 for one of the Ottawa seats and an average of 58,000 for the Toronto seats, although some of them are larger, and up to 66,943 for the county of Wentworth.

Mr. MALCOLM: Has my hon. friend the figures for Nipissing?

Mr. MacNICOL: I am glad the hon. gentleman has referred to Nipissing. There are two Nipissing ridings laid out in the bill, but whether they will go through in that form I do not know: one with a population of 40,000 and the other with 31,359, or if they are combined, the total population will be 71,359. We started out with the idea of taking out as few rural ridings as we possibly could, and I think that we have taken out fewer rural ridings than in any previous redistribution of which I have been able to get the figures. I believe that that fairly well answers the hon. member's objections as regards the city ridings, and his charge that the people of Canada do not exercise the franchise.

Hon. J. D. CHAPLIN (Lincoln): The Minister of Public Works told us a few moments ago that redistribution creates disturbances in the constituencies, and that if it is left alone long enough people will settle down and will not be disturbed if they do not have a redistribution. Well, I was here at the last redistribution and we made a strong plea for the Niagara district. Our people are beginning to get tired because they have been settled down so long now on the basis of seeing some other counties electing from two to four members with the same population that gives us only one representative; it is time now to get some unsettling done. We have a population in the two counties of Lincoln and Welland of approximately 140,000, and there are two members. Kingston, as has been pointed out by the minister, has a population of 26,000. So one man's vote in that county is the same as two from my county or three votes from Welland. I ask if that is a fair deal.

Mr. MALCOLM: No, it is not.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Very well, if it is not fair, this house is not the place to settle it. You won't settle it here in six months. You have to do it in another way, and it has to be done more equitably than it is being done in this bill.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

What does a redistribution mean? Do you intend to be fair? Do you intend to give to one county a number of votes that will elect only half a member when the same number of votes in another county elects a member; or, if you cannot divide a member into two, with the same number of votes we elect one member and another county elects two. In the case of Welland the people have only one-third of a vote, and only half a vote in my county. I heard the Minister of Agriculture in the late government making an appeal to the Prime Minister to be fair. He could be fair. I ask him to be fair to people who have been settled down too long. We want to get unsettled.

Mr. J. F. FAFARD (L'Islet) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in discussing the present bill before the house, I wish it to be well understood that I am not championing my own personal interests, which have no place in this debate, but I do ask that fairness be shown to those who did me an honour in choosing me to represent them in the house. I have no favour to ask, I simply request fair play for my fellow citizens of the county of L'Islet.

The measure under discussion provides for the annexation of the county of L'Islet to that of Montmagny with the exception of the parishes of St. Roch, Ste. Louise, St. Damase, Tourville and Ste. Perpétue of the old county of L'Islet, and the parishes of St. François and Berthier of the old county of Montmagny.

The counties of L'Islet and Montmagny were created in 1860, and their respective boundaries have always remained the same heretofore. I cannot see why it is necessary to carry out this change in 1933. This difference in population of 213 does not justify this change. L'Islet, in 1923, was thought sufficiently populated, and after an increase of 1,545 within the last ten years, it is found too small and sacrificed to create an English speaking constituency in the city of Montreal.

The county of Montmagny with a population of 20,239 is considered too small and it is sacrificed to form a new county which will be known as Chapleau, comprising a population of only 21,705 souls.

If we consider that the normal population of Montmagny is 22,000—that is according to the census of 1921—it is an outrage to suppress this county and create another having the same population and size. The reason given is that the city of Montreal has greatly increased and that, in the general interest, the counties of L'Islet and Montmagny must be annexed.

I greatly regret this decision; I should have preferred to see these old counties maintain their identity. However, if the general interest demands it, I accept the union, on condition that they be entirely merged and not cut up as the bill before the house intends to do.

Moreover, there is no reason to transfer parishes from one county or the other. The two counties united together form a population of 39,643, which is many thousands less than the unit fixed by the census of 1931. Besides, 50 per cent of the counties have a population of more than 40,000. To mention only the counties neighbouring Montmagny-L'Islet, we have, for instance, Témiscouata with a population of over 42,000; Beauce, with over 50,000; Charlevoix-Saguenay, with over 55,000; Chicoutimi, with over 55,000; Gaspé, with over 47,000; Lake St. John, with over 50,000; Matane, with over 48,000; Mégantic, with over 44,000; Nicolet, with over 47,000. This being the case, why not completely join together Montmagny and L'Islet, since they have less than 40,000 population?

If the wedding of these two counties is thought necessary in the interest of the country, as a whole, let us celebrate it in an atmosphere of peace, friendship and harmony, so that the union may have beneficial results to the people of the two counties united. Preserving their closely bound parochial, provincial and judicial institutions, they will live together in an atmosphere of peace, harmony and prosperity. By removing from the county of L'Islet the parishes of St. Roch, Ste. Louise, St. Damase, Tourville and St. Perpétue, you place in the county of Kamouraska parishes which belonged to the judiciary district of Montmagny, and the parish of St. Pamphile will be so situated that the people of that parish will be unable to reach their principal town or the St. Lawrence river without passing through Kamouraska county.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Just as it was, previously, in the county of Montmagny, as regards Bellechasse.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I regret, sir, that I was not consulted in this affair. I have been in the house one of the longest, and I was entitled, I think, to a better treatment from my opponents. The only compromise which was suggested to me through our representative, last Thursday, was the following: If you wish to accept the changes proposed in the bill, we are willing to remove the parish of St. Pamphile, where you have a minority of 130 votes, and the parish of Tourville, where you also have a minority of 30 votes, and place them in the county of Kamouraska.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): Will the hon. member permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): My reply to such a bargain was not long forthcoming. I felt insulted, because it was contrary to the principle I had laid down: that both counties be completely annexed. I had no desire to accept such an offer because I am attached to these parishes. St. Pamphile is a colonization parish which has grown before my eyes. The majority of these people vote against me, nevertheless, I visit them every year and I am very fond of them.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): You have a liberal heart.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Another reason for my refusal is that I want the people of those counties to see the injustice and infamy you are perpetrating under pretence of justice.

Were I to consider only the political and personal advantage gained by it, I would be tempted to accept this offer, but why disturb the municipal, provincial and judicial institutions of a county, when the thing is not justifiable and is unnecessary? Why disorganize our institutions when unity and cooperation is needed? The citizens of these two counties have grown, worked and prospered together. Since 1860, these counties have grown side by side, they have their municipal and provincial governments, they have their agricultural and cooperative societies. If you transfer parishes from either one or the other county, you disorganize them in every way. Take, for instance, the parishes of St.-Roch, St-Louise, St-Damase, Tourville and Ste-Perpétue; in provincial matters they will belong to three counties: Kamouraska, L'Islet and Montmagny; in municipal matters, they will cease to be part of L'Islet and its council. The warden of the county of L'Islet will find himself in the county of Kamouraska. There will be a complete disorganization in connection with farming.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The county council is a provincial matter and not federal.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Will the hon. member maintain order.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Were I to maintain order, I would, first, tell the hon. member not to read his speech.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): He is reading figures.

Mr. ST. PERE (Translation): As many members do.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): When the hon. member is chairman, he may then give his opinion as to the correct procedure to follow. The hon. member might regret it, should I set aside my notes.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Let the hon. member set them aside.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I stated a moment ago that the agricultural societies would be completely disorganized and would cease to function. The president of the agricultural society of L'Islet would, in the future, reside in the county of Kamouraska. There is another reason which might bespeak in favour of the complete annexation of the two counties. As the hon. member for Montmagny is well aware, farmers who are members of the society of agriculture, gather, at various seasons, at parish exhibitions. What will happen? A large number of the people of the old parishes of the county of L'Islet will no further be able to meet their friends. They will no doubt meet people as honest and friendly, however, a certain aloofness will exist in discussing farming questions.

As I stated at the outset of my remarks, the reasons which prompt me to protest against this bill are on a much higher plane than the political and personal interests of the two members. I am convinced—that is, I was—that the feelings that move me will be shared by the hon. member for Montmagny, known for his impartiality and broad-mindedness, and especially looked upon as the champion of minorities. I am convinced that after listening to the reasons given, he will wish for an intact Montmagny united to an intact L'Islet.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I have no objection.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I feel confident that after thinking it over he will recall that in the parishes, for instance, of St-François and Berthier, at the last election, a minority of 255 conservatives voted and placed their trust in him. They were the ones who elected him in Montmagny, because his majority was 222 votes.

I shall even go further: in 1904, the hon. member for Montmagny was a highly gifted young man, with great resources, he came forward in politics bearing the standard of Laurier. The liberals of Berthier and St. François cast their votes in his favour. He polled both the conservative and liberal votes in these two parishes, and I now wonder whether, after thinking it over, the hon. member will cast aside the weapon that these people gave him in 1904, which permitted him to pass many years in political life, and which again they gave him in 1930, or whether he will now turn it against them.

Political life has a certain attraction; however, I would rather withdraw from it than be false to my people.

Some hon. MEMBERS (Translation): Hear! hear!

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): All of us were elected by people who trusted us. Let us not betray them whatever may be our political standard. We were sent here to represent our counties and not to cut them up. Let us be just, if we wish that justice be done to us. If the government persists in its policy, the public will soon note that the conservatives are panic stricken because, it is an extraordinary thing, the members opposite hardly wish to have anything to do with their constituencies this year; they would like to remove all those who heard them deliver speeches or make election promises.

This discussion, sir, cannot last very long, let us remember that when this Parliament is dissolved, the two present members of the counties of Montmagny and L'Islet, will equally disappear. Unless chosen by the convention, they cannot be candidates. Let us suppose that the hon. member for Montmagny is chosen by the convention—and I most heartily wish that he will be so favoured—I am certain that he would be more at ease, if he were able to state, from the hustings, that he championed the cause of minorities against a hostile majority. If my hon. friend, for personal reasons, decided to quit the political arena, he would equally be more satisfied in quitting the arena where he shone, thinking that he was true to the county that had placed their trust in him and that he had proved himself the champion of minorities.

Some hon. MEMBERS (Translation). Hear! hear!

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): After all, political life is too short to soil it with one's personal aims. It is better to quit than to betray those who elected us. At least we would leave to future generations a reputation of honest men who perferred sacrifice to betrayal —because it is indeed a betrayal to use the weapon entrusted to us by the people to stab them in the back. It is not too late to remedy the evil, and that is why I place my grievances before the house previous to the discussion of the various appendixes of

the bill, assuring the hon. member for Montmagny and the government, generally, that should it decide to maintain the two counties of Montmagny and L'Islet, as a whole, the question will soon be settled, because the unanimous support of this side of the house will be assured.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I listened with much attention and interest to the hon. member for L'Islet. I regret that he did not disclose his views sooner. I first wish to inform him that I never went near the committee on redistribution and took no hand in the rearrangement of the counties.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): You should have attended to your own county.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I shall attend to yours next time.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): I invite you and shall expect you.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Very well. With your leave, sir, we shall continue the debate without being interrupted by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Brasset) on a subject with which he is not acquainted.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): I am better acquainted with your county than you are.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I have no objection in preserving the old county of Montmagny such as it is—none. I have known the people of St.-François and Berthier for 30 years and I greatly regret their leaving me, although the large majority of them vote against me. I can well understand the attitude of the hon. member for L'Islet, I was told, however, that L'Islet had to be divided. I am sorry for it. It perhaps gives me as much sorrow as it does to the hon. member for L'Islet—perhaps, a little less, because I consider that my hands are clean in receiving in the county of Montmagny former voters of L'Islet.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): You soil them in chasing the vote away.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I am chasing no one away from my county and when the hon. member makes such a statement, he speaks of something about which he knows nothing.

The county of L'Islet must be rearranged.

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): No, the county of Montmagny must be rearranged.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I shall refer to this later. If L'Islet must be cut up, I am willing to agree that it be cut in two halves. I think it is only fair. If L'Islet must be cut up—which I regret—we must give part of it to Kamouraska and part of it to Montmagny. A number of my constituents wrote to me on the subject and I always replied to them that I had nothing to do with the rearrangement of these counties, and all members in the house are aware of it.

I shall now make an offer to the hon. member for L'Islet. We agree on the fact that the figures given by the committee show that the county of Montmagny L'Islet comprises 30,800 people and the counties of L'Islet and Kamouraska also 30,800 people. The hon. member for L'Islet, with cause, does not wish to divide L'Islet. I agree with him. I am willing to propose that the county of L'Islet be not cut up but that it be annexed to Kamouraska.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Why not annex L'Islet to Montmagny?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Why not annex Kamouraska to L'Islet?

Mr. DENIS (Translation): It is because you are afraid.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I pass for a coward, such is my reputation; especially when the hon. member for St-Denis (Mr. Denis) speaks, I then shiver with fright, and feel feverish!

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Do not try to be smart, you are too old for that.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I do not have to be smart, the hon. member could not understand me. I call the hon. member to order; he should address himself to the chair. He has been long enough in the house to know the rules

Mr. DENIS (Translation): I have not been here as long as you have, however, I am less pretentious.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): With cause.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): We could count the stupidities, you say.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Those of the hon. member for St-Denis are countless.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Yes, because there are none to account for.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I again, sir, make my offer. The hon. member for L'Islet does not admit that it is acceptable. He does not want, with cause, the annexation of L'Islet to Kamouraska. Why annex it to Montmagny and create a county compris-

ing a population of 40,000, when adjacent to it there is a county of 20,000 people only? If L'Islet must be split up, let us divide it equally between Montmagny and Kamouraska. It would be a fair division; otherwise, we shall have Kamouraska with 20,000 population and Montmagny L'Islet with 40,000 and more. I therefore state: Why not wholly annex it to Kamouraska? My hon. friend from L'Islet does not want that and he is quite right.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I never made that statement.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): You are willing to annex L'Islet, as a whole, to Montmagny.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): If you will allow me to make the redistribution I shall do so and quite satisfactorily to myself.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): If the hon. member will keep the right proportions. It will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): If the hon. member wishes to put me in charge of the redistribution, I shall accept and it will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The hon. member is fully aware that I cannot do that no more than I can take charge of it myself. He is equally aware that I kept away from the committee so that I might not be asked to make suggestions. He is further aware that changes must be made in certain counties because of the decrease in the number of rural counties; therefore, I wish to state, that he may keep the county of L'Islet intact, if he wishes, as I have no objection, and I am ready to second him if he wishes to annex it entirely to Kamouraska.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Who issues the orders in this respect?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I do not know, I issue no orders.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Who told him that?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It must be the committee.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Who told the hon. member that the county was to be split up?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I have just read the bill and have noted the fact. The hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) can read, he therefore can examine the bill as I did.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I can read but I thought, perhaps, the hon. member withheld a little secret.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I am not withholding any little secret. The hon. member for Témiscouata, perhaps, knows that in my career I have been keeping a little secret. Does he wish me to tell him?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I have no objection.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It refers to the time he begged of me to see that no Tory came forward against him, in his first election.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Yes, I wish to thank the hon. member for it. I have never forgotten his kindness and that is the reason why I have never spoken against him in Montmagny.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): The hon. member's proposal is to annex the county of L'Islet to the county of Kamouraska. In the course of the debates of the house, we often listened to the beautiful patriotic views expressed by the hon. member as well as by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger). Would it not be apropos to unite the counties of Montmagny and Bellechasse and we would then have the finest abode for patriotism in Quebec.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I shall prove that I am more sincere than many other members. I am ready to accept your offer and perhaps the hon. member for Bellechasse would not have any better or warmer partisan than I would be.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): I fully appreciate your kind words.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Turn-coat!

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): All I have to say to the hon. member for St. Denis, is that when my coat is soiled I clean it.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): When it is very warm the coat is discarded.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I am willing to accept the offer of the hon. member for St. Henri (Mr. Mercier). If hon. members think that I am very anxious to represent a county in this house, they are mis-

taken; I would be better off at my office. If it were a case of annexing the county of Montmagny to that of Bellechasse, I would be very willing to accept. I do not wish to be more frank than that. Now, if the county of L'Islet must disappear, there is just as good a reason to annex it to Kamouraska as to Montmagny.

The hon. member stated a moment ago that the council of the county meets at Montmagny; that is absolutely under the jurisdiction of the province. Federal redistribution in no way affects the county councils. If the hon. member for L'Islet wishes to be candid, he will agree with me. If his county must be divided—which I regret—should we not rearrange it, as much as possible, so as to establish an average of 30,800 people in Kamouraska and in L'Islet, respectively? That is what the committee endeavoured to do. I think that this reckoning is quite fair. If it is not to be split up, then let us annex it to Kamouraska. I am sure that the two members will feel satisfied because they are fair, they hold the same views, the same policy, the same ideas and they would be glad to come to an understanding. As to the suggestion of the hon. member for St. Henri, I accept it. I still have enough heart—

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Oh! Oh!

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The member for St. Denis—

Mr. DENIS (Translation): I think you are a hypocrite.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): We know from whose lips such nonsense is uttered.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): I am sincere, because I am not continuously changing politics as you do.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the insults of the member for St. Denis do me honour and, the more I am insulted by people of his stamp, the more I should be considered worthy by my fellow citizens. I shall close my remarks in stating that if the county of L'Islet is to be divided, I certainly did not request it. More than that, if it be possible, I am ready to agree that the county of Montmagny be annexed to the county of Bellechasse. If the county of L'Islet must be divided, I think it should be equally divided, one half going to Montmagny, the other to Kamouraska.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The counties are being sawed off.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to sincerely thank the hon. member for Montmagny for having been so fair-minded with reference to the proposals I made to the house. I think that I must have expressed myself wrongly, because I never intended to say that the hon. member had soiled his mandate. If such was the impression gathered from my remarks, they were wrongly interpreted, and I regret it. As to the county of L'Islet, we agree on one score, that the county be not divided but, as a whole, annexed to another county. For the sake of comparison, I was taking the description we find in the bill where it is proposed to partly annex the county of L'Islet to the county of Montmagny. I based my argument on this information because it is so stated in the bill. However, even if L'Islet is, as a whole, annexed to Montmagny, there is still a population of less than 40,000—namely, 39,643—when 50 per cent of the counties in the province have a much larger population than that.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That would only leave Kamouraska with about 22,000 people, which is a very small county, adjacent to a large county comprising Montmagny and L'Islet. It matters little to me, I did not appear at the committee or go near it, and when I was asked my views, I refused to give them.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The hon. member is rather lucky that he was asked his views, they did not approach me. I greatly regret that they intend to blot out Montmagny which had a population of 22,000, in 1921, so to replace it by Chapleau which has a smaller population.

Mr. J. A. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): So as to make the case clear and inform the house what was the proposal made by this side, may I read to the house the following letter:

Ottawa, April 27, 1933.

Mr. Charles Dorion, K.C., M.P.,
Chairman of the Sub-committee on the Redistribution for the Province of Quebec.
House of Commons, Ottawa.

My dear colleague,

After seriously considering the question of redistribution of the constituencies in the province of Quebec, I have come to the conclusion that it would be preferable to follow the system adopted during the last forty years and to carry out the least changes possible in the rearrangement of counties. There are a number of them over which the committee have agreed.

There are, however, natural problems which thrust themselves upon us, as for instance, the disposal of counties whose population is less than the approximative unit, fictitiously or otherwise established—for rural counties also as to the number of divisions to be given to Montreal.

When two counties immediately contiguous are to disappear, as separate counties, they should be entirely merged, as in the case of l'Islet and Montmagny. When a county which should be eliminated is surrounded by other counties not having the electoral quota as laid down, its complete merging should be carried out with the contiguous county which offers the least difficulties both as to their topography and complete merging.

As to Montreal, the existing condition should prevail so far as the boundaries of the divisions are concerned. Naturally the increase in population of the island of Montreal entitles it to an increase in representation. Such an increase should be foreseen both for the western and eastern parts of the island.

The boundaries of the Montreal divisions should not extend outside of the island.

Yours truly,

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): By whom is this letter signed?

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier - Outremont) (Translation): By myself, as representative of the Liberal party in the sub-committee on the redistribution of the province of Quebec. I naturally submitted this letter to my two colleagues and we established a policy which we advocate and desire the house to adopt, that when there is to be a merging of the two counties, this merger should be carried out, as a whole. In the case under discussion, we have two counties L'Islet and Montmagny, which have at present a population of 39,643.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Merged.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier - Outremont) (Translation): Merged. The hon. member for Montmagny does not contest these figures?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): No, I just wanted to get the information.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier - Outremont) (Translation): I closely followed the speeches made on the subject and I find the situation as follows: it is intended to eliminate in L'Islet and Montmagny a Liberal majority of 585 votes, and transfer them to the adjacent counties, which are overwhelmingly Liberal and do not need these votes. Why not carry out the integral amalgamation of these two counties? The hon. member for Montmagny, for some reason unknown, states that the county of L'Islet must be rearranged.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I am not the one who made that statement.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier - Outremont) (Translation): You stated that you were willing to keep intact the county of Montmagny but that, for one reason or another, the county of L'Islet had to be rearranged.

[Mr. J. A. Mercier.]

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Because Montreal is given new counties.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier - Outremont) (Translation): The merging of the two counties is necessary. The population of both counties is less than the unit of representation and, therefore, an amalgamation must be carried out just as it must be worked out between certain counties in the Montreal district.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The amalgamation could be worked out just as well with Kamouraska.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier - Outremont) (Translation): I will discuss this matter in a moment. The counties which must be eliminated, according to the figures of this population, are Yamaska, Bagot, Beauharnois, and Laprairie, Napierville all in the Montreal district, and the county of L'Islet. The population of the counties of L'Islet and Montmagny joined together is not too large to prevent them being amalgamated. The population of Montmagny and L'Islet together comprises 39,643 people and, while the neighbouring county, Gaspé, has a population of 47,160.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): A rather remote neighbour.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier - Outremont) (Translation): In the same district.

The county of Kamouraska has a population of 30,852; Matapédia Matane, 39,977; Rimouski, 40,208 and Témiscouata, 42,679. May I, sir, quote the population of the various counties in Quebec. A number of our hon. friends have complained of not having these figures handy. There are but 65 counties, it will therefore not delay the house too long; I shall quote these figures so that they may be consigned to Hansard and can be referred to, to-morrow, because if I am not mistaken the discussion in connection with Quebec will last a few days.

The following is the list and population, according to the bill on redistribution: Argenteuil, 27,441; Beauce, 51,614; Beauharnois-Laprairie, 41,399; Bellechasse, 27,480; Berthier-Maskinongé, 34,545; Bonaventure, 36,184; Brome-Missisquoi, 32,069; Chambly-Rouville, 40,353; Champlain, 37,526; Chapleau, 21,705; Charlevoix-Saguenay, 55,594; Châteauguay-Huntingdon, 24,412; Chicoutimi, 55,724; Compton, 31,858; Dorchester, 27,156.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is rather weak!

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Drummond-Arthabaska, 53,338; Gaspé, 47,160; Hull, 49,196; Joliette-Montcalm, 39,154; Kamouraska, 30,852; Labelle, 28,287; Laflèche-St-Maurice, 46,781; Lake St. John-Roberval, 50,253; L'Assomption-Terrebonne, 47,215; Laval-Two Mountains, 31,896; Lévis, 28,548.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is rather weak!

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Lotbinière, 30,546; Matapédia-Matane, 39,977; Mégantic-Frontenac, 44,440; Montmagny-L'Islet, 30,869; Nicolet-Yamaska, 39,338; Pontiac, 42,950; Portneuf, 37,305; Québec-East, 58,145.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to make an observation?

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Yes.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The figures he has just quoted include the part annexed, according to the bill, and the same applies to Kamouraska L'Islet, 30,852. The proportion I think is quite fair.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): I have not yet understood the reason for the separation of Montmagny and L'Islet and why should L'Islet be annexed to Kamouraska and not to Montmagny.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Neither I, but it is being split up.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Quebec South, 33,441; Quebec Southwest, 43,417; Quebec-Montmorency, 40,152; Richelieu-Verchères, 35,782; Richmond-Wolfe, 36,568; Rimouski, 40,208; St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, 42,720; St. John-Iberville, 32,259; Shefford, 28,262; Sherbrooke, 37,386; Stanstead, 25,118.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): That is weak!

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Témiscouata, 42,679; Three Rivers, 44,226; Vaudreuil-Soulanges, 21,114; Wright, 27,107.

And in the island of Montreal: Cartier, 70,000; Laurier, 65,000.

These figures are approximative so far as the island of Montreal is concerned; details have not yet been given to the committee, however the figures are approximatively those I have quoted.

St. James, 65,000; Ste-Ann, 56,000.

These figures seem to be exaggerated.

St. Henri, 69,000; St. Laurent-St. Georges, 50,000; Verdun, 64,000; St. Denis, 67,500; Outremont, 57,500; Mount Royal, 65,000; Maisonneuve-Rosemont, 65,000; Lafontaine, 65,000; Hochelaga, 75,000; Mercier, 70,000; St. Antoine-Westmount, 57,500; Jacques-Cartier, 57,500.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Do these figures include births since the last sitting of the committee?

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): These are the figures given to the committee; however, I wish to state that as regards Montreal they are approximative and subject to revision.

Referring to Montmagny and L'Islet, you will note, by the figures given for the province of Quebec, that these counties, to-day, have a population of 39,643. There is no reason why these two counties should not be merged, as a whole. The change proposed consists in transferring a liberal majority of 585 votes to these two united counties. The hon. member for Montmagny stated that he was willing to keep the Montmagny county intact but that the county of L'Islet had to be rearranged. I do not know why. It is not because of its population, since the counties of Montmagny and L'Islet merged together have but a population of 39,643.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): According to the enumeration given just now by the hon. member, I think the figures are very fair.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Why split the county of L'Islet in two, why not keep it as a whole?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It appears that it is to create new counties in Montreal. I have no knowledge of it. The hon. member is aware that the province of Quebec has 65 members and that this number cannot vary. Montreal has a population equal to half of that of the whole province; it should have twenty new members according to her population.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): 24 in all.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is not the question; however, we must add new constituencies to Montreal.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): They are given new ones and L'Islet county is eliminated.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): When the committee met for the first time we were informed that it was an understood thing that the following coun-

ties were to be eliminated: Yamaska, Bagot, Beauharnois, Laprairie, Napierville and L'Islet; the elimination of these counties had to be carried out owing to the small figures of their population. The hon. member for Montmagny has just stated that he is willing to keep the county of Montmagny intact, but, for some reason or other, he wants to divide the county of L'Islet in two.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I did not make that statement. I said if it was desired to keep both intact, I was quite agreeable to that.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): That is what we wish.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): So do I.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Let us keep L'Islet and Montmagny intact, just as they exist to-day. It is proposed to remove from these counties a liberal majority of 585 votes, according to the last election figures and transfer it to the adjacent counties. Let us keep them exactly as they are to-day, with their boundaries and population. Why amalgamate them?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The hon. member does not follow me, I said that I was willing to keep the counties intact; I do not wish to amalgamate them.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): It is another distinction.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Then, why not join the county to Kamouraska? It is also adjacent.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): It is not in the same judicial district.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Why the change? Why choose Kamouraska rather than Montmagny?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): There is no more reason for one than the other. However, I must say that it would not please the opposition as well, because the present members for Kamouraska and L'Islet would have to fight over it, and that would be very unpleasant.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): It is because it is not the same judicial district.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is a political reason.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): The political reason is to be found in the refusal of my hon. friends to amalgamate these two counties and in the fact that a Liberal majority of 585 votes is transferred.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I want to join them together.

Mr. MERCIER (Translation): Is that not also a political reason?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): On the contrary, I wish to join them together.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Such as they are?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): We will amalgamate them such as they are—Kamouraska and L'Islet—will the hon. member consent to this?

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): That question was never broached.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It is strange, what a change has taken place. It is indeed extraordinary!

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I am referring to that part of the bill, as submitted by the Conservative sub-committee of the province of Quebec.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ASCENSION DAY—VICTORIA DAY

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, as Wednesday is a statutory holiday—Victoria day, as it is described in the revised statutes—and Thursday is Ascension day, which to a number of hon. members is a day of obligation, I suggest, if it is acceptable to the house, that the house meet at three o'clock on Wednesday and on Thursday. That will enable those who have Arbor day duties and matters of that kind on hand for Wednesday to dispose of them, and I believe it is satisfactory to our friends if they have the morning free until three o'clock on Thursday. If that is acceptable I shall be glad to make arrangements accordingly, and would give notice that I shall move to-morrow morning in that sense.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Tuesday, May 23, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. MACKENZIE KING

ADDITION OF TOWNSHIPS TO NORTH YORK CONSTITUENCY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the course of the discussion last evening with respect to the redistribution of 1924 a difference of opinion or rather a difference with respect to certain facts developed between the hon. member at present representing North York (Mr. Lennox) and myself as respects the effect of the addition of the townships of Markham and Vaughan upon the results of the election in 1925. I had made the statement that the addition of the townships of Markham and Vaughan in the redistribution of 1924 gave a distinct advantage to the Conservative candidate. I said later that I was under the impression that the addition of those townships had been subsequently responsible for my defeat in North York. From his seat in this House of Commons last night the hon. member for North York spoke, and his words are reported at page 5288 of Hansard as follows:

If it had not been for the assistance he received—

That is that I received.

—from the new municipalities which were added, instead of having a majority of 494 I—

That is, Mr. Lennox.

—would have had a majority in the old constitueney of 681.

Then later the Prime Minister emphasized what had been said by the hon. member for North York. He is reported at page 5290 of Hansard as follows:

It turns out as a matter of fact that had it not been for the two townships that were added by the redistribution of 1924 he—

That is, myself—

—would have been beaten by a much larger majority than he was.

The facts will be found in the report of the chief electoral officer for the fifteenth general election, 1925, at pages 179 and 180. The figures there given are—

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the right hon. leader of the opposition consider this a question of privilege?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I wish to make the necessary correction.

53719—335½

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. gentleman is merely contradicting another member's statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I am stating the correct position—

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —in a matter with respect to which I have been misrepresented. Surely your honour does not take exception to my placing on Hansard the facts with regard to misrepresentations which have been made on the part of the Prime Minister and the hon. member for North York.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not take objection to the hon. member raising a question of privilege, but as yet I fail to see that he has raised one.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The question of privilege is that it has been stated by the hon. member for North York and by the Prime Minister that the statement I made was not correct. I am giving evidence from records to show that what I did say was correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: That same state of affairs existed probably a hundred times yesterday. Members accused each other of making incorrect statements.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I hope your honour is not going to prevent me from placing the official figures on record, and allow Hansard to retain statements made by the Prime Minister and the hon. member for North York which are not correct. I am asking only to be permitted to put on Hansard the figures as they appear in the chief electoral officer's report.

Mr. BENNETT: The house is still in committee on the bill. It seems to me that that is the proper place to speak.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the Prime Minister wishes me to make the statement at another time, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. BENNETT: I think so.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ASCENSION DAY—VICTORIA DAY

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I shall now move the motion of which I gave notice yesterday when the house adjourned. I move, seconded by Mr. Rhodes:

That this house shall meet at three o'clock p.m. Wednesday, May 24, and Thursday, May 25, notwithstanding the resolution passed on May 8, 1933.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Is it within the knowledge of the Minister of Pensions and National Health that the medical officer in charge of the chest cases in the hospital at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec, is not a returned soldier, is not bilingual, and that he says to French-Canadians who do not understand him, "Why don't you talk a white man's language"?

Hon. MURRAY MacLAREN (Minister of Pensions and National Health): I shall make inquiries.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank you. And he is insolent and arrogant.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The clerk assistant having proceeded to announce the order of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): This is the second or third time that the clerk assistant has not waited for the orders of the day to be called but has proceeded at once to announce one of them. I wish at this time to take exception to that procedure.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): The Speaker called the orders of the day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Last week it happened on one occasion.

Mr. BENNETT: But it did not happen this morning.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then I beg the pardon of the clerk assistant and of His Honour the Speaker.

CONFERRING OF TITLES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): May I say that the Prime Minister has evidently overlooked something. He stated yesterday that he would reply to-day to a question I asked him respecting the conferring of titles, and the views of the government as to the resolution passed by the house in that connection.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I was about to rise and say that I had prepared a memorandum, but as it has not been typewritten I shall defer answering until three o'clock because it is not yet completed.

VALCARTIER CAMP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Saguenay): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I should like to draw the attention of the government to a dispatch appearing in Le Devoir with reference to the camp at Valcartier wherein it is stated—I do not know whether it is true or not—that there is no Roman Catholic priest at that place.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I may say that arrangements have been made for the regular attendance and care of the people by a Roman Catholic priest.

Mr. POULIOT: Perhaps they belong to the Oxford group.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house resumed from Monday, May 22, consideration in committee of Bill No. 2 to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. Smoke in the chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Three cheers for Kinistino!

Mr. McPHEE: There's the answer to your gerrymander!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Chairman, I quite understand the joy of my good friends from Saskatchewan. That verdict in the constituency which is represented here by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) is the best evidence that no carving of constituencies, no incision or excision or manipulation can prevent the voice of the people being made effective.

An hon. MEMBER: The handwriting on the wall.

An hon. MEMBER: We found that in North York especially.

An hon. MEMBER: You will find it next time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before I continue, my hon. friend the member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) has handed me a telegram in which he is given the information that Kinistino has been won by a majority of 2,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before beginning the observations I desire to make, which will be very few at this stage of the bill, I wish to refer to a somewhat personal matter. In my absence from the house yesterday I am told that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister seemed to suggest that the special committee that had been formed to negotiate on this question did not sit because I had gone home. I must tell my right hon. friend that I am rather surprised that he is not better acquainted with the facts. The committee, which had made good progress on Friday morning, as the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) said in the house, was adjourned to 2.30 in the afternoon. I went there at 2.30, so did my hon. friend from West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart) and the hon. member for Acadia, but we did not meet the other members. At six o'clock my right hon. friend the member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) told me that we would meet at 8.30. At eight o'clock in the house the Prime Minister suggested that we should proceed with the bill, but on request agreed to postpone it until yesterday. Sir George Perley then crossed the floor and told me that it was useless to go to the meeting room because all was off and there was no possibility of an understanding. I left for home the following morning.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to the two reasons given by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister for the changes which are being made in the electoral map of the province of Quebec. On two occasions he said that first this parliament must undo what had been done in the previous redistribution—of course, I assume he means done unfairly. Secondly, he said there must be a readjustment on account of the increase of population in the cities. With these two principles I agree. And I wish to say immediately that in any place or any constituency where any change was made, as my right hon. friend suggests, in 1924, which should not have been made—I go further, any change that was made either fairly or unfairly—I am quite willing to undo. But it is not necessary to change the whole map of the province of Quebec for that purpose.

As to the second reason, the increase of population in the cities, Montreal being given three more seats, it is easy to unite two counties in three places without carving them, without disfiguring them, and provide the additional seats required by the increased population in the city. I repeat; with these two principles I agree, I accept them as a basis for a fair redistribution of seats in the province of Quebec.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before I show what is being proposed, I desire to say, for the benefit of those hon. members who perhaps do not know conditions as they exist in the province of Quebec, how deeply attached the citizens of that province are to their municipal lines, which have existed from time immemorial. That applies to the municipal lines, the county lines, even the district lines. If the province of Quebec has grown united as it has, it is due to that spirit of union which has always existed. Every man, woman and child there in those old parishes of Quebec is as a member of one family. Then, the counties have always existed. There is a moral bond uniting those various places in every constituency of the province of Quebec from time immemorial. It was so in old France, la commune, and even in England. This house is called the House of Commons; the commons representing the counties between which there has always been a noble spirit of emulation and, of competition. The people of Quebec want to live together; they are living together not only municipally, but in their agricultural and other associations. There is a spirit of friendly rivalry between the various counties, the men serve as jurymen in the district courts, and they meet together very often. Now what is proposed is to carve up most of the counties of Quebec, to change absolutely the boundaries and, even to create constituencies by adding together four or five parts of adjoining constituencies. I say it is a desecration of the fair province of Quebec, and I do not believe that this bill will go through in its present form when my right hon. friend has considered the matter as it should be considered. I do not blame him so much as I blame those who know what the conditions are in the province and who yet have not only permitted this thing to be done but have insisted that it should be done.

I propose to show what the situation will be in my own district of Quebec, where there are twenty-five seats, leaving to my hon. friend the member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) the task of showing what is done in the Montreal district. There are twenty-five constituencies in what is commonly called the Quebec district. Out of those twenty-five it is proposed to keep two and to alter twenty-three. I am going to show, from the first to the last of these twenty-five, whether the principles as set out by my right hon. friend could be applied in the changes which are proposed, namely to undo what has been done or because of the necessity of increasing the number of seats in Montreal.

We start with the constituency of Gaspe, which it is proposed to change by the addition of two parishes, being in the townships of Dalibaire and Romieu West, the parishes of Mechins and Capucins. These parishes now are in the county of Matane. For what purpose is this change proposed? Gaspe is one of the largest ridings in Canada in point of territory, as all hon. members know. There are three provincial constituencies included in that area, Gaspe North, Gaspe South and Magdalen Island. To go to Magdalen Island the member for Gaspe has to proceed to Pictou and sail from there. The population of Gaspe at present is 45,617, while Matane has a population of 45,000. Why put those two parishes in Gaspe, where they do not belong? The constituency of Matane is represented here by a Conservative member, accidentally. Two parishes are being transferred from Matane to Gaspe in the northern part of the riding, but that is not all.

The second constituency is Bonaventure and the Baie des Chaleurs. There again three Liberal parishes are being moved from Matane to Bonaventure in order to try to save the head of my hon. friend from Matane (Mr. Larue). He is a nice fellow, but I do not believe it is necessary to disfigure these constituencies and tear away these places which always have been in Matane and which should stay there, in order to get rid of some Liberal votes from that constituency.

Mr. BENNETT: My hon. friend said they were being put in Bonaventure?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. The first two parishes to which I refer are being put in Gaspe while the other three are being put in Bonaventure. Matane is changed accordingly. The next constituency is Rimouski, which has a population of 33,151. Three places are being taken from Témiscouata and added to Rimouski, Begon, Ste. Françoise and Trois-Pistoles. These places are not in the same judicial district as Rimouski; Trois-Pistoles always has been a proud town of Témiscouata county, and it has nothing to do with Rimouski. These places are being taken away from Témiscouata and added to Rimouski in an attempt to deprive my hon. friend from Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) of one of his strongholds. Well, I know the conditions there better than they are known by any man in this house, and particularly any man who sat on that committee. I am a native of Témiscouata; I was born a few miles from that town of Trois-Pistoles. I know the feeling of resentment which will be created there if they are forcibly detached from Témiscouata. Trois-Pistoles was the home of Hon. L. P. Pelletier, who was a distinguished Conservative minister from Quebec. He was very fond of his parish, and once he was a candidate in Témiscouata. I should like to know what he would think of the very idea of taking Trois-Pistoles away from Témiscouata in order to serve some political end. Against this I protest, as every one in Témiscouata will protest, and if it is done for the purpose of trying to defeat my hon. friend from Témiscouata let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that he will be elected next time by a much larger majority than he had at the last election.

On the western side of the constituency Notre-Dame-du-Portage, another fine place, is added to the adjoining riding of Kamouraska, which is changed not only by this addition but by the further addition at the western end of three or four parishes from the county of L'Islet. You will see something very interesting here when the maps are laid on the table. They take from the county of L'Islet parishes that usually give a Liberal majority but at the end of the line, near the United States boundary, there is a strong Conservative place, St. Pamphile, which is left in L'Islet. Then L'Islet is added to Montmagny, forming a united constituency of Montmagny-L'Islet. As to this I have nothing to say; I agree that one constituency should disappear there. I submit, however, that L'Islet, with a representation of 19,000 and Montmagny, with 20,000, should be joined without being carved at both ends. This would make a constituency of 39,000, which is still below the unit of representation, and there are many constituencies in the province which have a greater representation. I say L'Islet and Montmagny should be joined as it is proposed, but they should not take away those parts of L'Islet and Montmagny which are Liberal, St. Francois and Berthier, which are perhaps the largest Liberal places in the county of Montmagny. It simply is not fair. Yesterday I was pleased to hear even my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne) say he was prepared to keep St. Francois and Berthier; even he seems to admit that this redistribution is not fair, but he asks why we do not unite Kamouraska and L'Islet

instead of Montmagny and L'Islet. Well, there is this difference, that Kamouraska already has a representation of 24,000 and with the addition of Notre-Dame-du-Portage that number will be increased, while Montmagny has only 20,000. That is the first reason, and the second is that Montmagny and L'Islet are in the same judicial district. They go together for various purposes, while Kamouraska is in another district altogether. Instead of seeing L'Islet and Montmagny carved in the way they have been, I should prefer to have Kamouraska and L'Islet together. I should prefer to have that rather than see that carving perpetrated. Of course, the natural division is to add L'Islet and Montmagny, for all the rules of the game are in favour of that amalgamation instead of the other one. But I protest against the carving of L'Islet and Montmagny by separating St. Roch des Aulnais, that fine old place in L'Islet, proud of having been part of L'Islet. As my friend from L'Islet (Mr. Fafard) said yesterday, we have the absurdity now that the warden of the county of L'Islet will be an elector of Kamouraska after this has been achieved.

We come now to Bellechasse. My hon. friend, the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger) is rather a fortunate being. Bellechasse is what is commonly called a Liberal hive, a strong Liberal constituency. Well, it is being proposed to make it stronger by adding to it part of Dorchester, part of Levis —and you will see how interesting is that part of Levis which goes to Bellechasse—and part of Montmagny.

Mr. BENNETT: The population is only 21,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but that is no reason for carving all the Liberal parishes from the adjoining constituency and putting them into Bellechasse.

The next constituency is Levis. Levis is an old historic constituency situated in front of Quebec city. There are two towns. There is the city of Levis, which has a population of about 11,000; there is the town of Lauzon, and there is also the large village of St. Romuald there. It is a county with an historic background. The population as it stands today is 35,656. It is in many respects a city constituency, because the city of Levis is situated in the riding. But it has only a population of 35,656. Now it is proposed by this bill to take away the old parishes of St. Henri de Levis and St. Jean Chrysostome, which are among the oldest places in the province of Quebec, as well as Riviere Boyer and St. Henri village, and to put them all in the county of Bellechasse, which is situated east of the county of Levis. To achieve this result you have to make a geographical monster. The county of Bellechasse is extended behind the town of Levis and St. Romuald, these fine places being driven from the county of Levis.

But that is not all. The western part of Levis is also composed of Liberal parishes. they are drawn into the county of Lotbiniere, which is another Liberal stronghold, where no Conservative has been elected since confederation. It is simply carrying coals to Newcastle. They have taken from Levis St. Etienne de Lauzon, St. Lambert de Lauzon, St. Nicholas, St. Nicholas Sud and the village of St. Redempteur, and this is being done for the purpose of trying to build up a Conservative seat in Levis. Levis, as I have said, is a city constituency with a population of only 35,000, and it will be reduced to 27,000, when so many rural seats have 40,000, 45,000 and even 50,000 of a population.

This is unfair on the face of it; it is a manipulation that cannot be excused. People laughed when this change was suggested. Nobody believed that it would enter into any sane mind to do this in the county of Levis, and my hon. friends on the other side representing the province of Quebec know the feelings of the people there. They know for instance that St. Nicholas is the home of the Paquet family as well as of so many other prominent families in Quebec—people who are proud to call themselves sons of Levis. And now they are to be thrown into Lotbiniere.

My hon. friend from Levis (Mr. Fortin) is a good fellow; he is an excellent physician. But let me say to him in all sincerity that I do not think that Levis should be disfigured just to save his political head. I do not think this wound should be inflicted on the fine old constituency of Levis just for the purpose of trying to save a Conservative candidate. Everyone knows that it is not necessary; it is not useful, it is inexcusable. How therefore can we accept such a proposal as this?

Lotbiniere, the next constituency, as I have said, is a Liberal stronghold, and it is being

added to from Nicolet, from Levis, from Megantic and from Beauce. My hon. friend from Lotbiniere (Mr. Verville) said to me, "There has been an increase on all sides except the north, because in that direction lies the St. Lawrence river and they could not very well put it into Lotbiniere."

Now we come to Dorchester. In Dorchester there is a place called St. Luc, which has been erected into a municipality in that county. It has always been there; it was included in Dorchester when it was created a municipality; it has always been part of Dorchester, provincially, federally, municipally and otherwise. It is a small place, but apparently there is virtue in its smallness, because it has always voted unanimously Liberal; it has always given a large Liberal majority. My hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) wishes to put St. Luc in the county of Bellechasse. He mentions also St. Maxime de Scott, which, when originally erected, was situated partly in Beauce and partly in Dorchester. Geographically, as the map will show, it should be in Dorchester, because, as I have said, it is in Dorchester provincially and should be federally as well, as it has been since 1924. I am quite willing to abide by what I say. I think it is a fair thing to put St. Maxime de Scott in Dorchester because it is there provincially and it is there geographically. The population of Beauce is over 50,000 while the population of Dorchester is under 30,000. If my right hon. friend wants to undo what has been done, I am quite willing. St. Maxime de Scott was put there in 1924, so let him take it away if that is the purpose of this redistribution bill.

Mr. BENNETT: Dorchester forms part of three counties.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Dorchester has existed since 1850.

Mr. POWER: Since 1792.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. GAGNON: Since 1791.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Dorchester has always been an old county by itself and this seems to be a clever distinction made by the hon. member for Dorchester. After all, I think he must have suggested these changes. The municipality of Honfleur is part of the county of Bellechasse but why was it not sent to Bellechasse? It is a Conservative community, as is Ste. Sabine, which is partly situated in the county of Bellechasse.

Mr. GAGNON: May I ask my hon. friend a question? If he will read the act of 1924 he will see that there was no change made in the bill which is before the house with respect to the municipality of Ste. Sabine. The same thing applies to Honfleur.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member has not asked a question. He states that no change has been made but these places are Conservative. They are situated partly in Bellechasse but they have been allowed to remain in Dorchester.

Mr. GOBEIL: Who made the change?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We were compelled to listen to my hon. friend in the committee and he will have to listen to us now.

Mr. GOBEIL: That does not say who made the change.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend from Compton will kindly let me proceed, it will be much better. The county of Beauce has been altered to include the parishes which I have mentioned. For the riding of Lotbiniere they took part of the county of Nicolet, but I suppose the hon. member for Richelieu will deal with that matter. In the case of the riding of Megantic, certain Liberal parishes of the county of Wolfe have been thrown in. The voters there have been opposed to the hon. member for Richmond-Wolfe (Mr. LaFlèche). As far as the north shore is concerned, I have nothing to say about the three seats in Quebec city. A change has been made in the seat of the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré). A rural section was added in the redistribution of 1914 but I agree that this should be a city seat altogether. I am quite agreeable to the change being made.

Mr. DUPRE: By this change I am losing a normal majority in the rural part of about sixty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know about that. My hon. friend might wait to make his remarks a little later.

Mr. DUPRE: I wanted to point that out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite sure my hon. friend is generous enough to give that up. In the case of the riding of Quebec South, the municipality of St. Colomban de Sillery is being taken away, but I have no objection.

This is naturally part of Quebec county to be represented by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion). I have been told that a small addition is to be made in Quebec East. I do not see this in the bill and I will reserve my remarks until later. As far as the constituency of Quebec-Montmorency is concerned I do not think the changes will effect any result. But why take away Ste Brigitte de Laval and put it into the county of Charlevoix-Saguenay, which is a province by itself and contains a larger population? I am quite sure when we reach the schedules my hon. friend will give some good reasons for this change. I should like some explanation in connection with Valcartier. This is part of the county of Portneuf but it has been included in my hon. friend's constituency. Has this change been made because there is an unemployment camp situated there where the men selected by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Bell) are sent? Is it intended that these men shall be in the constituency of Quebec-Montmorency? I do not see any reason why Valcartier which is part of Portneuf should be sent back to Quebec county. There is no population worth mentioning outside of the unemployment camp. The vote in that particular area may not be exactly as my hon. friend desires it to be. The riding of Charlevoix-Saguenay is changed by the addition of Ste Brigitte de Laval. The riding of Portneuf is changed by including Donnacona and some other places which were in Quebec West and by excluding La Tuque. There is a new constituency formed called Lafleche-St. Maurice, which is being made out of Three Rivers, St. Maurice and Champlain. This is very ingenious strategy. The strong Liberal communities of Shawinigan Falls and Grand Mere are being added together in a strong Liberal constituency. The hon. members for Three Rivers-St. Maurice (Mr. Bourgeois) and Champlain (Mr. Baribeau) will benefit by being rid of these thorns in their flesh. These are the changes which have been made in the district of Quebec.

If these changes can be justified I am quite willing to listen very attentively to any explanations which may be given. This whole thing is considered as a tremendous gerrymander not only by the Liberal members of the house but by the population as a whole. It is going contrary to elementary political morality. No one in a democracy has the right to lend himself to the loading of the dice in such an obvious and glaring manner. Even newspapers which are usually Conservative have been criticizing this scheme which has been submitted. Even the Montreal Gazette said the other day that they could not understand why this wholesale change had been made in the province of Quebec. They were curious to know the reason. L'Evènement of Quebec which has always supported this government, had a strong editorial in yesterday's issue protesting against this action. They asked why do this? Why create this embarrassment to the Prime Minister whom we love—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have a great respect for my right hon. friend, but I am speaking the language of L'Evenement. They are blaming his advisers from Quebec for having done that and they predict that instead of its having the effect which those gentlemen wish to produce, a contrary one will result. This is my initial speech; I have some further remarks to make and if the province of Quebec is sacrificed as is proposed in the bill as submitted, I shall have some frank, honest words to say on the third reading. I think I have given a bird's-eye view of the changes which are proposed to be made in the Quebec district, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you listen to my hon. friend from Richelieu who will give the rest of the story so far as the province of Quebec is concerned.

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General): I have not been very much associated with the committee on redistribution nor with the committee of elder statesmen which dealt with this question in the last few days. I intend only to answer, to a certain extent, some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). If I may divide his speech into two parts, I may say that he objects on two counts, first, on account of municipal lines, and second, on account of electoral results. I do not know whether I am mistaken, but this is approximately the division I can make of my hon. friend's speech.

Of course when changes occur, they cannot be made unless somebody on either side of politics is hurt to a certain degree; but speaking generally, and thereby answering my hon. friend by a sweeping statement, I may say that the federal distribution has nothing to do with municipal lines. Provincial constituencies are not changed; we do not and we cannot touch them and it is on provincial demarcations that the county councils and judicial districts are based. Therefore all the arguments of my hon. friend about tampering with constituencies and the harm that can be done to every one of them, municipally or provincially, by the changes he describes, falls to the ground.

Mr. POULIOT: Why not put St. Sauveur into Témiscouata?

Mr. DUPRE: May I point out again to my hon. friend, since I think there are eighty-two provincial ridings—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Ninety.

Mr. DUPRE: Thank you—ninety provincial ridings and only sixty-five federal constituencies, necessarily the demarcations and lines of the provincial constituencies have to be changed; we cannot do otherwise.

But there is another aspect and it is to consider the changes in a general way. I deplore the fact that in the district of Quebec we had to lose one constituency on account of the adjustment based on urban population.

Mr. POULIOT: May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. DUPRE: Certainly.

Mr. POULIOT: He says that the changes in Quebec were made on account of the increase in urban population. Is that the reason that the new rural constituencies Chapleau and Lafleche-St. Maurice have been created?

Mr. DUPRE: My hon. friend does not seem to understand my point. I am telling him that one of the main reasons there were some changes and new lines of demarcation necessary in the district of Quebec was that we had to lose one constituency which necessitated new lines in some others.

Mr. POULIOT: If my hon. friend permits me, I do not wish to interrupt him again—

Mr. ROBINSON: Sit down!

Mr. POULIOT: The Solicitor General is more courteous than is the hon. member for West Essex; he allows me to put a question. My hon. friend should learn manners from the Solicitor General; it will improve the tone of the house.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Smoke): Will the hon. gentleman ask his question?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes. We have been told that changes have been made in the rural seats because of the three new seats in Montreal. I ask the Solicitor General why it has been decided by the government to create two new rural seats, one in the Ottawa and the other in Three Rivers district. If three new seats in Montreal were too many, why did the government decide to create two new rural seats when there was no necessity for so doing?

[Mr. Dupré.]

Mr. DUPRE: If my hon. friend will follow me, he will understand my point. I will answer him immediately. Since we had to find new lines in Quebec district and lose one constituency in the district of Three Rivers and one in the district of Montreal, necessarily we had to form new divisions and in some special cases we had to create new constituencies. I deplore, as I said, that we had, on account of the readjustment of urban population, to lose one seat in the district of Quebec. If I could have prevented this, I would have done so with great pleasure, and in fact I tried but I did not succeed. At one time there was a question of taking away two constituencies from the district of Quebec and to this I objected. Yesterday I heard the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Fafard) complaining about the new lines in his constituency. I agree with him that this is most unfortunate, but we could not help it. I agree also that the hon. member for L'Islet, who has always been an acquisition to this house and who is a distinguished member, will find a way to come back, because we like his presence here.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think he will.

Mr. DUPRE: But if hon. members will consider the new districts, they will see how everything has been divided. For instance, around Quebec there are on the south shore from Levis up to Kamouraska different constituencies side by side. What is the result of the new adjustment? There is Levis with a population of 28,548; Dorchester next to it with a population of 27,156; Montmagny-L'Islet, the new proposed constituency, with a population of 30,869, and Bellechasse with a new population of 27,480, and Kamouraska with 30,852. Thus there are five constituencies side by side, each with approximately the same population.

My hon. friend has been talking about Levis. May I point out to him that with the new adjustment Levis will have about the same population as the four constituencies around it. Besides that, under the new adjustment there are nine constituencies in the province of Quebec with populations less than the population of Levis. Taking first Levis, with a population of 28,548, the others are:

	Population
Argenteuil	27,885
Bellechasse	27,480
Chapleau	21,705
Chateauguay-Huntingdon	24,412
Dorchester	27,156
Shefford	28,262
Stanstead	25,118
Vaudreuil-Soulanges	21,154
Wright	27,107

Therefore we have nine constituencies with populations less than the population of Levis. Of these constituencies with populations less than Levis there is one new one, five constituencies represented by Conservative members and three represented by Liberal members.

If, being dissatisfied you put back into Levis the parishes of St. Henri and St. Jean, you will have the following result: The population of Bellechasse will drop down to 24,315 and the population of Levis will increase to 31,713. But as it is, with the new proposals the populations of Levis and Bellechasse will be approximately the same.

If my hon. friend from Quebec East will revert to Quebec South, which is an urban constituency in the heart of the city of Quebec, he will see that Levis which is not fully urban, but only semi-urban, has with the new adjustment a population of 28,548 while Quebec South, which is fully urban, will have a population of 33,441, which is only 4,893 more than Levis. I have heard that in the past the county of Richelieu which could be compared to a certain extent to the county of Levis, because both contain a city of about 11,000 population—has remained for twenty-one years with a population of approximately 21,500. I shall not dare to add that very likely the stationary character of its population was due to the fact that it was a Liberal constituency. I should not like to be accused of such an argument, but the fact is that Levis has 28,500 while Richelieu, for 21 years, has remained at the figure of 21,500. Another reason for the change in Levis is that Bellechasse, next to Levis, has a population which does not increase or decrease. In fact in the last ten years the population of Bellechasse has decreased by about 106. It is stationary. If the hon. member for Quebec East will refer to the statistics he will find that the population of Levis increases from 3,000 to 4,000 every ten years. If this increase continues in ten years Bellechasse will have the same population as it has now, while the population of Levis will be about 32,000 or 33,000, which is approximately the same as that of Quebec South at the present time.

A moment ago I heard the hon. member for Quebec East deploring the fact that the Paquet family of Levis will for federal purposes have to live in the county of Lotbiniere. I may add that this is a most respectable old family. They are countrymen, farmers, and real gentlemen. It is a family for which I have as much respect as my hon. friend. They have given some remarkable men to politics, to the professions, to agriculture and to industry. I hope however that my hon. friend does not mean to say that the fact that the Paquet family has been thrown into Lotbiniere for federal purposes is a disgrace to them. The county of Lotbiniere, so far as I can see, is as good a county as Levis or Bellechasse. The Paquet family for federal purposes will belong to the county of Lotbiniere, and for provincial purposes will continue to belong to the county of Levis.

Coming back to Dorchester, I have a few words to say. I think the hon. member for Dorchester is able to take care of himself. I have not to defend what has taken place; in fact, I do not know what has taken place, because I was a member of no committee and attended no sessions of redistribution committees. I say to my hon. friend from Quebec East, however, that very likely we can agree on Dorchester for the following reasons: My hon. friend from Quebec East admits that so far as the parish of Ste Maxime de Scott is concerned, he has really no serious objection, because it is a parish which belonged to the county of Beauce (Mr. Lacroix). So far as the two parishes of St. Zacharie and St. Aurelie are concerned—

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are not in the bill.

Mr. DUPRE: No, because there has been a misprint. I understand there will be an amendment, because the county of Dorchester has not been properly described in the bill before us.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then I shall have to oppose that. It is still worse.

Mr. DUPRE: The proposal is to add the parishes of St. Zacharie and St. Aurelie to the county of Beauce. I might say that this has been done with the approval of the hon. member for Beauce. I have his own figures and his own writing before me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DUPRE: Let us study the situation in the district of Quebec, as outlined by my hon. friend. What is the result of these changes? I am considering what might happen from an electoral point-of-view, and I am assuming for the sake of argument that the figures will be the same as in 1930. What is the result? Quebec East, which has been so well represented by the ex-Minister of Justice, remains as it is. Therefore chances are that he would be elected by the same majority.

An hon. MEMBER: More.

Mr. DUPRE: Quebec South is about the same. The Liberal majority by the new changes, as far as Quebec South is concerned, is just a little increased.

As far as I am concerned, Quebec West is about the same, with the difference that by taking away the rural part of my constituency I will lose 60 votes of the Conservative majority. In Lotbiniere, basing ourselves always on the same figures, the Liberal majority will be increased; I am sure my hon. friend from Quebec East will not object to that. In Bellechasse, always taking the same figures, the Liberal majority will be increased. In Charlevoix-Saguenay it will be about the same, perhaps the Liberal majority may be increased by a few votes. Is that anything to complain about? In Kamouraska the majority will be increased also; what have my friends opposite to complain about? In Bonaventure the Liberal majority will be increased. In Gaspe the Liberal majority will be increased. My hon. friends smile as I give these figures—

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Because you seem to be a real fortune-teller.

Mr. DUPRE: I am only basing myself on the figures of the last election. In Portneuf there is a change, both parties will be about equal. I hope my friends will not complain at having to fight in a constituency where the chances are equal. In Montmagny and in Quebec-Montmorency it will be about the same as in 1930. In Dorchester and Levis I admit that the Conservative majority might be increased and that, based on the figures of 1930 the chances of the Conservative candidate will be better.

Mr. POULIOT: Listen to that!

Mr. DUPRE: If you are kind enough to follow my argument—

Mr. POULIOT: This is not an argument, it is a prognostication!

Mr. DUPRE: —there are seven or eight constituencies where the Liberal chances will be increased, and only two where the Conservative chances will be increased. Is that unfair to my hon. friends?

There are other arguments, which I will not cover just now because they will be discussed later in connection with the different constituencies. But there is one thing to which I wish to draw attention. It is this: my hon. friend from Quebec East has spoken about the general principle of municipal lines, judicial districts and so forth. My answer, and I ask pardon for repeating it, is that the federal demarcations have nothing to do with the municipal lines or judicial districts, because these municipal lines and judicial districts are based on the provincial constituencies, which are not changed, and which we cannot change. But there is another principle much more important than that. It is that in the new redistribution there will be in the province of Quebec no more solid blocs. There will be no more Conservative and no more Liberal blocs. I draw to the attention of my hon. friend from Quebec East the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier many years ago when he said it would be a most unfortunate situation if we had a Conservative or a Liberal bloc either in Ontario or Quebec.

Mr. POULIOT: Did the Liberal bloc elect twenty-seven Conservatives in the last election?

Mr. DUPRE: That does not change my argument; my hon. friend does not seem to understand me. He is going back now to the old divisions. We must be fair, we must be broadminded and we must think of principles and ideals. I say it is a most unfortunate situation when there is in the province of Quebec or the province of Ontario a solid bloc either Liberal or Conservative. And I draw the attention of my hon. friends opposite to this fact, that we have been able to fight and we have been able to win some seats when we were in the opposition, and we are going to fight again and to maintain our position in the next federal election. What I want them to understand is that the days of Liberal domination are finished.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: That is a good explanation.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Richelieu): I think, Mr. Chairman, that the last word uttered by the hon. Solicitor General will be regretted by him when he becomes a little more calm. His last observation is far from indicating a spirit of fairness on the part of the government in the working out of the redistribution project that is being placed before the house at the present time.

I quite realize the difficulties encountered when preparing a redistribution of the province of Quebec. Under the British North America Act we are in a very difficult and embarrassing position; we cannot increase the number of seats beyond the sixty-five allotted to us by the pact of confederation, and we have to take care of the English minorities in that province. I may say to the honour of the citizens of Quebec that that obligation has been more than respected during the past years. So when it comes to figuring out the allotment of constituencies in

Quebec we are limited by those two important considerations. And it is impossible to attain a satisfactory result when drafting the boundaries of constituencies in the province of Quebec if too much weight is given to the factor of population. It is utterly impossible to equalize population in the constituencies of that province in view of the two considerations I have just indicated. Then there is also the big city of Montreal, and the city of Quebec which is growing very rapidly; it is impossible, I repeat, to have equality of population in all the constituencies of that province. Since confederation there has been always a big discrepancy between the population of certain constituencies, even in the rural sections of the province. So I am driven to the conclusion, and I take the risk of expressing what is in my mind that the time has come or will be here very soon when the basis of dividing seats for the federal house will have to be changed and the British North America Act amended.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARDIN: It is unfair, with the growing population of the province of Quebec to keep our representation at the same number, 65 seats, when we have to take care of the English-speaking minorities as we have been doing in the past years. I am not afraid of a change in the British North America Act in that respect. When our number was fixed at 65 at the time of confederation it was done in order to protect the populations in the small provinces of Canada. But the trend of population has not been as foreseen by the fathers of Confederation; their estimates have proven wrong. At the time of confederation the maritime provinces were afraid, not of the province of Quebec, but of the province of Ontario, which at that time was expected to develop more rapidly than any other and to increase its population much more than Quebec. They wanted to be protected against the increase of the province of Ontario by assurance against reduction of seats in certain cases. The exception which was made at the time was for the protection of the maritime provinces, but circumstances have been such that the province of Ontario in fact is benefiting by the exception which was made with the intention of helping the maritimes. So the principle must be redrafted, and the sooner it is done the better it will be, and the sooner we will have a fairer representation in the House of Commons.

If I understood his words correctly the Prime Minister said that his party had made some sacrifices in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in order to avoid altering the boundaries of constituencies. I believe the Prime Minister said that in one province the Conservative party lost one seat because they wanted to respect the boundaries of the constituencies. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman in all frankness that if he would apply the same principle to the province of Quebec this question of redistribution would be settled in no time at all. It would be the easiest thing in the world to deal with this matter if the right hon. gentleman would apply that principle to the province of Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT: If I may interrupt the hon. gentleman, I trust he realizes that the electoral divisions in Quebec now comprise parts of many communities. For instance, the old county of Dorchester takes in parts of three provincial counties. That is the point I was trying to make.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, but I may answer that this situation prevails in a relatively small number of the constituencies in Quebec. It applies very little in the Montreal district, which has from forty to forty-two seats. I am quite ready to agree that this principle of respecting boundaries could not be applied everywhere; I admit that in certain cases exceptions should be made, but I urge upon the Prime Minister that generally speaking the principle he has applied in making sacrifices in the maritime provinces should be applied in the province of Quebec as well. I still hope, as I have said to a number of my hon. friends who are complaining with regard to the redistribution bill, that when the true picture is placed before the Prime Minister he will set aside some of the recommendations which have been made by his supporters and insist on having a measure brought before the house which will be fairer and more equitable to all parties in Quebec. I still have the firm belief that before we are through with the schedules many changes will be made which will bring about a better understanding among the citizens of the province of Quebec and will indicate more broadmindedness on the part of those who have the majority in this house. It is all very well to speak of equalizing the population, but if this is the aim why reduce the representation in counties which at present are below that unit; why reduce them still more? There are several constituencies in Quebec below the unit of representation, according to the last census. Instead of trying to increase them or even keeping them as they are and as they have been for many years, it is now proposed to reduce their population.

Then a new constituency is to be created in the northern section of Quebec, in order to give a chance to a very nice gentleman, the hon. member for Three Rivers-St. Maurice (Mr. Bourgeois), and in order to give a chance to another very nice and bright young man, the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Baribeau). These hon. members are to be helped by taking from their constituencies a certain number of Liberal centres. A new county is created, with a population of only 21,000. This is the answer to the argument of my good friend the Solicitor General that so far as possible we must equalize the population in Montmagny and L'Islet and the two adjoining counties.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Would my hon. friend allow me a question? Would he tell me the area of that new constituency?

Mr. CARDIN: The area does not mean anything when there is no one living in that area. You could take all the northern section of Quebec or all Ungava and you would not have a large population.

Mr. DURANLEAU: That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. CARDIN: It is an answer; there is a small population in that territory at the present time. The only justification for the assertion of the Minister of Marine is that in the future that area may be developed. Many things may happen in the future in these constituencies in the centre of Quebec which are being carved up to-day. By these proposals constituencies with populations of 40,000, 42,000 and 45,000 will be increased to 50,000, 55,000 and possibly 60,000 in the next ten years; so we had better bank on realities rather than expectations, as my good friend the Minister of Marine is trying to do in order to justify the present project. There is no justification for reducing the representation in counties which are too small now, or for creating a smaller constituency in a new section, in order to protect two members already sitting in this house. I wonder why hon. gentlemen opposite, representing constituencies where they have been elected by majorities of 500, 600, 1,100 and so on, are afraid to go back to the electors a second time. I cannot understand that.

Mr. DUPRE: Would my hon. friend permit me a question? I do not want to interrupt his argument, but the same point would apply to the Liberal party, because I have already named seven or eight constituencies in which the Liberal majorities will be greatly increased.

[Mr. Cardin.]

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, I can see the position taken by the Solicitor General. He is trying to hive all the Liberals he can gather together in a certain section of the province in order to weaken the chances of the Liberals in the section where the Conservatives were elected at the last election. That is the whole story, the whole purpose of the present redistribution bill, and I say hon. gentlemen opposite lack a certain amount of courage if they are afraid to go back to the electors who sent them here, if they are afraid to face them under the same conditions that existed during the election of 1930. My hon. friend the Solicitor General said that he was very strongly opposed to the changing of provincial counties, and that this bill does not change them. Let me tell him that in the proposed redistribution of the Montreal seats and the rural section of the district of Montreal the boundaries of the provincial seats are being changed.

Mr. DUPRE: We cannot change the provincial districts.

Mr. CARDIN: It is being done.

Mr. DUPRE: If my hon. friend will permit me, we cannot touch the judicial lines because they are based on the provincial constituencies. My theory is that whatever changes may be made in federal constituencies the provincial constituencies and judicial lines remain the same.

Mr. CARDIN: But the provincial constituencies do not remain the same under this bill; the provincial constituencies are changed, and I can give a very good illustration.

Mr. DUPRE: We have no authority to change provincial lines.

Mr. CARDIN: That is not the point; we are not discussing here any changes in the judicial districts of the province of Quebec. We are talking about provincial districts, provincial constituencies and federal constituencies. If I gathered rightly the observations of the Solicitor General, he said that the provincial counties were not being changed by this redistribution. Perhaps I was wrong in my interpretation of his remarks, but I think that was what he said. Well, my answer to the hon. gentleman is this: You are changing the boundaries of the provincial counties; you are changing them in the district of Montreal, and changing them very materially.

Mr. BENNETT: We are not following the lines of the provincial counties.

Mr. CARDIN: I thank the Prime Minister. I say, you are not following the lines of the provincial counties in Quebec.

Mr. DUPRE: We agree on that.

Mr. CARDIN: The Solicitor General said also that we have to make changes because the Quebec district has to provide one seat to be given to Montreal, or to the northern section of the province of Quebec. If the Quebec district has to provide one rural seat to be given to Montreal or to the north, why change all the other constituencies in the Quebec district? What has Levis to do with the counties of Montmagny and L'Islet, which are supposed to be joined in one way or another? To obtain that additional county for the Quebec district it would be sufficient to join two counties or possibly four. But what about the rest? Is the division of the county of Levis changed for the purpose of giving one seat to Montreal? Is the county of Gaspe changed in its limits for the purpose of giving one seat to the north? They are mere changes of parishes here and there. You are not taking the seat you want for Montreal from the changes which are being made in most of the constituencies in the Quebec district.

Mr. POULIOT: Neither in Témiscouata.

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend referred kindly to the county of Richelieu, which had been kept for a considerable time a small county of 21,000. For his information I may say that the county of Richelieu has been changed. It was changed in 1892. The parish of St. Marcel of the county of Richelieu was placed in the county of Bagot. That parish came back later on to the county of Richelieu, and in 1914 when the redistribution was carried out by the government then in power, the parish of St. Marcel was placed in the county of Yamaska. Changes have been made, though, I am ready to admit, not of very great importance. But the county of Richelieu is not the only county with a small population and which has not changed. There are much smaller constituencies in Canada and in the province of Quebec than the county of Richelieu; and I do not object very much to the increase which the present redistribution bill makes in Richelieu. They are giving the constituency now, according to this redistribution, part of Yamaska, part of Verchères and part of St. Hyacinthe, and they are increasing the population to 35,000. It is more 38,000 than 35,000. I do not object so much on that account, because I realize that my constituency, although it was not the smallest, should be increased; I admit that. But they are making changes for which there is no justification at all.

If I understood rightly the main argument of the Solicitor General, the justification was that they increased the chances of the Liberals in the constituencies they have, and increased the chances of the Conservatives in their constituencies. That is the principle of the whole redistribution which has been forced upon the Prime Minister of the country and which I am sure he will not accept when he is in possession of all the facts which are going to be placed before him.

I am not going to dwell very long on the situation in the island of Montreal. I confess that, living in a rural section of the province of Quebec, I am not as familiar with the island of Montreal as are the residents of that city. But the island of Montreal was practically settled when the committee of elder statesmen met, and when I was called before that committee as a witness; I got the impression that the island of Montreal had been agreed to. If that understanding had been signed at that time there would be no difficulty in regard to the island of Montreal. The difficulty came when the elder statesmen of the Conservative party consulted with their supporters in the island of Montreal and surrounding districts. The elder statesmen were quite ready to accept the plan as it had been modified, but the other gentlemen who advised those statesmen wanted to put forward a project of their own and so forced a disagreement on the committee.

I cannot understand for the life of me why, according to the redistribution bill which is before us, the county of St. Mary in the island of Montreal should disappear—the county which is more clearly defined than any other; the county which is more explicitly described on the map; the county which is most perfect geographically speaking, so far as the city of Montreal is concerned, and a county which has a population of 66,000. I cannot see why that population of working men, labouring people who have been together for twenty or thirty years, knowing clearly the boundaries of their constituency, and with a population of 66,000—I cannot understand, I say, why that county should disappear and why a new county is created with a population which is smaller than the population of St. Mary. St. Mary disappears, and they are creating a new county which is called Lafontaine. That county of Lafontaine, according to the figures given to us, is going to have a population of only 65,000 while the county of St. Mary, which is to disappear, has a population of 66,000, and is moreover more easily described and is much

more interesting from the point of view of geography and regularity of lines.

What is the reason? Why do away with St. Mary and create another constituency? The county of St. Mary could have been increased a little, as all other constituencies in the county of Montreal have been increased. The county of Hochelaga could have been increased also, and St. Mary could have been left where it is at present, and no one would have suffered on that account. But why make a gerrymander of this sort in the heart of the island of Montreal in order to create a new constituency, doing away with an old one against which nothing can be said? I repeat, I cannot understand why that county of St. Mary is to disappear.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Is my hon. friend not aware, was he not told by the members of the committee, that our friends on our side agreed to restore the division he is mentioning, St. Mary—

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, but—

Mr. DURANLEAU: —not because we thought it was a better redistribution but because we wanted to yield to the wishes of the hon. gentleman's friends. Is he not aware of that? Is it his wish now, is it the wish of my hon. friends opposite, to make political capital? If it is we will again yield to their wishes if they desire to make political capital out of it.

Mr. CARDIN: No political capital is being made. The only political capital which is being sought is sought by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, as I will show in a moment. When there was a meeting before the elder statesmen the question was discussed with respect to the county of St. Mary. The only difficulty was that St. Mary was disappearing. The members from Montreal were asked for suggestions and they suggested that a new constituency to be called Lafontaine should not be created but that the populations of St. Mary and the other adjoining constituencies should be increased. But what were the observations of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley)? He said: In doing that are you not destroying what has been practically agreed upon in the other sections of Montreal? The answer was, "no." This would only affect St. Mary, St. James and Hochelaga. The hon. member for Argenteuil did not want to destroy St. Mary or change the boundaries of St. Antoine and other constituencies in Montreal. He said that they might agree to effect changes in regard to St. Mary without changing what had been practically settled upon and accepted by certain Conservative members from the island of Montreal. He was told that that would not change the position and he said that they might agree. What is the new proposal now being made? It is that a change be made with regard to Outremont. Other changes were to be made in other sections of the island of Montreal. That is the proposal to which the Minister of Marine referred. If he would come to us with the proposal which was practically accepted by the hon. member for Argenteuil and accepted to a large extent by himself, there would be no objection on the part of Montreal. Why is there any objection? It is because they want to do something new and make changes on the island of Montreal which would be contrary to the views expressed by the hon. member for Argenteuil. That is why we cannot accept the new proposal which has been made. It is not the proposal to which the Minister of Marine agreed before the committee of elder statesmen. If it was, I would be the first one to advise my colleagues from the island of Montreal to accept.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The suggestion made with regard to Outremont was to restore that seat. The objection raised by the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier) was that we were changing the lines of Outremont, and we are now suggesting that they be restored.

Mr. CARDIN: Why go back on the proposals which were made three or four weeks ago after it was practically agreed in the special committee that St. Mary should be restored without disturbing the other constituencies except by increasing the populations of the surrounding constituencies? Why revive old difficulties? That is what my hon. friend is trying to do at the present time.

I hope I shall be pardoned for the heat of my observations. I have no desire to hurt the feelings of anyone but I have not the advantage of being able to switch to soft tones. It is my nature and I cannot change it. I do not mean any offence to hon. gentlemen who do not share my views. There may be much heat but there is no ill feeling at the bottom of my heart.

Let us leave the island of Montreal and go to the constituency of Chateauguay-Huntingdon. To a large extent the county of Huntingdon is to remain in the same position as it was. It is a small county which has been represented practically continuously by an English speaking representative. As

far as I am concerned I am willing to make sacrifices in order that this riding shall not be disturbed. This is a small constituency but it is being reduced still further by this proposal.

Mr. BENNETT: It will have 4,000 more than Richelieu.

Mr. CARDIN: The present proposal reduces it by over a thousand. If it will satisfy the Prime Minister, I will not object to leaving it as it is. I would be ready to do that.

Mr. DURANLEAU: It was done to meet our hon. friends' wishes, as a matter of fact.

Mr. CARDIN: I beg your pardon, it was not.

Mr. DURANLEAU: You objected to joining Beauharnois and Soulanges.

Mr. CARDIN: I objected to joining two counties which were separated by lake St. Francis and the St. Lawrence river without any bridge communication. That was the proposal made by the Minister of Marine. There is not even a regular ferry service and in the winter time it is impossible to go across. The only justification which could be offered by my hon. friend was that some day there might be a bridge. I know they will say that they did not change Soulanges which has only 21,000 population. I asked them to change it logically by taking in Ste. Anne de Bellevue which at the present time is in Jacques Cartier. That would be the natural way to increase the population of Vaudreuil-Soulanges. It cannot be increased to the north because of the lake of Two Mountains; it cannot be increased to the south because of lake St. Francis and the St. Lawrence, but it could be increased by taking in Ste. Anne de Bellevue. There are two bridges crossing the Ottawa river to provide communication. But Vaudreuil-Soulanges remains as it is because they do not want to increase it in the logical and fair way. That is why it is being kept at 21,000.

Mr. DURANLEAU: You would have to cross two rivers.

Mr. CARDIN: Where there are two highway bridges.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Toll bridges.

Mr. CARDIN: That is better than trying to cross the St. Lawrence and lake St. Francis where there are no bridges.

Mr. DURANLEAU: There is a railway bridge.

Mr. CARDIN: I have no great authority to speak for my party but as far as I am concerned personally I would be willing to accept Chateauguay-Huntingdon as it is at the present time. The proposal is to take Lacolle in St. John's-Iberville and join it to Chateauguay-Huntingdon. I cannot see any justification for that and I would be inclined to oppose this transfer. But that is not my main objection to what is proposed for Chateauguay-Huntingdon. My hon. friend will understand me when I say that in the county of Huntingdon there is a parish called Ste. Barbe. The proposal of the bill is to take that parish of Ste. Barbe from the county of Huntingdon and transfer it to the county of Beauharnois which is going to be a hive to which surrounding Liberals will be brought. That is not all. There is in the county of Beauharnois the little Conservative parish of St. Etienne. It is taken from the county of Beauharnois down to the county of Huntingdon to assist the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Moore). That is the present proposal which is being made and it is the one to which I very seriously object. It is not a matter of joining counties together or adjusting population or increasing population. My hon. friend by that process is reducing the population of his constituency, carving the parish of Ste. Barbe from it and taking in its place the parish of St. Etienne. The reason is obvious; it is to get rid of the little parish of Ste. Barbe which is Liberal and to take in the parish of St. Etienne which is Conservative and which he wants to get nearer to his heart. That is the position. As regards the constituency of Chateauguay-Huntingdon, if that is not gerrymandering, I wonder what gerrymandering is. In reality is it worth while to change the configuration of the county of Beauharnois, to make a hole in the south-eastern boundary of that county in order to get the small parish of St. Etienne?

An hon. MEMBER: Not a hole.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, it is a hole and as far as the municipality of Ste. Barbe is concerned, it is a little block which is added to the extreme southwestern end of the county of Beauharnois. These changes cannot be justified by any process of imagination nor for any reasons which can be advanced. If we are to apply the principle advanced by the Solicitor General that we have to find constituencies to give to Montreal and other places, it is not necessary to change Ste. Barbe or St. Etienne for that purpose; there is no reason for doing so. But I repeat, I would be ready, so far as I am concerned,

to leave my hon. friend's constituency the way it is at present.

As regards the new proposal which is being made, in view of the fact that my constituency has been compared by the Prime Minister with that of Chateauguay-Huntingdon, under the new redistribution, I can say that the constituency of the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon will have a population of 24,000 and the new constituency of Richelieu will have a population of 35,000, so if there has been any discrepancy in the past the present bill takes care of it so far as I am concerned, but not so far as the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon is concerned.

Let us make a trip into the adjoining county of Beauharnois which is Liberal. The county of Beauharnois which they wanted to send across the St. Lawrence or across lake St. Francis, they wish to add to the county of Laprairie which is also Liberal. But unfortunately there is no contact between the two.

Mr. DORION (Translation): The obstacle!

Mr. CARDIN: Yes. They are separated by a portion of the county of Chateauguay and the present bill is creating a corridor in order to join the counties of Beauharnois and Laprairie. Inspired by what was done by the diplomats of Europe after the war, my hon. friends have created a new corridor; they have transplanted on the soil of Quebec the idea which originated in the minds of European diplomats. So we have a corridor joining the counties of Beauharnois and Laprairie. At a certain section it is very narrow. If I were to carve on a sheet of paper the counties of Laprairie and Beauharnois and try to keep them together by the small piece of paper which would represent the corridor, it would not keep them together; it could not stand the strain; it is so flimsy that on account of the divisions of the parishes which exist there, you could not join the two counties properly. Even at that, if there was a necessity of uniting constituencies, it is a lesser evil to have Laprairie and Beauharnois that way than to have Beauharnois and Vaudreuil-Soulanges on the other side of lake St. Francis. If that had to be done to help those constituencies to disappear and to give one more seat to the island of Montreal, arguments could be put forward and settlements reached. But I repeat what I said in regard to Chateauguay-Huntingdon: If Beauharnois is joined to Laprairie through that corridor, it should be joined as a whole, not after having the parish of St. Etienne carved out of it and the small parish of Ste. Barbe added to it. If you want to join those two constituencies, join them as they are through the corridor narrow as it is. If this were the only objection, I would not fight very strenuously in order to come to an agreement and do away with the unpleasant example which is at present being given to the country. I cannot think—and I am most sincere in saying this—that in these dying days of the session, in these days when we are ready to go home and when a large number of members have already left, in the end we are going to be forced to swallow the proposal which has been made and we shall not be able to come to some understanding. Surely there should be a possibility, with every one of us making a little compromise, of reaching an agreement and settling the matter amicably as has always been done in the past. The Prime Minister, when speaking the other day, said that on another occasion he was on a committee and they did not agree at first; they fought strongly, one against the other; they had conflicting proposals, but the fact remains that in the end they agreed. After a strenuous fight, they came to an understanding. Why not try to come to an agreement in this case? Why not be as generous as we can, make little concessions here and there and do away with the follies in connection with certain sections of Quebec which are proposed by this bill? Why not do away with that and try to agree on general lines? If we follow generally the principle advocated by the Prime Minister and try to preserve as far as possible the county boundaries, we can reach an agreement and the small difficulties outside can be very easily adjusted by the leaders of the two parties.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BENNETT: As we are compelled to ask for the attendance of the House of Commons to secure royal assent to the New Zealand extension trade agreement in order that the proclamation may be issued to-day, in view of the fact that it expires to-morrow, I ask that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following message:

Ottawa, May 23, 1933.

Sir:—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Hon. Lyman P. Duff, Chief Justice

of Canada, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate chamber this day at 8.15 p.m. for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

James F. Crowdy,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor General.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): The hour of 8.15 was selected because the Senate does not meet until eight o'clock. The right hon. gentleman is not in his seat, but I might explain that the necessity of securing royal assent is to enable proclamation to be made in connection with the New Zealand treaty for a further extension of six months. The treaty expires to-morrow.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I thank my right hon. friend for repeating his former statement. I was here while he was speaking, however. As I came in I looked at the clock and it was exactly three o'clock. I must point out to His Honour the Speaker, as I have privately on two or three former occasions, that frequently the bell is rung ahead of time, and I believe in this instance the Prime Minister, according to the clock in the chamber, began to speak before three o'clock.

CONFERRING OF TITLES

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): In reply to the question asked yesterday by the right hon. the leader of the opposition, I have to inform him that section 17 of the British North America Act, 1867, provides that there shall be one parliament of Canada, consisting of the Queen (King), an upper house, styled the Senate, and the House of Commons, and it is the considered view of His Majesty's government in Canada that a resolution passed by one house of parliament is legally effective only as an expression of the opinion of those who support such resolution in that house, and this is particularly true with respect to the prerogatives of the crown.

The sovereign can only be deprived of a prerogative right by statute of parliament, in very special form, which the government does not propose to introduce. There is apparently no opportunity at this time for discussion of the matters referred to by the right hon. gentleman.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house again in committee on Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

53719—336½

Mr. CARDIN: When the committee rose at one o'clock I was dealing with the proposed arrangement between the counties of Beauharnois and Laprairie. Before proceeding any farther I should like to insist upon the point which has been disputed—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has spoken forty minutes, and should not speak again before another member has spoken.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): Mr. Chairman, last night when the committee rose I was saying that the reason we objected to the division of Montmagny and L'Islet was that it took away the Liberal majority. The hon. member for Montmagny-L'Islet suggested that—

Mr. LAVERGNE: Not yet.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): The hon. member for Montmagny suggested, as a counter proposition, that L'Islet should be put with Kamouraska. I was about to answer him upon that point when—

Mr. LAVERGNE: I did not suggest that. I said, "Why not?"

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): Yes, the hon. member said, "Why not?" I was about to correct him when eleven o'clock came, and the right hon. Prime Minister suggested I should continue to-day. The reason I have not an answer to give him to the new proposal he made was that that which he had suggested was not the proposition laid down in the bill. The bill which we have before us dealt with Montmagny and L'Islet. Had the bill referred to Montmagny and Kamouraska it would have been a different proposition. However the proposition before us last night was that of joining up Montmagny and L'Islet, thereby taking away the Liberal majority of 585 votes.

Mr. CARDIN: Now that we have complied with the rules of the house I ask the indulgence of hon. members to proceed with the rest of my remarks in regard to the redistribution bill before us. When I was speaking this morning the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Moore) expressed a doubt when I said that in the proposed merger of the counties of Beauharnois and Laprairie an encroachment was being made on the county of Beauharnois in order to get around the small parish of St. Etienne, and to bring it into the county of Huntingdon. There is no doubt about the matter; I looked at the map to refresh my memory in regard to the point. There is no doubt in the world that the taking of the parish of St. Etienne from the county of Beauharnois

creates an encroachment on the county of Beauharnois, and creates a hole in the southern section of the constituency. If there is any doubt in the minds of hon. members I need only place before your eyes a map of what is going to be the county of Chateauguay-Huntingdon. Anyone can see the white section at the right of the map I now hold in my hand. The part to which I am now directing the attention of hon. members is that part taken from the constituency of St. Johns-Iberville. That is the Lacolle section. The small white part at the top of this map is the parish of St. Etienne which is taken from the county of Beauharnois and is to be placed in the constituency of Chateauguay-Huntingdon. At the corner of this map there is the parish of Ste. Barbe which, according to the project, is taken from the constituency of Chateauguay-Huntingdon and put into the new constituency of Beauharnois-Laprairie. There is no doubt about my contention of this morning. Anything I have said is amply supported by the maps which have been prepared showing the different constituencies, and which have been distributed to all hon. members. I need only pass before the eyes of hon. members the map which I hold in my hand showing the new county of Beauharnois-Laprairie, including the corridor I mentioned, to prove my statement. I am placing before you a design of what is going to be the county of Beauharnois-Laprairie.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): It looks like a tape-worm.

Mr. CARDIN: This small section to which I am pointing is only about two miles wide. That is the corridor by means of which connection is established between the present counties of Laprairie and Beauharnois. I suggest that my contention of this morning is perfectly justified. Then hon. members will see the little hole which is taken out, and the little tail added by the addition of the parish of Ste. Barbe. That is the position. Surely no one would contend that this change has been made in order to give more seats to the city of Montreal. More seats could be given to that city without disturbing these two parishes. If we must unite the counties of Beauharnois and Laprairie I do not object so much. Please add them together, but do not take out of one county a certain parish which satisfies a group and leave out another section of the adjoining county. I think it is unfair, and this is enough to show what has been the spirit of those who have engineered the project of redistribution that we are dealing with at the present time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I might be asked what would be the logical method of doing away with the county of Beauharnois, which is a small constituency. The logical course—though I admit that there are difficulties and that several objections could be raised, not from the point of view of geography but other considerations—the natural and logical course would be to join both Beauharnois and Chateauguay-Huntingdon. They are both part of the triangle which is formed by the St. Lawrence river, the American boundary and the counties of Laprairie and Napierville. This would be a perfect delimitation of the constituency. I recognize that it would make a very largely populated constituency, that is true. And there may be another objection of which I am ready to take cognizance. It would make that county an overwhelmingly French-Canadian county, and my friends could raise the objection that an English-speaking constituency in the province of Quebec was being done away with. That is one of the reasons for my observation that this plan would be reasonable and logical but there are serious objections to it which we ought to take into consideration, and to which I would be the first to give due weight. It would be probably a too largely populated constituency, and as to the division between the English-speaking and the French-speaking communities, it might be unfair to the English-speaking minority of the province of Quebec. Therefore in that case we are forced to abandon the logical course, the reasonable course, and try to adjust the matter in some other way. If nothing better is offered I am ready to accept the establishment of a little corridor to join the counties of Beauharnois and Chateauguay and Laprairie, but I insist that these two counties be united in the position in which they are at the present time, that they be not carved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us come to the next county which presents a serious difficulty, the county that my good friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) is trying to create for himself. He was elected in the riding of Chambly-Verchères with a majority of nearly 1,200 at the last election. I am very much surprised that he is not ready to go and face the same electors again. Generally speaking the changes that he proposes to make are not going to help him to create a seat in the island of Montreal. The change of the limits

of his constituency is for other reasons than finding another constituency in Montreal. He was elected in the riding of Chambly-Verchères, and according to the new proposal he wants to make me a gift of the county of Verchères. As far as that is concerned, and if I were the only one to be considered, I would be very much pleased. There is no better population in the whole of Canada than the population of the county of Verchères. That population comes in a direct line from those who discovered this country and who first established Christianity in Canada. In the parishes of the county of Verchères we find the best citizens and the best Canadians to be found anywhere in the Dominion. As far as I am concerned, personally, I would see no objection to taking them into my county or giving them to someone else who may replace me at the next general election. Why my hon. friend is abandoning that county of Verchères I do not, I cannot understand. The reasons which have been given up to the present time are no reasons at all, they are not even a pretence capable of justifying the scheme of the present bill. But my hon. friend wants to give me the county of Verchères, excepting a section which he wants to keep with him in the county of Chambly. That section is that part of the county of Verchères included in the municipality of the town of Beloeil, the village of McMasterville, and the municipalities of Ste. Julie and St. Mathieu. I frankly admit that when we discussed the matter before that solemn committee of elder statesmen I did not raise any great objection to that. I wanted to accommodate the Minister of Marine; his summer residence is in the town of Beloeil and in view of that fact I was ready to concede that he might keep part of the county of Verchères. I mention this fact only to show in what way the work of preparing this plan of redistribution has been organized. This is an illustration of the ideas that prevailed; it shows very clearly the desire of those who are the masters and who prepared that redistribution. But the Minister of Marine is not satisfied with leaving out of his constituency the county of Verchères; he wants to carve from the county of Laprairie a small section, a small community which is at present in that county and which is to be added to the county of Chambly to satisfy his desire. He said: Well, it does not amount to much, it is a small territory. If it does not amount to much why not respect the limits of the county of Laprairie and not go to the expense and trouble of encroaching on it by taking that small and unimportant section to add to the county of Chambly? He wants to replace the county of Verchères—which apparently he does not like because he wants to get rid of it—by the county of Rouville. There would not be so much objection if he wanted to take the whole county of Rouville, but no. He wants to cross over the river. They do not like to cross over rivers in other sections of the province, they want to make the rivers the boundaries, but my hon. friend is not afraid to go over the Richelieu river and to take part of the county of Rouville, a part in which he expects to be a little more successful than he was in the county of Verchères which he wants to detach from his constituency. If he wanted to take the whole county of Rouville, well and good. If he wanted to replace the county of Verchères by the county of Rouville in its entirety I would agree to that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The whole or nothing.

Mr. CARDIN: But his objection is that that would make too large a population. He said: With what I have to-day, with what has been carved out for me, I have 40,000 population. If he would take the rest of the county of Rouville that he refuses and leave the part of Verchères he wants to retain, the population would come within a reasonable figure. But he does not want to take the whole county of Rouville for reasons which are obvious. There is a section in that county where he might be very successful and there is another section in which his success would be rather doubtful at the present time and under present circumstances. Mr. Chairman, I think that that is not fair. Our complaints in regard to the situation are perfectly justified. To repeat what I said this morning, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the Conservative members, including the ministers, who were elected in 1930 are afraid to go back to the electors who sent them here. Certain members on the other side of the house deserve credit and praise for their courage. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) is ready to go back to his constituency as it existed in 1930; the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) is also ready to face the constituents he faced in 1930, and the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Pickel) is ready to do the same. This is a good example which should be followed by the two French Canadian ministers from the district of Montreal. Neither my good friend the Minister of

Marine (Mr. Duranleau) nor my good friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Sauvé) is ready to go before the electors by whom he was elected in 1930; each minister wants his constituency changed. Apparently these hon. gentlemen have not the courage that is possessed by the hon. members for Stanstead, Compton and Brome-Missisquoi.

That is the position, Mr. Chairman, and I say there is no justification in the world for the proposal which has been made with regard to the new constituency of Chambly-Rouville. That is not the proper name for it; if it were named according to the division which has been suggested it should be called Chambly-Rouville-Vercheres-Laprairie. That should be the name of the new constituency which has been carved out for the benefit of my good friend the Minister of Marine. This is most objectionable, and in order to bring about that result the riding of Richelieu-Vercheres must be composed of the old county of Richelieu, plus a section of Vercheres, plus a section of the county of St. Hyacinthe, and a portion of the county of Yamaska. This is the sort of constituency that is being created under this redistribution. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that it does not mean very much, but if that is so why not keep them as they are at the present time? That would cause less embarrassment and would indicate a little more confidence on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in the electors whom they will have to face in a year or two.

I have dealt with the constituency of Richelieu-Vercheres, Mr. Chairman; now let us go to the constituency of Nicolet-Yamaska. Because of its small population the county of Yamaska is bound to disappear. It has been kept with a small population for many years, when circumstances permitted the keeping of small constituencies, such as Argenteuil with only 18,000 and Richelieu with only 21,000. That county of Yamaska, I repeat, we are practically agreed should disappear, but in my humble judgment it should disappear in a reasonable, fair and logical way. This is a small constituency.

Mr. BENNETT: 17,000.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, about 17,000 at the present time. Why not add this constituency to Richelieu or Nicolet, or even Bagot? I see my right hon. friend the Prime Minister smiling when I mention Richelieu; probably he is under the impression that this would make Richelieu a pretty safe seat for me. If that is what my right hon. friend has in mind let me tell him that with the carving they have done they have made my seat much safer than it would be with Yamaska added to it; so I do not need to be placed in such a position. They are giving me a very strong Conservative section of St. Hyacinthe; if I have to take these people I shall be glad to do so, because they are very good citizens, though it will mean a majority of more than 400 against me there. By this means they are bringing my constituency to the very door of the city of St. Hyacinthe; that is the situation in which I find myself. However, it has been thought desirable to unite the county of Yamaska with the county of Nicolet. Very well; we can agree on that, but unite it as a whole; do not destroy the old county of Nicolet.

Let me deal first with the section of the county of Yamaska which is near the county of Richelieu. The proposal in the bill is that the municipality of Yamaska be cut in two; one half is to be united with the county of Richelieu—because they are Liberals—and the balance is to be added to the county of Nicolet. That is the sort of work that is being done. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that the Yamaska river runs through that territory. That river goes through the municipality of Yamaska; they are not separate municipalities on each side. The Yamaska river is not a navigable stream; it is narrow, and at present there is a highway bridge connecting the two parts of the municipality. My hon. friends may answer, though it is not an answer, that in certain other places municipalities have been divided. Well, two wrongs never make a right, and if that anomaly exists somewhere else that is no reason why the same thing should be done this year. The municipality of Yamaska should not be separated into two sections.

Now let us come to the county of Nicolet. Is it proposed to keep that county as it is? No; in joining the greater part of Yamaska with the county of Nicolet they want to do away with six old parishes of the old county of Nicolet and throw them into the county of Lotbiniere. They want to carve that new constituency at both ends; adjoining the county of Richelieu they want to cut the municipality of Yamaska in two, and where the county of Nicolet touches the county of Lotbiniere they want to take away six parishes and include them in Lotbiniere. They want to hive those people with the Liberals in the county of Lotbiniere. My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) said we should not complain if anything is done to make the Liberal seat of Lotbiniere safer. Hon. gentlemen opposite want to make it extra safe; they want to include in

the county of Lotbiniere the Liberal parishes of the county of Nicolet. That is the sort of gerrymander that is proposed.

I have heard hon. members mention municipal lines and provincial lines, and I have even heard arguments based on what are called diocesan lines; that is, that we should not destroy the limits of the diocese of a bishop. By doing that you are destroying the diocese of the Bishop of Nicolet at both ends, taking six of his parishes in Nicolet and throwing them into the county of Lotbinière. I do not insist so much upon that because I realize the force of the argument that the federal constituencies should be constructed having in view federal exigencies. I refer to this circumstance however to answer certain arguments which have been advanced against concessions that have been refused in certain quarters of the province of Quebec. If these two counties of Yamaska and Nicolet are to be joined they should be joined as they are without being carved at both ends, as now proposed.

Before leaving the southern section of the St. Lawrence, let me say a word or two in regard to the counties of Richmond-Wolfe. The counties in the eastern townships have not been touched generally; that was the understanding, the idea which prevailed at first when the party in power prepared the bill. Stanstead is not disturbed; Sherbrooke is not disturbed; Compton is not disturbed; Shefford is not disturbed. Why then disturb the old counties of Richmond-Wolfe?

Mr. LAFLECHE (Translation): May I put a question to the hon. member?

Mr. CARDIN (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. LAFLECHE (Translation): Have you taken into account the population of these various counties? The county of Richmond-Wolfe has a larger population than any other county in the eastern townships. Did you compare the figures of the population of these various counties with those of Richmond-Wolfe? Richmond-Wolfe has a population of 41,867 while those of the neighbouring counties vary between 25,000 and 31,000. Richmond-Wolfe is the most populated constituency in the eastern townships and I consider that it is only fair and just that part of its population be transferred. That is what I wished to point out to the hon. member and the house.

Mr. CARDIN: I quite understand the observations which the hon. member for Richmond-Wolfe is making. His argument is that the county as it stands at the present time has a larger population than the counties I have just mentioned in the eastern townships. But if that is the case, if his county is too large and if others are too small, why not increase the small ones? I am not the master of this redistribution; the government is the father of the bill. If the member for Stanstead has not a sufficient population why not increase it? If there is not a sufficient population in Compton—if I am not mistaken the figure is 29,000, but it does not matter —and if the county of Stanstead is too small, a county of 25,000, why not have an increase to a certain extent? If that were done we might find a justification for taking out from the counties of Richmond-Wolfe a certain proportion of their population. The idea that has been put forward since this discussion has started has been to increase the population of small counties. Why then reduce counties which are still below the number they should have according to the census? If my hon. friend's county of Richmond-Wolfe has 42,000, it is still lower than the figure which is given as a guide for redistribution. Why not keep as they are counties which have a reasonable population at the present time and so avoid the necessity next time of going over all these constituencies again, exposing them to changes as a result of every census? If the county of Richmond-Wolfe has 40,000 it is within the reasonable limits of population, and the county is not going to be disturbed by the next census; whereas if you reduce the county of Richmond-Wolfe to a population of 30,000 or 29,000, at the next census you will have to recast the whole thing and bring in a new scheme of redistribution. I understand my hon. friend's position, but a county with a population of 40,000 is not extraordinary, because one of the new counties being created in the north of the province of Quebec is to be established with a population of 41,000; and there are in the province of Quebec a number of constituencies which are not being touched and in which the population is higher than the population in the county of Richmond-Wolfe. One has only to look at the counties of Drummond-Arthabaska, 53,000; Charlevoix-Saguenay, 55,000; Chambly-Rouville, as at present carved, 40,000; and there are many others in the same position. Pontiac has 42,000, Rimouski 40,000, and St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, as now proposed, will have a population of 42,000.

Mr. LAFLECHE (Translation): Have you any objection to mentioning the counties which have less population?

Mr. CARDIN (Translation): I have no objection, absolutely none.

I have not gone through the list, but I admit, and it is undeniable, that there are several counties with a much smaller population than Richmond-Wolfe. I am not blind; I can realize that, and I know perfectly well that there are other counties in that situation. But I think I am equally right in saying that there is no reason for complaint on the ground that the population of the county is 40,000 when the present bill creates new constituencies in rural Quebec with a population exceeding that figure, and when by this bill we are increasing the population of certain small constituencies where the figure is lower than 40,000.

In my opinion therefore it is not fair to bring about such a change without the necessity for providing a new seat. This has no relation whatever to the creation of new seats in Montreal—none at all. The changes I have just mentioned affect only the relationship between counties and counties and do not help to provide one more county for Montreal or in the north of the province of Quebec. I think it is unfair to take away from Richmond-Wolfe five or six parishes which have always been included in that county.

The Solicitor General referred, as no doubt other hon. members will, to the changes made in 1924. May I point out that in the proposed changes in this redistribution bill there is nothing to alter what was done in 1924. If there is any complaint in regard to the changes made in 1924 it cannot be of any great importance because hon. gentlemen are ready to accept what was done at that time. Their proposed changes do not reestablish the limits before 1924. The changes that are being made are new ones, absolutely independent of the changes which were made in the redistribution of 1924, so that on that score there is no justification for hon. gentlemen opposite. They may cite a list of changes in 1924, most of them minor changes, and to which no one objected, but the proof that everything was satisfactory is the fact that hon. gentlemen were elected in 1930 on the strength of that redistribution. And they are not asking that a change be made now.

I am frank enough and fair enough to say that if the committee of elder statesmen had continued to sit I could have reached an agreement with the hon. member for Richmond-Wolfe. I think he knows me well enough to understand that I would have been fair and I believe we could have found common ground upon which to agree with regard to Richmond-Wolfe. I submit that it is not fair that this thing should be done in the way it is being done by this bill. After all, this would have been a very small difficulty to adjust between ourselves. I know he is fair enough and I think he will credit me with also being fair. He may not have been the master of the situation but perhaps we could have gone over the head of somebody else and found ground for agreement in regard to this county. A constituency is being dismantled without justification. So much for the southern section of the province of Quebec.

Let us go north for a moment. The proposal made by this bill is that the counties of L'Assomption and Terrebonne be joined. Terrebonne is a large county and it does not need to be increased. Its population is larger than that of many of the constituencies which have been created by this redistribution bill. Terrebonne could be left without being disturbed because it has sufficient population. I submit it is a mistake to change the present constituency of L'Assomption-Montcalm. These counties were united by the Conservative party in 1914 and they go together better than any other two counties in Canada. They have common interests in the cultivation of tobacco, one of the most important industries in the dominion, and the addition of Terrebonne will change the whole situation. But if this has to be done, why should it not be done by joining L'Assomption and Terrebonne in their entirety. Why does the Postmaster General (Mr. Sauvé) want to carve out of the county of Terrebonne the towns of Ste. Therese and St. Janvier? Why not leave these two places where they are; why disturb the boundaries of Terrebonne? Terrebonne could have been joined to L'Assomption to provide another constituency to take care of Montreal or the northern section of the province. But they were not satisfied to do that. They have created a riding which will cause some difficulties when considered from certain points of view. Instead of separating L'Assomption and Montcalm, I think we would be ready to join with Joliette, not only Montcalm but also L'Assomption. It is true that that would make a very large constituency but the county of Joliette—

Mr. DORION (Translation): We are willing to accept the hon. member's offer.

Mr. CARDIN: Without any restrictions? I have heard that a proposal of that kind would be permitted to go through provided we allowed the Postmaster General to get

Ste. Therese and St. Janvier. Other centres would be thrown into Montreal. That cannot be agreed to but if they want to avoid dividing the counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm and join them with the county of Joliette, as far as we are concerned we are inclined to agree. It would make a constituency with a little over 50,000 of population but we would not be afraid of that. There are other constituencies in the province containing more than 50,000 population. I have mentioned one already which contains 55,000.

I regret that I must abide by the forty-minute rule but I will complete my observations after another hon. gentleman has spoken.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): Mr. Chairman, as was stated this morning by some hon. members on this side of the house, this redistribution was not desired by the party in power. It had to be done according to our constitution. At every decennial census it is the duty of parliament to redistribute the representation in the House of Commons. I think everyone will admit that redistribution is a very difficult task. The adjusting of boundaries of constituencies is a difficult problem and it is natural that diversities of opinion exist on the subject. It is manifestly impossible to make a division which will please everyone but after having heard my hon. friends opposite one would come to the conclusion that they want no redistribution at all. They want the boundaries of the counties left exactly as they are; they do not want to consider the changes in population and other circumstances which should be taken into consideration in a case like this. I was not a member of the committee but I have studied the map and the figures suggested by the committee and in my opinion it is a very fair redistribution. This committee has taken into consideration every circumstance which should be considered. Our friends opposite seem to have only one thing in mind—political circumstances.

An hon. MEMBER: Never.

Mr. DURANLEAU: If a parish or a township has been taken from one county and put into another my hon. friends opposite will not admit that the committee had to take into consideration the equality of population. They say it has been for political purposes. I am not surprised to hear those views because our friends opposite have had their own way in the province of Quebec for forty years. They have ruled in that province, they have made their own political map and decided their own boundaries, provincially and municipally. As everyone knows, the political map of Quebec is the basis of redistribution in the federal field. Of course, if you look at the statutes of Canada you will not find many changes except perhaps in 1903. I might come to that later on.

Mr. POULIOT: In 1892.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Not during the debate on this redistribution.

Mr. POULIOT: I shall be ready to meet the hon. gentleman on the matter.

Mr. DURANLEAU: A number of changes were made in 1903 and if many were not made in 1924, this was because the basis of our redistribution was the provincial boundaries. Our friends from Quebec who are not very scrupulous and I think the Dillon act, which is still on the statutes of Quebec, is a proof that they were not very scrupulous—

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has accused us on this side of not being scrupulous. I suggest that that is not parliamentary and should not be used.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Speaking to the point of order, I just stated that the Quebec boundaries were made the basis of the federal redistribution and I am trying to show that the lines of those boundaries were not very scrupulously made.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): It was not the boundaries the hon. member said were not scrupulous; it was the men who made the boundaries that he said were not scrupulous. That is unparliamentary and should not be used.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Boundaries have no scruples.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Shaver): The hon. member did not name any member; I think he is in order.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): He named the members on this side of the house.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Our hon. friends opposite are asking why so many changes in the province of Quebec have been made by the redistribution committee. Obviously, if we wanted to make a fair redistribution we had to make these changes. As has been stated, we had to give three more seats to the island of Montreal and on account of the in-

crease in population from 36,000, the quota of representation of the last distribution, to a quota this year of 44,100, we could not do otherwise than make changes. Then we have to take into consideration the fact that our hon. friends opposite in the redistribution of 1924 did not seem to take into account the population of the province. Why? Was it because they were satisfied politically with the lines of the constituencies in Quebec in 1924 when they had friends returned in almost every riding? Was it because of that that they left a great number of seats in Quebec with a population of 20,000 although the quota was 36,000? Why did they do that?

Mr. FAFARD: Hon. gentlemen opposite have done the same thing this year.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Do they not think the duty of parliament in case of redistribution is to take into consideration the population of the province, not the fact that a constituency is Liberal and that a change might affect the chances of a Liberal friend? We have to take into consideration the population of every constituency and that is what has been done in this instance. The hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) admitted very frankly that it was a difficult task to make a redistribution so as to give to the population equality of representation. He stated that in Quebec we were anxious to preserve a few seats for the English speaking element of our province. I am quite in accord with my hon. friend's views on this question. It is true that we have always been trying to give to the minority in Quebec a fair representation in this house and I think this should be the case in all the provinces; every minority should have a voice in the House of Commons and that is why we have protected some of the English-speaking constituencies of Quebec.

The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and the hon. member for Richelieu have laid great stress on the provincial or municipal boundaries of the constituencies of our province. According to them, it is a crime for this house to touch these boundaries.

Mr. POULIOT: It is not a crime; it is a mistake.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Why do they say so? We do not deprive those citizens of their right of voting; we do not deprive them of the rights of citizenship. They have still the right to vote and I say that we give that population an opportunity to be in a better position to exercise their rights of citizenship than was the case before. We have to take into consideration the population of those constituencies.

[Mr. Duranleau.]

To my hon. friends who are so fond of speaking about respecting the municipal boundaries of Quebec, I say: That is fine to hear, but was it done in the past by the Liberal party?

Mr. POULIOT: Yes.

Mr. DURANLEAU: If you read the Hansards of the past, you will find the principles which were laid down by the late great chief of the Liberal party in regard to the lines of municipal counties in Quebec, but what did they do after the speech of their leader on the subject?

Mr. POULIOT: They did right.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Under my hon. friends there were in Quebec twenty-three federal constituencies, also provincial constituencies, which did not conform to municipal lines.

Mr. POULIOT: May I say just a word to my hon. friend?

Mr. DURANLEAU: If my hon. friend wishes to make a speech, I shall not allow it, but if it a question, it is all right.

Mr. POULIOT: Just one sentence and it will be short. In the province of Quebec there have been changes pro forma, not to change but to maintain the old boundaries; that is all.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend should wait to make those statements in one of his sixty-five speeches. That is not a question.

Mr. POULIOT: But this was a speech in one sentence.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What was the date when that statement was made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier?

Mr. DURANLEAU: During the session of 1899.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What date?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I have not the date, but I can give the volume of Hansard and the page.

Mr. POULIOT: There was no redistribution that year.

Mr. DURANLEAU: There was the principle laid down by the Liberal party, but it was not followed. My hon. friends are like the reprobates of the Divine Comedy of Dante who left all their hopes at the door of the inferno. The Liberal party, before entering what they think is the heaven of power, leave at the door all their principles, to take them up again when they go out of power.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated that principle when he said:

We think it is a principle which will commend itself universally to public opinion, that the basis of representation in this house should be municipal and county organizations.

After quoting the words of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the leader of the opposition in 1924 said:

It is upon that basis—

Municipal organizations.

—we shall expect the committee to whom the present bill will be referred to proceed.

If you look at the Quebec map you will find that there are twenty-three constituencies in Quebec, provincially and federally, which do not conform to municipal boundaries or county boundaries. Take Arthabaska, Brome, Compton, Drummond, Frontenac, Hochelaga, Hull, Jacques Cartier, Kamouraska, Labelle, Lotbiniere, Matane, Megantic, Nicolet, Richmond, Rimouski, Saguenay, Stanstead, and Témiscouata—those counties are not the same as are the municipal counties. Why? Because the Liberal party did not follow that principle. I say that owing to a lack of redistribution made in 1924, a great number of constituencies were left without any quota. The redistribution at this time has to be made complete, and that is what we are doing. It is no crime to depart from municipal boundaries—not at all. I think it fair that we give to the population, irrespective of municipal boundaries, a fair representation in population and in area. It is well known that in arranging the redistribution we had to take into account a great number of circumstances.

The hon. member for Richelieu has dwelt at length with almost every constituency in the vicinity of Montreal. After listening to this gentleman we are supposed to believe that this redistribution is a terrible piece of legislation, that it is a monster, that it is anything that is bad. Well, Mr. Chairman, I say that exactly the contrary is true. If hon. members would look at the map and consider all the circumstances which have to be considered in connection with a redistribution, they will realize that the report of the committee is fair and equitable to every citizen in all parts of the country.

The hon. member has spoken about two new constituencies which were made in the northern part of the province. One has about 21,000 population and the other about 25,000 or 26,000. The two to which he has referred are Lafleche-St. Maurice and Chapleau. If the hon. member would look at the map he would see that Chapleau represents almost one-fifth of the whole area of the province of Quebec.

Mr. CARDIN: One of the areas has a population of 46,000.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Chapleau represents practically one-fifth of the area of the province of Quebec. Its population is not centred in small towns, but is scattered throughout the constituency. I hold that this constituency, which is crossed only by a railway, is entitled to representation. The citizens in that district could not be fairly represented with the map as it previously existed. Anyone who is familiar with the province will admit that some representation should be given to that part of the province. It is a section under colonization. I do not say that the population will increase rapidly but I do say that owing to the area and the population that constituency should have a representative.

The same observations would apply to Lafleche-St. Maurice. It is a very large constituency with a large population. If hon. members would look at the figures they would conclude that a fairly reasonable division has been made. The hon. member has suggested that a change has been made in connection with Three Rivers in order that an easier seat would be made for the hon. member for Three Rivers-St. Maurice (Mr. Bourgeois). But if my hon. friend would consider all the circumstances I believe he would change his mind and come to the conclusion that this redistribution has been fair and equitable.

My hon. friend spoke concerning the divisions in the city of Montreal. Both parties agreed that instead of giving thirteen seats to that city it would be only fair that with a population of over 1,000,000 people it should be entitled to at least sixteen representatives, with a quota of 50,000 to 75,000 representation. My hon. friend asked why a redivision should be made of all the constituencies in the city of Montreal. I hold such a change was absolutely necessary.

Mr. CARDIN: That is not exactly what I said.

Mr. DURANLEAU: We could not add three new seats to Montreal without retouching almost every constituency on the island. My hon. friend's own maps would show the same thing. Hon. members opposite admitted it had to be done. Hon. members say that the constituency of St. Mary has disappeared. Speaking frankly, I do not see anything in that. St. James, St. Mary, Hochelaga and Maisonneuve all have about the same population. It is a population of Canadians with large families, aspirations, people with the same habits. I do not see any crime in making a slight difference in the boundary lines. The only way to do it was to put St. James

and St. Mary in one constituency. I say there was nothing wrong in that. As a matter of fact my hon. friend will admit that we were prepared to meet their wishes. We were prepared to give to St. Mary the very same lines which existed previously, although to my mind it made no difference at all. We were and are still prepared to do that. I say that my hon. friends are now trying to make some political capital out of this matter of redistribution. If I judge correctly from the tone of their speeches made this morning, that would seem to be their object.

My hon. friend spoke also of Outremont. I am glad he brought up this question. When the first draft was made by the committee my hon. friend representing Laurier strenuously objected to the lines of the city of Outremont being changed. Is that right or not?

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): All the division. I wanted Outremont to remain as it was.

Mr. DURANLEAU: That was the wish of my hon. friend. Now that we are reverting to the lines of the city of Outremont, my hon. friend seems to object.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): Will my hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. DURANLEAU: I want to put that question to my hon. friend and when answering he might put his own question. Do I understand that my hon. friend representing Laurier-Outremont is now opposing the line of the city of Outremont? I want to know that, because we can accommodate my hon. friend otherwise. But I say this: if we have reverted to the line of the city of Outremont it is because it was the wish of my hon. friend at first and because it is the wish of a great number of citizens of that part of the constituency.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): The question that I wanted to put to the minister is this: will he explain exactly what is to be done with Montreal? We have heard so many rumours we do not know where we are. If the minister would say now what is to be done to Montreal that might clarify the situation and there might not be any discussion at all.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I do not intend at the present time to give all the details of the redistribution in the island of Montreal, it would take too long. It will come in committee when we discuss each and every constituency in the island of Montreal. But I thought it was the wish of my hon. friend that we should revert to the city lines, and that is what we are doing. Anyway we will come to this point later. Now my hon. friend from Richelieu said: Why touch the lines of the counties in the city of Montreal?

Mr. CARDIN: That is not what I said. My hon. friend ought to be fair. I said: Why change the agreement practically reached before the special committee of what is called the elder statesmen?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Because we did not agree.

Mr. CARDIN: We were satisfied, we agreed.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): We might agree now, but we do not know where we stand.

Mr. DURANLEAU: If you do not know now you will know later on. But I may say our friends in Quebec have changed the boundaries of the counties in the island of Montreal time and again. My hon. friends will remember 1923 when my county of Laurier was cut in half to make a Liberal constituency, which is called to-day the Mercier division.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): That was not federal.

Mr. DURANLEAU: No, but I say our friends opposite did not respect county boundaries at all. They divided the counties to fit their own purposes, their political purposes. It is surprising to see how scandalized and amazed they are to-day because we have made some redistribution to give a fair representation to the population of Quebec.

My hon. friends have dwelt at some length on the new constituency of Chateauguay-Huntingdon and Beauharnois-Laprairie. Well, I suppose my hon. friend will not complain of the fact that we have left Vaudreuil-Soulanges with 21,000 population without any change whatever. I suppose my hon. friend will not object to that?

Mr. DUPUIS: And Laprairie will have to pay for it.

Mr. DURANLEAU: I do not think my hon. friend has studied the situation carefully, when he makes that statement.

Mr. DUPUIS: I know one thing, my riding is cut away.

Mr. DURANLEAU: At first we thought that Beauharnois should be united to Vaudreuil-Soulanges. Of course everyone knows

that Vaudreuil-Soulanges is on the boundary of Ontario, no population can be taken from that side. Vaudreuil-Soulanges have about the same population as Beauharnois; the church interests are the same, their bishop is at Valleyfield, they have their courts at Valleyfield and they go to Valleyfield for their business—

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Not at all. I come from Valleyfield, there is no bridge, there is no communication.

Mr. DURANLEAU: There is a railway bridge.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Two trains a day.

Mr. DURANLEAU: And apart from a little portion on one side of the lake the river St. Lawrence is not very large there, and not deep at all. As a matter of fact we all know—

Mr. CARDIN: You cannot walk across, there is enough water to prevent you walking.

Mr. DURANLEAU: No, but you have the railway bridge.

Mr. POULIOT: Do you see the farmer with his cart crossing on the railway bridge? He would be killed by the train.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend is very cute.

Mr. DUPUIS: The farmer would not be so cute.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Your proposition is more cute.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The proposition was fair, it would give a population of from 40,000 to 42,000. But my hon. friends objected so strenuously that we had to yield and say, all right, we will not touch Vaudreuil-Soulanges. But the committee had to do something with the other constituencies. I admit it was a very difficult task, not because we wanted to make a Conservative constituency, my hon. friends opposite will admit that Vaudreuil-Soulanges is a Liberal constituency, and my hon. friend from Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) will admit that Laprairie and Beauharnois will be a Liberal constituency. I do not think there is any question about that. When my hon. friend speaks of the corridor, I say exactly the contrary; there is a corridor existing now and we are doing away with that corridor by joining Laprairie and Beauharnois. If you take the map you will see that Chateauguay-Huntingdon is on the boundary of the United States, down below.

Mr. DUPUIS: Down below!

Mr. DURANLEAU: Yes, my expression may not be appropriate. I hope my hon. friend will be happier in his expressions when he will address the house. I say that a part of Chateauguay goes as high as the St. Lawrence river perhaps three or four miles or more, while Chateauguay-Huntingdon goes as far as the St. Lawrence river, starting from the United States boundary. The committee thought the only thing to do was to use that strip of land as a connecting link between Beauharnois-Laprairie. It makes a very reasonable constituency. I do not say it is perfect, it is impossible to make things perfect under these circumstances, but they have the population. If you look at the figures you will see that they have a fairly good representation, 41,399. Now you have the national route starting from Montreal to Malone which passes through these two constituencies. As a matter of fact the future representative of Beauharnois-Laprairie will visit his whole constituency in a day on account of that national road. The population of both constituencies have the same habits and the same interests.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): We are not a band of Zulus!

Mr. DURANLEAU: I do not think my hon. friend can object very strenuously to the joining of these constituencies.

Mr. POULIOT: They hear the same things on the radio.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend from Richelieu admits that in these circumstances the joining of those two counties would be accepted, except the removing of St. Etienne and Ste. Barbe from one constituency to another. My hon. friend made a good deal of fuss about those two parishes. Well, I think if you look at the map you will see that these two parishes are on the edge of the constituencies, and the change does not destroy the lines materially.

Mr. CARDIN: The minister is not serious, surely, when he makes that statement.

Mr. DURANLEAU: One of our hon. friends opposite said that since the report of the committee the map of Quebec has been a sort of puzzle. Well, Mr. Chairman, the map of Quebec has been a puzzle for years. My hon. friends had their own way in that province, and I would invite our English-speaking friends from the other provinces to look at the map of Quebec as it was after the redistribution of 1924. The map is nothing but a puzzle, and if you look at the map to-day you will see that it is much better.

Mr. CARDIN: Still worse.

Mr. DURANLEAU: The map is at the disposal of my hon. friends; my hon. friend from Témiscouata knows it very well.

Mr. POULIOT: I know the map by heart, as well as the minister does.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What about the Indian reservation near Caughnawaga? You are getting away with that if you leave it in Beauharnois.

Mr. DURANLEAU: It forms part of Laprairie, and it is not disturbed.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Do those Indians go into Chambly?

Mr. DURANLEAU: No, not at all. I will come to that in a moment; there is nothing extraordinary about my own constituency. My hon. friend from Richelieu said there was only one thing to do, and that was to join Beauharnois with Chateauguay-Huntingdon.

Mr. CARDIN: I did not say that.

Mr. DURANLEAU: That was what I understood; if I am wrong I should like to be corrected.

Mr. CARDIN: I said that could be done.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend admitted that it would be quite proper.

Mr. CARDIN: No, I said it could be done; geographically that would be the best thing, but there are other objections.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend will admit that if this had been done it would have been a departure from the principle that, so far as possible, we should protect the seats of the minority.

Mr. CARDIN: I said that.

Mr. DURANLEAU: If Beauharnois had been joined to Chateauguay-Huntingdon it would have nullified the chances of an English candidate in that constituency.

Mr. CARDIN: That was one of the objections I mentioned as against the geographical advantages.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend made particular reference to the division of Chambly-Rouville and St. Hyacinthe and Richelieu. That was also a very difficult problem with regard to population. As my hon. friend knows, Richelieu had a representation of only 21,000. Surely we could not have Vaudreuil-Soulanges with a population of only 21,000 and Richelieu with the same population as well, so the committee thought that a division should be made in order to give a fair representation in population to Richelieu. This is why the larger part of Vercheres was joined to Richelieu. My hon. friend says the member for Chambly-Vercheres was not satisfied with the citizens of Vercheres. I can tell my hon. friend that I have more friends in Vercheres to-day than in any other part of the province; I have no better friends than those in Vercheres. The committee did not only consider the interests of the member; we had to give fair representation according to population, and that is why the committee thought a part of Vercheres should be added to Richelieu.

My hon. friend went to to say that a part of Laprairie was also added to Chambly. I am afraid my hon. friend does not know the conditions existing there. As a matter of fact that was done against my wish. The committee asked me if I would consent to take a strip of land in Laprairie because the population of St. Lambert and Greenfield Park, which are two cities on the bounaries of Laprairie, had overflowed. This overflow formed part of Greenfield Park and St. Lambert so far as religious purposes and other interests are concerned, as a matter of fact a part of this population is called St. Lambert annex. I was asked, and the committee was asked by some citizens of that locality, if there would be any objection to joining this little strip of land to the population of St. Lambert and Greenfield Park because as a matter of fact they had nothing to do with Laprairie except to pay taxes there. All their relations were with St. Lambert and Greenfield Park. I said I had no objection, but personally I do not care whether or not I keep that part of Laprairie that is added to Chambly.

Mr. DUPUIS: Will the minister allow me a question? Who gave him this information that these people had nothing to do with Laprairie?

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend will have to ask the committee about that, but I know that someone representing that population came to the committee and asked if this would not be advisable. The population only numbers a little over 700, so it is not very important. They claim that all their relations are with St. Lambert and with Greenfield Park.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Shaver): The hon. gentleman has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. CARDIN: I think the committee had better let me finish to-day and get rid of me. I have only a very few observations to make in order to complete what I have to say, and I think it would be better to finish my

remarks now. When I was reminded that I had spoken for forty minutes I was dealing with the counties of L'Assomption, Montcalm, Joliette and Terrebonne. My point was that there was no reason for destroying the present county of L'Assomption-Montcalm and that if there was any justification for increasing the population in the county of Joliette we might as well add the counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm to the county of Joliette. I understand that would make a total population of a little over 50,000, but this is no great objection when we see that many other constituencies have representations of 50,000 or more. An intimation came from the other side of the house that the Conservative party was ready to accept the suggestion and join the three counties of L'Assomption, Montcalm and Joliette. If this was a clear understanding certainly there would be no objection, but with that suggestion from the other side came certain other conditions. These other conditions were that the present Postmaster General should retain the supposed advantages he is getting from the bill now before the house. The Postmaster General is asking that the town of Ste. Therese in the county of Terrebonne and St. Janvier also in the county of Terrebonne be added to the county of Two Mountains, and that the three parishes of Pont Viau, Laval des Rapides and L'Abord a Plouffe, which are at the present time in the county of Two Mountains be transferred to the county of Mercier. We object to that, but if the question with regard to L'Assomption, Montcalm and Joliette can be decided without regard to these requests from the Postmaster General we will agree. We cannot however agree to the proposal to allow the Postmaster General to take from the county of Terrebonne two municipalities and throw from the county of Two Mountains three municipalities in the county of Mercier. We cannot accept that.

I contend that the county of Two Mountains, being a small constituency, should be increased rather than reduced. It is true that by adding St. Janvier and Ste. Therese you would increase somewhat the population of Two Mountains, but by throwing out of Two Mountains Laval des Rapides and L'Abord a Plouffe you are reducing the two counties to that extent. Why change the boundaries of that county?

There is also the county of Argenteuil, which is a small constituency.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Would not my hon. friend admit that these three parishes on the other side of the bridge practically form part of the island of Montreal?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DURANLEAU: Are not the residents of these three parishes almost all citizens of Montreal—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. DURANLEAU: —having their place of business in Montreal.

Mr. CARDIN: That is not the case. These municipalities have formed part of the county of Two Mountains for years.

Mr. DURANLEAU: But now there is the overflow in Montreal.

Mr. CARDIN: You object to taking into the county of Nicolet and Yamaska the western section of the village of Yamaska because there is the river of Yamaska, and now you want to throw across Riviere des Prairies the three parishes I have mentioned and which are now in Two Mountains. If you wish to keep Yamaska river as the boundary in one case, you ought to keep Riviere des Prairies as the boundary in the other, as it has been for years. These municipalities are not inhabited by citizens of Montreal; they are municipalities and centres by themselves and the population lives there the year round. There is no comparison between these three centres and other centres along lake St. Louis in the county of Jacques Cartier. These people are summer residents, in the section of Dorval and along St. Louis in the constituency of Jacques Cartier; but L'Abord a Plouffe and Laval des Rapides have always been in the county of Two Mountains, and there is no more objection to their being in the county of Two Mountains because they are small villages than there is to the town of Ste. Therese. If the minister wants to discard these centres because they are villages, why does the Postmaster General want to take Ste. Therese from the county of Terrebonne and place it in the county of Two Mountains? In my opinion there is no justification for such a proposal.

The proposal before us now is to increase the county of Argenteuil, which at the present time—

An hon. MEMBER: It has been settled this afternoon.

Mr. CARDIN: I am not speaking of what has transpired since negotiations took place. In the bill before us it is suggested that the county of Argenteuil should be increased by taking the southeast corner of the county of Labelle and transferring it into the county of Argenteuil, building up the population from 18,000 to about 28,000 in the

county of Argenteuil. But there is no need to destroy the county of Labelle as it exists. That county should remain as it is. There is no reason for making such a change. The population of the county of Labelle is not very large, but it is larger than the population of surrounding counties, and if the county of Labelle is large enough, the county of Argenteuil being a small county, why arrange matters in such a way that, instead of having a large county and a small one, we shall have two small counties now? If you take that part of the county of Labelle and place it in the county of Argenteuil, Argenteuil will still be a small county and you will only make the county of Labelle smaller than it is at present. There is no reason for such a change. It would be easy to make adjustments in Argenteuil. It could be joined to Terrebonne, which would be logical. The more logical step to take, from the point of view of population and boundaries, would be to join Argenteuil to Two Mountains; they are two small counties. But I am fair enough to recognize that it is probably asking too much to propose that you place two ministers together, one in front of the other. Throwing the hon. member for Argenteuil into a fight with the Postmaster General would be logical, taking into consideration the constituencies, the boundary lines and the population; but it might not be fair so far as personal feelings are concerned. Therefore I do not insist on that. I mention it only to show what would be the more logical thing to do, joining two counties that have not sufficient population if they remain as they are. You might also join the county of Two Mountains and the county of Terrebonne; that would be much more logical than joining L'Assomption and Terrebonne. There are many ways whereby the difficulty might be adjusted. I will go further. If the government is ready to join together L'Assomption, Montcalm and Joliette, I am prepared to leave all the other constituencies in that vicinity undisturbed—no change in Terrebonne, no change in Two Mountains, no change in Argenteuil, no change in the county of Labelle. So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon leave the county of Argenteuil as it is; it is an English speaking constituency with a population of 18,000, and I would just as soon have it that way as with 25,000 or 26,000 or even 28,000 because it would still be a small constituency. It would still be too small a constituency and any readjustment in population would not improve matters very much.

I think we could all agree and leave the rest of the northern section of the province as it is. That would be a very satisfactory settlement. I would not be afraid to have in the province of Quebec certain constituencies where the population was below the required number. It would not matter very much because whatever we do we cannot equalize the population in that province. That is impossible, so what is the use of carving out of a constituency a certain number of parishes in order to increase the adjoining constituency by a small number? The result is that even with the addition, the population has not been brought up to the number required by the last census. What is the use of disturbing all the harmony which has existed in that section of the province in order to achieve a result which is not better than the present situation? Let, if you will, Joliette have a population of 51,000, and do not disturb the rest. I think that compromise could be accepted.

This completes my poor observations and I ask to be pardoned for having spoken so long with regard to this matter. I may have something to say later on but I want to conclude with the expression of a thought which is very deep in my heart, that we should be capable of doing better than has been done by this bill. We should be capable of stopping this disgraceful fight about small things which are not going to mean very much or have a very great significance when we place our arguments before the electors of the province of Quebec. I hate to see the province of Quebec made the subject of such criticism and such fighting. According to the information I have received, this will be the only province in which there will be a bitter fight to the end. Concessions have been made by the government in other provinces in order to reach an agreement and avoid disgraceful discussion in the House of Commons. Why are our Conservative friends from the province of Quebec not ready to make some concessions and put a little water in their wine in order that our province may not be held up as a disgrace? Why should we show the public that we are incapable of understanding, why should we fight over little things like the taking of a parish of less than 200 out of the county of Huntingdon, or a parish of a few hundred out of the county of Beauharnois? These are small things when compared with the problems with which the Prime Minister has to deal. A few parishes have been taken out of the county of Nicolet and put into the riding of Lotbiniere in order to make the former a safer ground for a Conservative candidate. It is considered that he would have a better chance but how does that com-

pare with the problems which we have to solve in these times of difficulty? What is that compared to the good reputation of the province of Quebec? These small matters could be disposed of and the bill could be corrected with five strokes of the pen. This could be done if we were reasonable on all sides and if our friends were willing to make legitimate concessions. I feel sure in the bottom of my heart that we can agree. Why should such a poor example be set for all the other provinces of Canada? Sacrifices have been made there by both sides of politics but in the province of Quebec we cannot agree.

Our friends on the other side want to take a small parish from Huntingdon to place it in Beauharnois; they want to put certain parishes in Chateauguay-Huntingdon and they want to take the Liberal parishes from Richmond-Wolfe and put them in Megantic. I think I can see my way clear to speak for the hon. member for Richmond-Wolfe (Mr. Laflèche) and say that they will make a compromise. There is a difference only of five or six parishes. I would be willing to cut that difference in two and give my hon. friend some satisfaction. I would do the same thing with the six parishes in Nicolet which it is proposed shall be thrown into Lotbiniere. I would be willing to make a sacrifice of three and possibly four in order to reach an agreement. These are some of the sacrifices I would be willing to make as a Liberal and as the leader of a very small section of the province of Quebec. I am ready to make these concessions in order to avoid the disgrace which is going to fall on the province of Quebec because we cannot agree.

Very serious sacrifices have been made in the province of Ontario in order to solve the difficulties there. I know it has not been an easy matter to have certain counties in Ontario kept as they are; I know it has been a very hard job for the hon. members who got together to keep the constituencies as they exist at the present time, but sacrifices have been made by the English speaking colleagues of the French ministers. I am told that sacrifices have been made in the face of protests and objections which have been raised. They have decided to agree and now the province of Quebec is the only province which has not agreed. Why? Because the French Canadian ministers and certain French representatives on the other side of the house want to carve out constituencies and change the boundaries of counties in which they were elected in 1930 by very substantial majorities. Why should we not all be men enough to stop these petty criticisms? It is all very well to say that we have had our way for forty years, but that did not prevent hon. gentlemen opposite from being elected. The supposed gerrymandering which took place at the last redistribution did not prevent the Minister of Marine being elected in Chambly-Vercheres. It did not prevent the Postmaster General and other French members now sitting on the other side being elected. This supposed gerrymander could not have been so bad because they were elected in spite of it.

Let them have the courage to go back before the electors who sent them here and whose mandate they have exercised in this house. Let them take a lesson from the man they call their god, from their leader the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) and not go to him as they are at the present time with a stuttering and shivering prayer asking that they be taken out of the constituencies which have elected them and be given safer seats made by the carving up of other constituencies. I have never been so seriously convinced as I am at the present time that the answer of the Prime Minister will be: Young men, take courage, because fear has never spelled victory for any man or any party.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I have listened very patiently every minute of every hour of yesterday and all of to-day to the arguments that have been made in this house against the bill which is now before this committee for consideration. I have endeavoured to approach the problems dispassionately, but there are certain facts that cannot be overlooked and one would be indeed an unfair and unjust man who would not recognize them. Redistribution in its very nature is a task that has always invoked passions in the House of Commons, sometimes in a moderate and sometimes in a most immoderate way; sometimes because there has been a frank recognition on the part of all parties that an effort is being made to take advantage of redistribution for political purposes; at other times for other reasons.

Let me remind the committee that in the days of the first prime minister of this country there were great difficulties about redistribution and that the leader of the opposition who finally succeeded in destroying the Conservative party in 1896, pledged his party that if he came into power, an effort would be made to have a redistribution effected by a committee of the house. As a matter of fact, the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was

responsible for one redistribution and one only, in 1903. The census was taken in 1901 and the redistribution was made in 1903. Being curious to ascertain whether there was that measure of perfection that we might expect because a parliamentary committee had been set up, I took the trouble to turn up the journals of the house and it is amazing to find just what those journals disclose. At page 87 of the journals for 1903, there is the following entry:

Ordered, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier have leave to bring in a bill to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

He accordingly presented the said bill to the house, and the same was received and read the first time; and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

On a further page there is the entry of the second reading of the bill and the setting up of a committee which was established for the purpose of determining what the boundaries should be. That, I am sure, was regarded as a reasonably fair committee. It consisted of Messieurs Fitzpatrick, Sutherland (Oxford), Hyman, Davis, Borden (Halifax), Haggart and Monk, with instructions to prepare schedules. But before the committee was set up and second reading was given to the bill, a debate arose as to the interpretation to be placed upon the British North America Act and a division occurred, the question being whether there should be referred to the courts the issue as to the legal interpretation to be placed upon the act. That the government defeated by 72 votes to 37.

The committee did its work and if those who may be interested will take the trouble to turn to page 575 of the journals of that year, they will find that not only were there profound differences in the house, but they were expressed in terms of motions on the third reading in which motions the principles declared for by Mr. Borden in the committee—and the details will be found at page 576—were voted upon in the house again on third reading, the vote being 28 to 65. The principles that Mr. Borden in the committee asked to have passed, one might well have thought, after listening to what has been said here by the opposition, during the last two days, had been declared by them. I mention that because it must be apparent to every thoughtful man in the house that those out of power always charge those in power with failing to apply what they conceive to be the correct principles for redistribution; and those in power declare that they are applying the principles which their opponents applied when they were in power. That is the situation. There were five or six divisions on the third reading, but I will read only two or three. The first resolution, as it appears on page 575 of the issue of the journals for September 25, 1903, was moved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and seconded by Sir William Mulock, that the bill be now read the third time. Mr. Haggart moved, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Kaulbach, that it be recommitted to the whole house for the purpose of rearranging the schedules in accordance with the principles laid down by Mr. Borden to the select committee. Those principles are:

(a) The municipal county boundaries shall be those as set forth in chapter 3, revised statutes of Ontario, 1897, and the word "county" herein shall include any provisional county or territorial district established by the said act.

(b) The separate representation to be allotted to the city of Toronto shall first be fixed and determined before proceeding with the representation of the rural constituencies.

(c) The unit of representation for such rural and city constituencies shall be determined by deducting from the total population of Ontario the population of the city of Toronto and by dividing the remainder by the total number of seats to be allotted to such rural and city constituencies.

(d) The population of any city receiving separate representation shall be excluded in computing the population of the county within which it is situate.

(e) The redistribution of the representation of Ontario shall then be determined as follows:

Then they follow setting forth what counties should be entitled to one member, two members and three members, the maximum rising to 82,000 and making the sum total, after the application of those principles, of 86 members for the entire province.

Then came the question of Prince Edward Island, with a motion and an amendment as to that; then an amendment with respect to Manitoba where the whole schedule was to be dealt with. Finally, on those divisions the redistribution bill was passed. That is the only redistribution bill with which the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to deal.

In 1914 the government of Sir Robert Borden had to deal with redistribution. There was set up a select committee which consisted of a larger number of members having regard to the increased size of the house. A debate took place on the second reading and finally a committee was set up consisting of Messieurs Beland, Bennett (Calgary), Buchanan, Macdonald, Pardee, Pelletier, Reid (Grenville), Rhodes and Rogers. Three of the members of that committee are still in the house, and at least one, if not two, of them are members of the other chamber. That was on Febru-

ary 9, 1914. As the hon. member for Richelieu has just said, that committee took a long time over its deliberations. Finally it made a report which is found at page 673 of the journals for that year. It will be observed that that committee did not arrive at unanimity, but it made a report, the second part of which reads:

Your committee have prepared and unanimously agreed to report upon the description and the return of members contained in the several electoral divisions, which are set forth in the schedules hereto appended, in respect to the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon territory, and upon the description and the return of the several electoral divisions which are set forth in the schedule hereto appended, in respect to the province of Nova Scotia, with the exception of that portion of the last named schedule which relates to the return of two members for the proposed united counties of South Cape Breton and Richmond, in the province of Nova Scotia, to which a majority of your committee have agreed.

Then followed provisions with respect to Prince Edward Island which had the result, in the end, of an amendment to the British North America Act whereby it was provided the total representation in the House of Commons of any province should not fall below its representation in the Senate. The bill passed, as I say, without amendment. A short time was taken to consider it, some slight amendments were made, and at page 726, on June 12, it was ordered that the bill be read a third time. It was read a third time, without amendment.

Then came the redistribution of 1924. That there were serious differences in 1924 need not be questioned. That in the end they arrived at what might be regarded as a half compromise is quite apparent, because the bill having been introduced on March 3, 1924, it was given its second reading and referred to a second committee on March 25. I am leaving out the fact that in 1923 the then government endeavoured to pass a redistribution bill. A committee was set up and failed to arrive at a conclusion. In the last minutes of the session the bill was abandoned and set over until 1924.

In 1924 the special committee was set up, and made its first report. The chairman of the committee was the Hon. E. M. Macdonald, Pictou county. Later they prepared a report which is found in the journals of the house of July 11, 1924, at page 546. I direct attention to the fact that the suggestion has been made that this legislation is being pressed in the closing days of the session. As a matter of fact in 1924 it was dealt with on the last two days of the session, and part of the third; that was all. I mention that only in passing, because I suggest it is not proper to charge that because we are dealing with the bill in the closing days of the session it is part of a deliberate plan. However, about that I shall say something later. The committee will pardon me if I direct attention to the words of the report.

Mr. Macdonald (Pictou), from the special committee to whom was referred Bill 2, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, with instructions to prepare schedules to contain and describe the several electoral divisions entitled to return members to this house and to report the same, prescribed the second report of the said committee which is as follows:

Your committee have prepared and unanimously agreed upon the description and the return of members contained in the several electoral divisions, which are set forth in the schedules hereto appended, in respect to the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon territory, and upon the description and the return of members contained in the several electoral divisions which are set forth in the schedules hereto appended, in respect to the province of Ontario, with the exception of the electoral divisions of South Hastings, West Peterborough, Hastings-Peterborough, and Fort William in the said province to which a majority of your committee have agreed.

Your committee have also considered section 4 of the said bill and have unanimously agreed to recommend that the said section be amended. The proposed amendment is appended to this report, and submitted with the several schedules for the consideration of the house.

Some slight changes were made in the Senate with respect to the language of the bill. The words "Missisquoi-Brome" were deleted and for them were substituted the words "Brome-Missisquoi," that being strongly but unsuccessfully advocated in this chamber by Mr. McMaster.

Let us pause for a moment, endeavouring if possible to be perfectly fair in this matter, and look at the position of the parties in this house, bearing in mind the conditions which existed in the province of Quebec. Let us for a moment look at what the position was in 1921. There were elected to this house from the province of Quebec sixty-five Liberals —see page 316 of the Parliamentary Guide— Conservatives none. So it would appear that when the redistribution was made the Conservative party was without representation in this chamber from the province of Quebec. Behold the result. In the succeeding election, notwithstanding the fact that the Conservative party polled between forty per cent and

forty-five per cent of the entire votes, they did not elect any candidates. I ask this committee if that, in itself, does not give cause for thought. I am endeavouring to be as fair as a man can who has had some little legal training, and I shall stick to a recital of the facts. Will any judge say that the fact I have recited would not, in itself, give cause for thought? Does it not cause every thoughtful man in this house just to ponder a moment on the situation?

Then in 1931 we have another census, and in 1933 we set up a committee. It was a committee which, I submit, must be regarded as a fair and reasonable committee of this house. It was selected after a great deal of care and attention had been given to the matter. From British Columbia there were Mr. Barber and Mr. Reid—I believe I am departing from the strict rules of the house by mentioning names. From Alberta there was a parliamentarian of long experience, the Hon. Charles Stewart, together with Doctor Stanley of Calgary and Mr. Kennedy of Peace River. From Saskatchewan there were Mr. Turnbull and Mr. Totzke; from Manitoba there were Mr. Burns, Mr. Beaubien and Mr. Heaps. From Ontario, there was, Hon. H. A. Stewart, who became chairman of the committee; Hon. Mr. Manion, succeeded by Doctor Cotnam; Mr. MacNicol and Hon. Mr. Elliott, a former minister of the crown; from Quebec there were Mr. Dorion, Mr. Gobeil and Mr. Mercier of Laurier-Outremont. From New Brunswick there was Mr. Bell; from Nova Scotia, Mr. Ilsley and Mr. Smith of Cumberland. As there was no change possible in Prince Edward Island no member from that province was placed on the committee.

I ask members of this committee if those members were not representative of the different parts of Canada. Is that not reasonable representation? Is that not a reasonable cross-section of this house, for the purpose of arriving at a conclusion? On November 25, this committee was appointed. I made it my business—myself—to have sent to each member of the committee information which had been prepared in the bureau of statistics for the purpose of enabling the committee during the recess to obtain a reasonably fair appreciation of the problems with which they had to deal.

At the threshold of inquiry you have to determine the unit of representation upon which redistribution shall be made. If hon. members who are interested would turn to page 3 of the information prepared by the bureau of statistics they would find these words:

> Unit of representation: While the number of the members of the House of Commons has been growing steadily since confederation, the unit of representation—one-sixty-fifth of the population of Quebec within its boundaries prior to the 1912 extension—has also been increased after each census in consequence of the expanding population of Quebec. The units of representation as shown by the seven decennial censuses taken since confederation, are as follows: 1871, 18,331 persons; 1881, 20,908; 1891, 22,901; 1901, 25,368; 1911, 30,819; 1921, 36,283; 1931, 44,186.

Thus you have in the province of Quebec a more difficult task than you would have ordinarily in other provinces because of its unit of representation being 44,186 and there being 65 members—no increase and no decrease—you have a complex problem; as the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin) very properly said to-day, a very much more complex problem to deal with than otherwise would be the case.

But the problem has become complicated in two of the largest older provinces by reason of another circumstance, namely the steady trend of population from rural to urban centres. That fact you will find dealt with on page 6 of the information sent out to the members. I will only point out that the entire rural population of the Dominion of Canada in 1931 was 4,804,728 and the urban population 5,572,058; in other words the percentage of rural population in 1931 was 46·30 and urban population 53.70, a change since 1921 from 50·48 rural and 49·52 urban. Now bearing in mind the increased urban population I ask the committee to be good enough to look with me for a moment at just what the situation was with respect to that great centre of population, the island of Montreal. The entire population of Quebec in 1931 was 2,874,255, and of that number 1,060,649 was rural and 1,813,606 was urban. Now let us turn for a moment to the island of Montreal. If the committee will be good enough to turn to page 26 it will be found that the island of Montreal had a population of 1,003,868 souls. I wonder if it has ever occurred to the members of this committee that that is within 57,000 of the entire rural population of the province of Quebec. Imagine the difficulties that confronted the committee—sixty-five seats in the province of Quebec, 1,004,000 people, in round numbers, on the island of Montreal, and 1,060,000, in round numbers, of rural population in the entire province. The committee, confronted with that difficulty, together with a unit of representation of 44,000, realized of course

that what could be said with respect to Montreal could be said—with less force, it is true—with respect to Toronto and the rural portions of the province of Ontario.

The committee endeavoured to deal with that problem. Every word that was said yesterday by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott), the former Minister of Public Works, represented the appeal that was made from time to time to that committee not to overlook the rural population. The hon. member for West Middlesex pleaded that there should be no dealing with this matter on a hard and fast mathematical and mechanical rule whereby the representation of the rural population would be so sadly cut down. What was said this morning by the former Minister of Marine, reechoing in part what was said by the former Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Malcolm), indicates that if a hard and fast mechanical rule, a purely mathematical rule, is applied, not only will there be departure from county boundaries and municipal and parish lines, but such confusion will be caused by the carving out of constituencies in conformity with mathematical requirements as to bring about a condition which will be at least offensive to the people of the province of Quebec. Yesterday we were reminded that there were large differences in population in some of the counties in Ontario; that one county had 83,000 and another 26,000, one 30,000, another 55,000 and another 75,000. Everything said by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm) was said before the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier came into power. The very same considerations were urged. But once in power there has not yet arisen in this country any committee prepared to disregard county boundaries and municipal lines in the provinces. The very plea made in this house by hon. members from Quebec, the very plea made by the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) this morning, pointing out how people become attached to their county, become attached to their county town, become attached to their market town as part of their constituency—everyone knows that is so. Yet I believe that what the former Minister of Marine said is true; after listening to everything that has been said, after looking at the figures as carefully as one can, I am convinced that the time must come when parliament must be prepared to apply a different rule with respect to some of these smaller seats in all parts of Canada than has been heretofore applied. The ex-Minister of Trade and Commerce was perfectly fair when he said yesterday that the blame does not attach to the committee. He said it attaches to all members of the house, because every representation made to the members, the friendly members of the committee, by the members of this chamber constituted an effort to maintain the status quo. There is no doubt about that. I was struck by the force of what the former Minister of Trade and Commerce said in that regard, because it represented the conviction I had arrived at—and I am going to explain in a moment what my position has been with respect to this redistribution measure. Having seen a committee set up, a committee in which I had confidence, I believed it was not my duty to say to the chairman or any members of it that you should do thus or so with respect to particular areas. I could not tell you to-day definitely what are the boundaries of my own constituency of West Calgary. Doctor Stanley spoke to me from time to time, and I said: Whatever conclusion you arrive at is entirely satisfactory to me. And that represents my position now.

Confronting that problem I put this to my hon. friends opposite; I say to you: Gentlemen, for forty years or more you have been responsible for the boundaries of counties in the provincial legislature and for the distribution as it now stands. There is only one thing I should like to say with regard to the admirable observations made by the former Minister of Marine in some parts of his speech, and that is this, that he cannot have read very carefully this book or he would have observed that the county lines have been departed from in the existing distribution. For instance, Dorchester comprises parts of three counties as the counties are defined by the provincial legislature, and if you will take the list and look at the second word, that is the county name, and the population of the county, you will find that the variation between the county population and the electoral division population represents the extent to which county boundaries have not been followed in Quebec. What is true in Quebec is true in other parts of Canada also. I do not allege for a moment, and I do not think it necessary to do so, that in 1924 or in 1903 men so lost their sense of fairness as to desire to do what was unjust and unreasonable to their fellow members. I do not charge that at all, but knowing human nature as I do and knowing the instincts that govern men with respect to political matters I do say that I am perfectly clear that when there was a favour possible by doing a thing in

one of two ways, with either way just and proper, they would choose that method which gave the greatest benefit to themselves and their friends. Is there any doubt about that? What have we here to-day? The closing appeal of the former Minister of Marine is one which cannot be lightly disregarded in this chamber, but what have we listened to for a day? We have had statements that something was done this way instead of that way; that is what it gets down to, that instead of doing it the way you want it done we have done it the way we want it done. Had there been any voice to raise in this house in 1924—unfortunately there was not—exactly the same thing would have been said. I do say to this committee, sir, that on Saturday last I asked to see the old and new maps of the province of Quebec. Having heard all that I had heard in this house, with the charges that had been made, as man to man I can say frankly that I was amazed when I saw the map that had been prepared. I found that the map of 1924 contained all these jogs, these little differences and variations in order to effectuate what was regarded as a fair redistribution. Then when I took the map of 1933 and looked at the boundaries there shown I saw exactly the same sort of thing, varied, it is true, to meet the changed conditions of population. Undoubtedly where two courses were open our friends chose the course that was more helpful to them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course, just as in 1924 the course chosen was the one more favourable to the party then in power. Now it gets down to a contest as to the acceptance of your plan, under a given contingency, or the plan of the committee under a given contingency; that is the fact. If I may be allowed to say so, when this committee of elder statesmen met, about which I shall have something to say presently, it was amazing how the number of complaints narrowed themselves down to so few, and some of those were capable of simple adjustment. It became apparent, however, that as soon as one point was yielded the whole thing stopped and started all over again. It was just as the former Minister of Trade and Commerce said yesterday; every member was playing his own hand in his desire to secure his own position. As soon as he found that some change had been made to meet a certain condition he thought, "Well, I must have my way too," and the result was that we were getting nowhere.

That was the reason I said to the house the other evening that we had reached agreements with regard to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba. There was very little disagreement with regard to British Columbia; that has been adjusted and the agreement has been signed. The disagreement in Alberta is slight, nothing that I conceive to be very serious, and in the two older provinces and Saskatchewan, to which I shall refer presently, the disagreements were more serious. What do the disputes narrow themselves down to? Simply the complaint that in order to meet a situation that was real—and it has been admitted to be real, for the reasons I have given and for the reasons mentioned by the former Minister of Marine—and in the effort to adjust those actualities of population, of convenience and of the desire, as I have said, to cause as little friction and disturb existing conditions as little as possible, a certain course has been chosen. Some hon. gentlemen say it is highly immoral that these choices should be made in the way they have. The answer given by the committee is this: "We have chosen these because in our opinion these were the most convenient changes to make, and the least inconvenient to all parties concerned." That is the old province of Quebec, and I do not think anyone will say that I have not stated the facts just as they are. I have set them before the committee, not in malice; I have not overstated anything and I am certain that I have not understated the position from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Under those circumstances I wholly agree with what was said by the former Minister of Marine. He made a very earnest appeal for agreement and accommodation but I must remind him that appeals such as his, unless evidenced by conduct, are as faith without works, which is dead. That is the difficulty. However willing he might be to yield on this or that point the committee finds itself up against an absolute stone wall when it asks that those concessions be made that would at least indicate a reasonable willingness for accommodation. I am not going to traverse all these various constituencies, though I have taken the trouble to go into them with some care. For instance, I find that the basis of population around the city of Quebec now has been equalized within a few hundred, and it is said that this has been done with the least inconvenience to the people affected. It is perfectly clear that the population does not average more than 30,000 per riding in that territory; it is perfectly clear that the unit of representation throughout Canada is 44,000, but I for one believe that in this country at this time it is desirable that we

should not treat the rural population on an entirely different basis from that which has prevailed hitherto, by making the absolute unit of population 44,000, which would have the effect of cutting down the seats outside the island of Montreal and the cities to a point that in one sense would be almost negligible. In the very nature of things you cannot apply the same tests in the rural portions of the country that you can apply in the cities, and this committee has not endeavoured to do so.

Without going into the details, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have not yet reached the point where I believe that human nature is so constituted that those who for the moment are out of power are unwilling to recognize that fact. In all sincerity may I say that while the Liberal party is in the ascendancy provincially, and federally in point of the number of members from the province of Quebec, in this parliament there happens to be in power a Conservative administration. Is it not fair to say that hon. gentlemen opposite must recognize that fact, and to recognize the further fact that when a choice has to be made in one of two given ways you must expect that choice to be made in the way that will be most advantageous to the party in power. Is that unfair? Is that not what has always happened in regard to anything? I do appeal to those who sit to the left of the Speaker to recognize that fact with regard to the province of Quebec. I think I understand something of their point of view. I know it is not always easy to reconcile one's self to a fact; it is not always easy to become reconciled to a fact when it is believed that the fact never should have been. But just let me quote one line, if I may, from what Sir William Harcourt said away back in 1882, when Gladstone was moving his measure of closure in the British house:

> It is essential to secure to a majority the right to prevail which lies at the bottom of parliamentary institutions. To recognize in one-third or one-quarter of the house an absolute right to postpone indefinitely the decision of a question is, in my judgment, to give a formal consecration to the principle of obstruction. Why is it to be assumed that the minority will not abuse their veto when it is taken for granted that the majority will abuse their clôture?

These were the words of Sir William Harcourt, who at least was the spokesman for a great school of thought of which Gladstone was the chief, when he was introducing his measure of closure.

I have endeavoured to approach this question not from a partisan point of view, and I suggest to those members of this committee who, representing the majority of deputies from the province of Quebec, represent also the opposition, or the party that sits to the left of the Speaker in this chamber, that any little inconsistencies or incongruities, or anomalies that appear in the bill can easily be ironed out without any difficulty in the world.

I was struck this morning with the observations made by the former Minister of Justice. He denounced in unmeasured terms what he conceived to be, as he said, a gerrymander; yet the very illustrations he gave were illustrations which in my judgment proved that a continuance of the condition that now exists would be the perpetuation of an unfair distribution of seats, having regard to population and what followed from the redistribution of 1924. That is all I have to say at the moment with respect to the province of Quebec except to say that, so far as the island of Montreal is concerned, we are faced with a difficulty of the first magnitude. The entire population of that island, I repeat, is equal to the rural population of the province of Quebec less 57,000; and if you accorded to them representation by population they would be entitled to one-tenth practically of the entire representation in this house, which would be 24 seats. The committee have said that 16 seats amply represent what is fair and just with respect to the island of Montreal, and that leaves 49 seats to be distributed between the rural and urban population in the rest of the province of Quebec. Now, the committee have earnestly striven, as everyone can see, not unnecessarily to eliminate seats at this time, not unnecessarily to disturb existing conditions in the rural communities—because the population in many of these counties fell below 30,000, and in some instances below 25,000—but to maintain them, some of them being, I repeat, as strongly Liberal seats as one could possibly find. The committee endeavoured to retain them, having striven to assert this principle, that you could not apply the unit system of 44,000 mathematically to the rural population of that province.

I turn now for a moment to the province of Ontario. There you have the great city of Toronto with its surrounding territory. The population is something less than a million souls. They have necessarily increased the population of that section of Ontario, and you have the same problem which you had in the province of Quebec. The question is: Shall you, as the ex-Minister of Trade and Commerce suggested, just simply say, "There is the unit of population of 44,000; let us go out and ruthlessly apply that mathematically to the whole province of Ontario."

Mr. MALCOLM: I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT: That was the sense of it.

Mr. MALCOLM: No.

Mr. BENNETT: It meant nothing else.

Mr. MALCOLM: Oh no.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. gentleman will read his words—

Mr. MALCOLM: I have; I have read them to-day.

Mr. BENNETT: —he will find that he put forward the idea that population must be the governing factor.

Mr. MALCOLM: I mentioned two exceptions.

Mr. BENNETT: What are they?

Mr. MALCOLM: I know the Prime Minister does not want to be unfair. I mentioned especially the fact that the small percentage of voters in a city did not justify the unit of population being the same—the small percentage of people polling their votes.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman, then, made the distinction that in the city, where apparently they thought it unnecessary to go to the polls—

Mr. MALCOLM: They apparently did not go to the polls.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, the answer to that is that, in the illustrations which the hon. gentleman gave, the people were so certain of the result that they did not think it necessary to go to the polls.

Mr. MALCOLM: That may be.

Mr. BENNETT: That seemed to be the case which the hon. gentleman selected for the purpose of illustration. I will not discuss this afternoon the question of compulsory voting; that will have to be done some other time. I do say however that if you applied the rule of dividing the population of the province of Ontario, outside the great cities, by 44,000 and saying, "There are your seats," you would create complete chaos and dissatisfaction throughout that province, because in that province you have the same situation that exists in the province of Quebec.

The committee have certainly not been governed by political considerations in Ontario. I know exactly what the hon. member for North Bruce contends. I know—at least I have been told, because it is only hearsay and one cannot say one knows—of the difficulties in connection with Southeast Grey and the taking of certain portions of a constituency and putting them in that rather than another. All these are matters of detail, but the great principle is that in the rural part of Ontario there has been no application of the rule I have referred to, namely, the division of the population by 44,000. Not only has there been no effort to do that, but because it has not been done you have in Welland to-day 83,000 people represented by one member, just as they were at confederation in that constituency. That cannot be said to be fair; and yet, if you endeavoured to apply the 44,000 rule and set about doing so, you would so disorganize the whole rural population of Ontario as to create a condition not only of dissatisfaction but of chaos. I would point out that the very principles which in 1903 were moved for on the third reading of the redistribution bill—the first redistribution bill of the Liberal party—were principles such as are now asserted by the opposition here. But when the government of Sir Robert Borden were charged with the responsibility of redistribution they realized that you could not apply these principles, and the committee unanimously arrived at this conclusion: You had here a small constituency and there a large one; you had county boundaries, municipal lines, the convenience of a great population, and in some instances the historic and traditional circumstances connected with the riding itself. This committee have not departed from that; if they did, it would be such a radical and complete change applied to the dominion that I do not believe that this house would adopt any such redistribution measure. I do not believe that any government which this country has ever seen could put through a redistribution measure on that basis.

Now, the eastern provinces are disposed of. Let me say in passing what I said the other day with respect to Nova Scotia. There is the oldest province in which elections have been held in Canada. When Cornwallis signed the warrant for an election in the ward-room of his ship, the first divisions of constituencies were made in Canada. There are a number of counties established in Nova Scotia, counties that have grown up with our municipal system during the course of a century and more. What have you? You have down by the sea Guysborough and Antigonish united, with a population of 25,000. Following along the seaboard you have the old county of Halifax, and you come to Shelburne and Yarmouth; you have Lunenburg and Queens—counties on the Atlantic seaboard. Now, what had the committee to face in that province? There had to be faced the question whether or not you would break up, as might have been done, the county of Colchester, represented in this house by a Liberal. Add half of it to Cumberland and you would still be under your population.

You would not be over the population according to the unit and you have eliminated the one seat that had to be eliminated on the mainland. What did the committee do? Because county lines are so highly regarded in that province it left Cumberland, Colchester and Digby; it left Antigonish-Guysborough with its 25,000 and left Shelburne-Yarmouth with the addition of the parish of Clare from the county of Digby. It then took the county of Digby, the county of Annapolis and the county of Kings and made them into one riding without disturbing the lines, and this new riding has a population of 50,000. It is said that according to the principles laid down, that is unfair but the committee felt that rather than dismember counties, rather than split them in two and put part of the population here and part there, it was better to have a county which was 6,000 over the unit than to have all the consequent confusion and ill feeling which would arise from following the course I have mentioned. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Short) objected, and very properly so. He still objects and doubtless will voice his resentment when the schedule for Nova Scotia is reached. He says that at his time of life he cannot contest a constituency 125 miles long. I heard some hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan say something about there being 125 miles in a constituency. In the first election to this House of Commons which I contested I was the candidate for the whole district of Alberta. This comprised all the territory from the extreme north, south to the boundary line including Lethbridge, Macleod, Calgary, Edmonton and Wetaskiwin. That was the position in 1900. Mention is made of 125 miles, but I had 300 or 400 miles to cover. In this instance, 125 miles in the province of Nova Scotia means a great deal.

In New Brunswick one member has been dropped from Saint John-Albert, and that is the end of that. There is a Conservative seat again, but other arrangements could have been made in that province.

Prince Edward Island has not been disturbed because it still has four seats.

I have dealt with Quebec; I have dealt with Ontario and I come now to Manitoba. Is it not amazing that in Manitoba where you have such sharp political differences they have been able to arrive at agreement? Each side made concessions and the Liberal party did not go unrepresented. But it realized what the situation was and that arrangement was made.

We come now to the province of Saskatchewan. It was most unfortunate in my judgment that the difficulties in Saskatchewan should have been discussed at such length. What do these difficulties amount to? This one group who say that they constitute the majority in Saskatchewan insist that the redistribution should be made north and south. They say that is the way in which it should be done. There was some little difficulty south of Qu'Appelle and the Saskatchewan river but the committee arrived at some sort of, we will say tentative understanding. We then get into the north country. The province of Saskatchewan under Liberal guidance united the Battlefords and the Battlefords are now one provincial riding. Is there anything that has been held up to us in days gone by as being more desirable than that wherever possible the federal and provincial boundaries should coincide? That being so, why should there be any great complaint if the committee arrived at that conclusion?

The right hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is a former minister of the crown and former prime minister whose constituency is in Saskatchewan. The former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) is the second ex-minister from that province. The former Minister of Agriculture contended that he had been very unjustly and unfairly dealt with. In the end—I desire to remove any misapprehension on the point—the committee agreed to give him the boundaries of the constituency for which he asked. It was not done at my instance and I did not know of its being done until after it was done. As a matter of fact I believed, and I stated my belief, that the extent to which they would go in agreeing to his contention would jeopardize any chance of unity in the whole. And I was right. Look at what we have. Because the committee yielded to the importunities of the former Minister of Agriculture we are now told that the whole thing is bad and wrong and must be set at naught.

That is not all. I was rather surprised when the right hon. leader of the opposition suggested that there was a deep laid plot to have him driven from public life. If I had my choice there is no man I would rather keep in public life than the right hon. gentleman. That is all I have to say. It would be far from me to suggest and I say sincerely that I do not believe that any member of the committee desired that the right hon. gentleman should be driven out of public life by any redistribution made in Prince Albert. What are the facts? The facts are that the Liberal member from Saskatchewan agreed to

the boundary of Prince Albert being extended south beyond its present boundary. He has said in the committee that he agreed to that, and he has repeated it. It therefore follows that there was recognition by the Liberal member from Saskatchewan that the existing boundaries were wrong. Having recognized that the existing boundaries were wrong, the question then arose as to the extent to which they should be remedied.

Mr. TOTZKE: I am sure the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) does not want to be unfair to me. I did say that the southern boundary of the constituency of Prince Albert was wrong but I did not agree to the southern boundary as suggested by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull).

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman has not been following me carefully. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke), who was the representative of the Liberal party from the province of Saskatchewan on that committee, has admitted that the boundaries of Prince Albert should be rectified. He has admitted that the southern boundary should be extended further south, and he made his extension. The Conservative member from Saskatchewan said that that was not far enough south having regard to the movement of population to the north. There was an acute difference of opinion as to where the boundary should be, whether it should be x miles north or y miles north. That is the only issue. Now, is there not the greatest likelihood for a difference on that point?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not the only issue.

Mr. BENNETT: That is the only issue.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has left out the fact that a considerable part of another constituency has been added to Prince Albert notwithstanding the complaint that Prince Albert was too large and must be cut down.

Mr. BENNETT: I am not overlooking that factor. Rectification of the boundary was asked for and there was a difference of opinion as to how it should be effected. That is something that arises in every redistribution or in every case that ever comes up in a court of law. What is the basis of all our institutions? Our whole legal institution is based upon the fact that when there are differences they must be settled, not by fighting as they used to be in the old days but by recourse to the courts. The right hon. gentleman has said very properly that this is the high court of parliament. It is very seldom that it divides on other than party lines, nevertheless it is the high court of parliament. The issue in Prince Albert is this: How shall the boundaries be rectified, it being admitted that they are wrong at the present time? Let that never be forgotten. How can you talk about indignity or a lack of chivalry being shown on the part of any party or men who say that there is the necessity for this rectification, and admit the only question at issue is: How shall the wrong be righted? That is the issue. Speaking for myself and for the government as well, I say, the government say and every member of the government says that we desire to work no wrong to any man with respect to redistribution, and if on the subject matter under discussion it becomes apparent that the boundaries suggested by the Conservative members of the committee can be adjusted on a fairer or more proper basis, that will be done. But it is wrong to say, when you have an admission of the fact that the boundaries are wrong and the only issue is that of rectification, that therefore your opponents are guilty of all the crimes and misdemeanours that can be found in the calendar. That does not make for securing what is desired to be secured; it does not make now and it never has made. I leave it to the judgment of this committee, if every member of it ever heard a more provocative speech than that which the leader of the opposition made yesterday morning. But it was not and it will not be met in that spirit, so far as we are concerned. I repeat that in respect to the province of Saskatchewan it has been in the main admitted that there must be rectifications; that is admitted by everybody. Why? Because the population has moved north. One hon. gentleman says that that will rectify itself in time by the population moving back. He may be right, but in the meantime we have to deal with actualities and realities, and the reality is that there is no change in the number of members to be returned and that therefore all one has to do is to adjust the same membership to new boundaries for a shifted population; that is all.

The facts disclosed before this committee indicate that the matter has been approached, if the individuals were left alone, in a spirit of compromise and accommodation; but some people say: No, we will not do this; that is all there is about the matter; we are not going to do it. The hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) said that he did not like the name "Touchwood." Touchwood is a name

older even than the fifty years of Yorkton, but if it will be any satisfaction to change the name from Touchwood to Yorkton, it will be changed. One is not to have a quarrel over redistribution merely because a man prefers Yorkton to Touchwood. Some hon. members suggest that the word "Battleford" should be "Battlefords." The fact is that the original manuscript contained the word "Battlefords," and it will be so if that will appease the feelings of the hon. gentlemen in the matter. But if you go through the whole representation of Saskatchewan, you have just this difference: an unwillingness on the part of those who sit to the left of the Speaker to recognize that if the choice has to be made between a line that way and a line this way to accomplish the same result, the choice lies with their opponents, they being a majority in the house, and not with them. Should not that fact be recognized? Is that unfair? That is all that is at issue.

I am not yet advised as to the whole issue in Alberta and not having had an opportunity to discuss it fully with anyone who could inform me, I am not going to do more than say that I believe the former Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart, Edmonton) with his conciliatory spirit, and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) will have no difficulty in working out that problem. But let me say this: Alberta is a difficult province to redistribute. Why? On account of the mountains and rivers, and in building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the crossing of the Battle river was one of the great difficulties experienced by the engineers. You have the Saskatchewan river, the Battle river, the Bow river. When we were dealing with redistribution as long ago as 1914, the difficult problem was what to do with that centre seat that became Bow River. It represented just what was left of the rest of the province; that was the only way in which it could be worked out and there was great difficulty in doing so. To the west you have that long range of mountains; away up in the northern part of the province you had the hon. member for Peace River representing half an empire and a new seat had to be found there. It has been given the name of Jasper-Edson. There had to be retained by readjustments the seats in the south and one more seat added to the north. In the readjustment, having regard to population, I daresay there may be some difficulties; there were in 1914. I remember in the case of the late Doctor Clark who represented the constituency of Red Deer, the line as drawn and as it remained for weeks put the late Doctor Clark and myself in the west riding of Calgary. The problem which engaged the attention of the committee then was whether the line should be drawn so many townships south or so many further north. To-day the problem of the boundaries of Bow River is one of some difficulty, but I think there should be no really insurmountable obstacle in the way of its solution.

As regards British Columbia, since this discussion began an agreement has been made that, I trust, is satisfactory to everybody, as I believe it is. On the mainland there was a certain area that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) thought should properly go to Vancouver North, and to Vancouver North it has gone. That has been arranged. It is only a small matter, and on a question of choice it may be the majority of the committee prefer it should go some other place, to Comox-Alberni, but the wishes of both Mr. Munn and Mr. Neill, if I might mention their names, have been met, and that part of the mainland, at least that portion from Bute inlet south, now comprises the constituency of Vancouver North.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no business under the heading of private and public bills the house will resume in committee consideration of Bill No. 2.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. Stirling in the chair.

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, I have to attend at another place, so I shall continue my remarks at another time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): Is clause 1 carried?

Mr. JEAN FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): No. Some newspapers have stated that in opposing the schedule and sections of this bill, members are struggling for their political lives. I am not afraid of my political future. For over eight years I have represented my constituency and have done the best I could for my people. I have abandoned a profitable legal practice to give all my time to my parliamentary duties. My electors appreciate that

fact, and I am very thankful to them for what they have done for me.

Every member of parliament incurs a great number of responsibilities, and in staying here during long sessions, and in abandoning his private business he sacrifices a great deal. For instance, early last year I was busily engaged in some personal work which I have not yet completed. I resumed my work here in Ottawa, intending to use the library, and was told that I could not have the services of a stenographer and could not even have a typewriter if I did not fulfil entirely my parliamentary duties. I did so conscientiously and to the best of my ability, and I am very much surprised to hear some hon. members opposite complain that I take too much of the time of the house. Perhaps some of them work as much as I do; I do not boast of working twenty hours a day. I do say however that none of them works harder. When I come here Saturday afternoons and Sundays to work in my little office upstairs. when I receive books from the library I see hon. members in the building, but I very seldom see any who come as regularly as I do. I do not say that by way of boasting, but merely to place some facts before the committee. I see the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and I see the hon. member for St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) who stays here some week ends. I see other hon. members from the west. At times I meet my genial friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion) who comes here on Sundays. We are all doing our best, and any hon. member will say that we cannot do that without a great amount of sacrifice.

My second statement is that I ask nothing from the government. I ask for nothing. I ask for no favours. I wish only to put the facts before the house in the same manner as I would put the evidence of a witness before a judge who in the first instance states such evidence is not necessary but admits it might be useful at the court of king's bench. When I speak I am not speaking particularly to the government; they may take it if they wish. I am very independent about it. I place myself on record to show what I have said, and that the proof or the evidence is complete. When I go back to my people I will tell them that I have put those facts before the Prime Minister and his colleagues, and if they do not listen to the remarks I make in plain English, they will be judged accordingly.

My only reason for being here to-night, when I should have been attending the funeral of a dear friend in my constituency, is that I feel it my duty to support petitions which have been sent in regular and due form by heads of families in my constituency to this House of Commons protesting against the proposed changes. In doing so I am following their example. They have been faithful to me; they have been devoted to me, and I intend to be just as faithful and devoted to them.

I cannot understand how hon. members opposite can say: "Those people at so and so may be excellent people, but we cannot listen to them. The Paquet family is a great family, but we may dispense with them, and it will not matter whether they vote in this or that constituency." When a man has his heart in the right place he cannot forget the ties which bind him to those who for years and years have been so kind to him. In my constituency there are about 20,000 voters. In that number there are only about one hundred people who have not voted for me at least at one election. I know them. I do not know if there are many hon. members who can say the same thing. I know by name about ninety-nine per cent of my electors. I know the history of each of them, and last year when the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) came to my constituency with the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) there came from distances as far away as sixty or eighty miles about eight hundred people, in spite of the bad weather. I introduced each one to the leader of my party by giving each person's name and family history. I know those people, and it is because I know them that I love them. It is because I love them that I will not let anyone take them away from me, even by brute force.

Another reason for my speaking is that Bill No. 2 to readjust the representation in the House of Commons does not bear the name of any junior member of the cabinet. It bears the name of the Prime Minister himself. It is a measure of such importance that I am in duty bound to put all the facts before the house in order that the Prime Minister and his colleagues may see to it that something is done. But mark you, sir, I ask for nothing, the facts will speak for themselves. I ask for no favours. At the same time I have no fear—I never had any.

An hon. MEMBER: Why should you?

Mr. POULIOT: The history of the legislation on redistribution as given by the right hon. Prime Minister this afternoon is far from complete. I am here to express the viewpoint not only of the electors of Temiscouata but also of the electors of the province of Quebec.

May I take this opportunity to offer my warmest congratulations to my hon. friends who spoke yesterday, and especially to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) who gave such admirable orations to-day. Sir, let us go back eighty years, to 1853. At that time an enactment was passed creating new electoral constituencies in the province of Quebec. I will speak only of the province of Quebec, because while I do not know the details of what happened in other provinces, I am very familiar with what has been done in the province of Quebec.

In 1853 an enactment was passed setting the boundaries of many constituencies in Quebec which have existed until now. This piece of legislation has served for provincial as well as federal elections—for provincial elections until 1886 and for federal until 1892. In the province of Quebec in 1886 the only change was to divide three constituencies, that of Chicoutimi-Saguenay, that of Drummond-Arthabaska and that of Richmond and Wolfe, which had been united in 1867, in order to have only 65 seats in the province. The only change made by that legislation in 1886 was to make the constituencies exactly as they were before confederation. In the federal ridings minor changes were made in 1882, minor changes had been made previously in 1872, but until the gerrymander of 1892 the legislative enactment that served for provincial purposes served at the same time for federal purposes.

There is another thing that I wish to bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman: always the federal acts relating to redistribution in the province of Quebec have referred to the provincial electoral districts after the new legislation had been passed in the province of Quebec. For instance we see the names of those constituencies which do not exist for federal purposes in their entirety; Papineau, Frontenac, Matapédia, Abitibi-Témiscamingue, Charlevoix East, Charlevoix West, Gaspé West and Gaspé East, Papineau, Roberval, Lake St. John East, Lake St. John West. May I now tell the Prime Minister that the provincial boundaries are as much respected in the province of Quebec as they are in Nova Scotia; they are just as sacred in Quebec as in Nova Scotia, and I do not see why what is good for Nova Scotia is not good also for Quebec.

The right hon. gentleman spoke about redistribution that had been made under the first Prime Minister of Canada. If my memory serves me rightly the first Prime Minister of Canada after Confederation was Sir John A. Macdonald. In 1872 under Sir John A. Macdonald there was a redistribution. What was done by that act, 35 Victoria, chapter 13? St. Félix du Cap Rouge was transferred from Portneuf to Quebec. There were three new electoral districts in the city of Montreal. I mean that the electoral districts already existing in the city of Montreal were changed in 1872. That is all that Sir John A. Macdonald did in the first redistribution after confederation. And mark you, sir, even Portneuf county and Quebec county were not defined in that year by a federal statute, but the description of that constituency in 1872 was found in the old statute of 1853 that I have already referred to.

In 1882, while Sir John A. Macdonald was still alive, by 45 Victoria, chapter 3—and I would ask my hon. friend the Solicitor General to listen to me; these are things that might interest him, because yesterday he proved that he did not know even the number of the Quebec seats in the local house.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

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

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

Accordingly, the house went up to the Senate.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the house that the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the royal assent to the following bills:

An Act respecting the Canadian National Railways and to authorize the provision of moneys to meet expenditures made and indebtedness incurred during the calendar year 1933 and to authorize His Majesty to make loans and advances to the Canadian National railway company.

An Act to amend the Railway Act.

An Act to amend the Excise Act.

An Act to amend the Customs Act.

An Act to amend the Soldier Settlement Act.

An Act to authorize the Governor in Council to agree to extend by proclamation the duration of the trade agreement made between Canada and New Zealand, dated the twenty-third day of April, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-two, as approved by chapter thirty-four of the statutes of 1932, entitled An Act respecting a certain trade agreement between Canada and New Zealand.

An Act respecting Extra-territorial Operation of Acts of the Parliament of Canada.

An Act respecting the Canadian National Railways and to provide for co-operation with the Canadian Pacific railway system, and for other purposes.

An Act for the relief of Birdie Glickman Steinberg.

An Act for the relief of Harry Prupas.

An Act for the relief of Olga Shidlowskaya Lowrey.

An Act for the relief of Emily Florence Lawrence Knight.

An Act for the relief of Marjorie Bertha Willcox.

An Act for the relief of George Andrew Carruthers.

An Act for the relief of Lilias Torrance Newton.

An Act for the relief of Hilda Mary Falkenberg Gilmour.

An Act for the relief of Eva Amy Falle Jordan.

An Act for the relief of Joseph Claremont Carroll.

An Act for the relief of Venita Angeline Scotten Kendall.

An Act for the relief of Angelo Stavrow.

An Act respecting The Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate The Sarnia-Port Huron Vehicular Tunnel Company.

An Act to facilitate Compromises and Arrangements between Companies and their Creditors.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff.

An Act to amend the Indian Act.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act to amend the Special War Revenue Act.

An Act to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.

An Act to amend an Act respecting Canadian and British Insurance Companies.

An Act to amend the Senate and House of Commons Act.

An Act to confirm an agreement made between the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company and the Northern Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act.

An Act respecting a certain trade agreement between Canada and France.

An Act respecting a certain convention between Canada and France concerning the Rights of Nationals and Commercial and Shipping Matters.

An Act to amend the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Act, 1932.

An Act to amend the Tariff Board Act.

An Act respecting a certain patent of Genter Thickener Company.

An Act to amend the Pension Act.

An Act to incorporate The Discount and Loan Corporation of Canada.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house resumed consideration in committee of Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. Stirling in the chair.

Mr. POULIOT: In 1882 the act 45 Victoria chapter 3 was passed. The townships of Salaberry, Wolfe and Grandison were transferred from Argenteuil to Terrebonne, and the same year, by the same legislation, St. Monique was transferred from Terrebonne to Two Mountains. In that act there is a new description of the electoral district of Bellechasse: Madeleine islands are annexed to Gaspe and Anticosti island is made part of Chicoutimi-Saguenay. That is all. This means that in the redistribution of 1872 and 1882 only minor changes were made in the legislation of 1853, which served also for provincial purposes. On June 6, 1891, Sir John Macdonald died—the first Prime Minister of Canada since confederation. Sir John Macdonald cannot therefore be held responsible for the gerrymander of 1892. What was done in 1872 and 1882 resulted only in slight changes in very few constituencies. In 1892 a real gerrymander was perpetrated by a moribund government. I will not enter into details; I will only quote a few words from my late leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and also a statement made by one of the Conservative ministers of the time, the Hon. Mr. Ouimet. I will give the page of Hansard so that the Minister of Marine may easily find it among the records. On April 29, 1892, Mr. Laurier, as he was then, said, as reported at page 1866:

> I must say at once that as far as the province of Quebec is concerned, in so far as I can see it at first sight, the apportionment seems to me to have been the most arbitrary that could have been designed. I am sorry, sir, that those who were in charge of that measure from the province of Quebec did not choose to follow the principle which was laid down as far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned; that is to say, of making the changes in the line of existing divisions.

On the same date Mr. Laurier said:

> But when we come to the counties south of the St. Lawrence river in the province of Quebec, where the strength of the Liberal party has always been for twenty years or more, we find gerrymander on such a scale that it will be impossible to recognize the counties now in existence. No attention has been paid to existing limits, parishes which have been united together for very many years are now divided and are jumbled over into five or six different counties. The county of Verchères, an old county which was represented in the old parliament of Canada by Sir George Cartier, for, I believe, more than 15 years, now disappears and is distributed into three different counties, Richelieu, St. Hyacinthe and Chambly.

I would remark here that history repeats itself.

Then the county of Chambly receives a portion of the county of Rouville, and the county of Rouville receives a portion of St. Hyacinthe, if I remember aright, and a portion of Bagot also. What reason or what

justification can there be for that? As far as the city of Montreal and the county of Hochelaga are concerned, I cannot speak with very great accuracy because the limits have been given in only a very imperfect manner, but so far as I can see enough has been given to enable me to congratulate the Minister of Public Works, who had in the county of Laval a very soft bed before, and who will have in the new county of Laval a still softer one now.

What I have just read appears at page 1867 of Hansard of the date mentioned. Now there is not only one minister who is preparing a soft bed for himself; there is the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau), there is the Postmaster General (Mr. Sauve), and there is the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre). They are all looking for Marshall mattresses in the province of Quebec but they will find thorns.

Now let me quote what Mr. Ouimet said. I am sure it will interest every member of the house, because that gentleman used exactly the same language as was used to-day by my hon. friends the Minister of Marine and the Solicitor General. He is reported on page 1870 of Hansard of April 29, 1892, as follows:

> . . . we thought it would be very useful to temper the very pronounced Liberal colour of St. Hyacinthe by adding to St. Hyacinthe the two parishes of St. Marc and St. Antoine.
>
> As to Bagot, we had to take from Richelieu the parish which was next to it and which properly belongs to it, and my hon. friend, the member for Bagot, was so sensitive that he was afraid of being open to the charge of having taken away too many of his opponents in the parishes of St. Pie and St. Dominique, and he took the Liberal parishes from Drummond and Arthabaska, which have already too much population. These two Liberal parishes he expects to manage so that in the future they will be good Conservatives. Those are St. Guillaume and St. Bonaventure.

Is that not the same thing we have heard to-day? The story repeats itself. But what was the flaming language used by Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself, a man who was always very prudent in his expressions? Forty-one years ago, referring to the redistribution drafted by the Conservative party, he said, as reported on page 1862 of Hansard of April 29, 1892, "that is a gerrymander with a vengeance." Referring to this bill as it relates to the province of Quebec, I use the same words as those used by Sir Wilfrid Laurier—this is a gerrymander with a vengeance. That is why we fight it and will fight it to the last.

This morning the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), my leader in the province of Quebec, said some kind things about my constituency and myself. I want to tell him how grateful I am and how much I appreciate his kind words. I appreciate them the more because he was born in my constituency. He knows the different places just as well as I do; he knows the people just as well as I do and he likes them just as much. The only trouble is that perhaps they like him a little more than they do me.

The intention of the government is to take three parishes away from the east side of Temiscouata constituency, the parishes of St. Jean de Dieu, Ste. Francoise and Trois Pistoles. They are taking away the parish of Notre Dame du Portage on the west side, a very beautiful parish.

Mr. DUPRE: They are all beautiful.

Mr. POULIOT: My hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) will not deny that they are beautiful.

Mr. DUPRE: I said that they are all beautiful.

Mr. POULIOT: I have the old statute book of 1851 and I shall read the description of the county of Temiscouata which it contains. I see the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Laurin) laughing, but I want him to know that I am speaking of serious matters. He should be ashamed of himself and should hide instead of showing himself in the House of Commons.

Mr. LAURIN: I had nothing to do about Quebec.

Mr. POULIOT: He should not laugh when we are talking about these matters. This is not a joke and I am most serious. He should fix his hair with a brush and it would help him. I am sorry I cannot do it for him but I am too far away. The statute contains this description:

> (Translation): The county of Témiscouata will be bounded on the northeast by the county of Rimouski, as above described; on the southeast by the northeast lines of the parishes of St. Andre and St. Alexandre and the township of Parke, and its extension to the provincial line; on the southeast by the provincial line, and on the northwest by the St. Lawrence River, comprising Ile-Verte and all the islands in the St. Lawrence river nearest to the said county of Témiscouata, and opposite such county in whole or in part; the said county so bounded consisting of the parishes of Trois-Pistoles, St. Eloi, Ile-Verte, St. Gregoire-de-Kakouna, St. Arsene, St. Patrick de la Rivière-du-Loup and the township of Whitworth, Viger, Begon, Denonville, Raudot, Demers, Hocquart, and the seigniory and settlements of Témiscouata.

What I have read proves that for eighty years the boundaries of the county of Temiscouata have been the same for federal, provincial, municipal and judicial purposes. Two years ago this district was divided for provincial purposes, but it was divided as a whole. A line was drawn from the east to the west dividing the lower and upper parts of the constituency. The new constituencies are called

Riviere du Loup and Temiscouata. Those who have framed this bill have proved to be so ignorant that they did not even know the names of the provincial constituencies which had been formed out of the federal constituency. It will be necessary to amend the schedule as it relates to the electoral district of Temiscouata, because the description as it now appears is false. It mentions Temiscouata but it does not mention Temiscouata and Riviere du Loup. St. Jean de Dieu, Ste. Françoise and Trois Pistoles are not taken away from Temiscouata, they are taken away from the electoral district of Riviere du Loup. This shows how negligent, how ignorant and how insipid have been those who drafted it.

Mr. GAGNON: I rise to a point of order. We on this side of the house have discussed this matter very strongly but we have been careful not to offend and not to insult hon. gentlemen on the other side. I submit respectfully, Mr. Chairman, that the words "ignorant and insipid" as addressed to members of the committee are not parliamentary and should be withdrawn.

Mr. POULIOT: In answer to that may I say that there is brain work and manual work to be done. The brain work is done by the big men while the manual work is done by the clerks. I suppose the members of the committee said to the clerks: take three Liberal parishes from the east side of Temiscouata, from Pouliot's constituency, and take another one from the other side.

Mr. GAGNON: I ask for a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. POULIOT: I am speaking strictly on the point of order and I hope time will not be taken from that allowed for my speech.

Mr. SPENCE: You speak too long anyway.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence) does not understand a word I am saying and he might just as well go and smoke a cigarette.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): Will the hon. member confine himself to the point of order?

Mr. POULIOT: My contention is that I do not believe any member of the committee took the time to write out the descriptions of the electoral districts. My contention is that they gave instructions to the clerk to make some changes and the clerk was ignorant of the changes which had been made in the provincial law. This is why it is so badly drafted. Speaking again to the point of order, I say that I did not name any member of the house when I called the fellows who had drafted that section ignorant and insipid; I said that about those who are responsible for it. It is a mistake and so much a mistake that even if the government or the majority in the house were to take those parishes from my constituency, they would have to change the drafting which is erroneous. Therefore, as a gross mistake has been made, am I not justified in calling the ones responsible for it, ignorant and insipid? I did not name any member of the house.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): On the point of order I would suggest that the hon. member restrain his language as far as he is able to do so.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank you. Why are those parishes being taken away from that riding? The excuse which has been given for credulous people who do not read between the lines is this: Too much population. What was the population of Témiscouata when the census was taken in 1931? It was 50,163. What is now the population of Rimouski? It is 33,151. How many electoral districts have a population of less than 33,000 by virtue of this legislation?

Constituency—	Population
Argenteuil	27,441
Laval-Deux-Montagnes	31,896
Another minister's seat.	
Vaudreuil-Soulanges	21,114
St. Jean-Iberville	32,259
Chapleau	21,705
A new constituency which has been created at our expense.	
Labelle	28,731
Wright	27,107
In the eastern townships:	
Brome-Missisquoi	32,069
Chateauguay-Huntingdon	24,412
Compton	31,858

The constituency of the hon. member for Compton, who sat on the committee, has not been changed.

Shefford	28,262
Stanstead	25,118
The following in the district of Quebec:	
Bonaventure	32,432
Kamouraska	30,852
Montmagny-L'Islet	30,869
Bellechasse	27,480
Levis	28,548

And 7,800 people have been taken way from this constituency.

Dorchester	27,156
Lotbiniere	30,546

This afternoon the Prime Minister said that the constituencies around the city of Quebec have an average population of 30,000. It will be seen that these nineteen constituencies, according to the new law, will have a population less than that of Rimouski as it was before, and seven of them are in our own district of Quebec. Therefore, if the change were necessary for Rimouski, why was it not necessary for the others which are just as much rural constituencies as is Rimouski?

There is another argument: If someone says that the population of Temiscouata of 50,163 is too much, how is it that other constituencies will have the following populations?

Constituency—	Population
Beauce	51,614
Charlevoix-Saguenay	55,594
Chicoutimi	55,724
Drummond-Arthabaska	53,338
Lake St. John-Roberval	50,253

There are at least five rural constituencies excepting the cities of Montreal and Quebec which have a greater population than Temiscouata has now, and outside Quebec and Montreal there are eighteen constituencies which have a smaller population than Rimouski had formerly. Why then is it necessary to increase the population of Rimouski at the expense of Temiscouata? This is a question I ask in all fairness to those who will speak after me, in order that they may explain the situation, and thus put me in a position to give satisfactory answers to my constituents when they ask me questions about the matter.

The Prime Minister this afternoon spoke about the difficulties of an electoral distribution. There were thirteen seats in Montreal; the number has been increased to sixteen. There were three seats in Quebec city; the number is not changed there. We see that Montmagny is annexed to L'Islet, Beauharnois to Laprairie, L'Assomption to Terrebonne.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): The hon. member has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. POULIOT: I started to speak at twenty-five minutes to nine.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): The hon. member has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. L. E. PARENT (Terrebonne) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, after hearing the discussion on the redistribution bill and listening to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Stewart), who was chairman of the committee on redistribution; the ex-Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin) who made such a remarkable and clear statement on the redistribution of the counties comprised in the northern district of Quebec, including the district and county of Terrebonne which I have the honour of representing in the house; the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau); the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) who made a statement on the principles which should guide us and which must have been heard by all those who were present in the house, I believe that it should be possible to come to a friendly understanding on the redistribution of counties both in Quebec and other parts of the country. I shall be brief. I was somewhat astonished at the information I obtained a few weeks ago, in connection with certain changes and annexations which were proposed for the county of Terrebonne. I therefore deem it my duty to rise in the house and furnish the committee with certain information which, in addition to those already given, might probably induce this committee on redistribution, to accept our fair and rational requests.

At present, the county of Terrebonne is surrounded by the five following counties: Argenteuil comprising a population of 18,580, with eighteen municipalities and 7,900 voters; Labelle, comprising a population of 30,953; Laval-Two Mountains, with a population of 30,434, 30 municipalities and 13,700 voters; Joliette, with a population of 27,959, 18 municipalities and 12,700 voters; L'Assomption-Montcalm, with a population of 29,214, 17 municipalities and 14,000 voters; and finally Terrebonne with a population of 39,555, 31 municipalities, and 18,300 voters

I understand, sir, that when the study of the redistribution of the counties in Quebec and throughout the country was first taken up, the question of the required unit of population in each county was broached. Must we be forced, we representatives of rural counties to acept the principle that the representation of urban centres must be increased to the detriment of that of rural sections? I shall not delay the house in discussing this principle, because we will have to accept it such as it is. The committee has therefore decided to add three constituencies to the city of Montreal and two in the northern parts of Quebec. To reach this aim it was necessary to choose the localities where these constituencies would be created. The committee cast its eyes on the map, north of Montreal, and found that a redistribution could be carried out there and thus solve the problem in a fair and rational way. The following is what was decided. Argenteuil, at present, has a population of 18,000.

The population of this county will be increased by annexing six or seven municipalities of the county of Labelle, with a total population of 8,666 and the municipality known as St. Colomban will be transferred from the northern part of the county of Two Mountains. The area of St. Columban is more than 5,000 acres and has only a population of 243. These two sections are annexed to the county of Argenteuil, the first is taken from Labelle and the second from the county of Two Mountains; they comprise in all a population of 8,909. I shall point out just now why part of the counties of Labelle and Two Mountains are transferred to increase the population of Argenteuil. Labelle, which comprises the counties of Labelle and Papineau, had a population of 36,900 before the last census. This number is less than the unit of representation, 40,000 agreed upon by the committee for rural counties in Quebec. The committee fixed the unit of representation for urban centres at 70,000 and for rural counties at 40,000. Why then remove nearly 9,000 people from the county of Labelle to place them in the county of Argenteuil?

The population of Laval-Two Mountains is fixed at 31,940, when actually there are only 30,434 people. To what means did the committee resort so as to readjust Laval-Two Mountains? I do not wish to convey, sir, that the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Sauvé) who is Postmaster General, asked the committee to favour him, because he personally told me, in an interview which he was gracious enough to grant me, that he never asked the committee for any favour.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): He was wrong.

Mr. PARENT (Translation): He asked for no favour. I accept his word; however, he never stated to the committee that he was opposed to the transfer to his county of the parishes of St-Janvier and Ste-Thérèse, as well as the town of Ste-Thérèse, which have always formed part of the county of Terrebonne, ever since the latter was established. However, so as to compensate for this population of 6,162 from the parishes just mentioned, 4,656 people were taken from Laval county. It is clear that the liberal majority of about 400 votes which these three municipalities give did not suit the hon. Postmaster General. He did not request it, but nevertheless the change is made. It is also quite evident that the members of the committee must have weighed the political advantage which it would give the representative of that county before arriving at that decision.

[Mr. Parent.]

The county of Montcalm is annexed to Joliette increasing its population to 41,392, with 35 municipalities. Finally, the committee tackles the county of Terrebonne with a population of 39,555, although the unit of rural counties is fixed at 40,000, the county of l'Assomption is annexed to it with a population of 15,781, which brings it up to 55,336, from which is deducted 6,162 from the municipalities of Ste-Thérèse and St-Janvier. There still remains a population totalling 49,174 with 45 municipalities.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): What do you suggest?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): Just a second, I am coming to this. I am asked, sir, what I have to suggest. It is quite simple. There is no easier problem to solve. It is only necessary to know one's national and municipal geography and to glance at a map to find out, and thereby, the problem is solved. I have here a map prepared by an official of the Interior dept., it should, therefore, be acceptable to the committee. To the left, there is Argenteuil with a population of 18,976. I pause a second, sir, the hon. Minister of the Interior who presided over the committee on redistribution. . . .

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): The Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I beg your pardon, sir, the hon. Minister of Public Works, chairman of the redistribution committee stated, when he commented on the bill, that he had recommended to the committee to base the redistribution of the counties on population. Should we rely, sir, on population to carve out a county, among a group of counties, we would choose the smallest, not as regards area but population. Which among them had the least population? I have just pointed them out. Among the counties which I enumerated, there is one only that has less than 20,000 people. They have all 27,000, 28,000 32,000, 33,000 or 39,000 of a population, except the county of Argenteuil.

I have made three suggestions to the committee, and among the three, it could only be a question of annexing the county of Argenteuil to that of Laval-Two Mountains. I well realize that political interests had to be considered. As the majority is with the government, it was clear that it would be irrational that two ministers would have to fight it out at the next election.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): That is well thought out!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): When parliament is dissolved at the next election, will

not both the minister and member be on an equal footing before the eyes of the people of their respective counties.

An hon. MEMBER: (Translation): Hear! hear!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): The only difference between a cabinet minister and a member is that the former holds a more responsible position and must render to the people a more exacting account of his mandate, otherwise they stand on an equal footing before them. Whether he be a member of the government or a simple member, both have an opponent to face when an election is at hand, and the people are free to vote for one or the other. I wonder, sir, basing ourselves on this principle, whether we should not consider merging the county of Argenteuil with that of Laval-Two Mountains as it was done with l'Assomption and Terrebonne.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): What do you suggest?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): My suggestion? I submitted three plans. If you have not seen them, I would advise you to glance over them, it would give you some geographical knowledge of the counties.

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): Where is your plan?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I have it here. I submitted it to the committee, together with three solutions, by writing. The plan is as follows: The county of Argenteuil has but 18,580 population; Two Mountains, 14,488; Laval, 16,150. These three counties joined together would form one with a population of 49,218.

I have here, sir, a plan which I look upon as a logical and remarkable solution in itself, with reference to the counties I just mentioned. The merging of Argenteuil with Two Mountains would give a total population of 33,000, 34 municipalities, and 15,178 voters; Joliette-Montcalm, 41,000, 35 municipalities and 19,000 voters, and, lastly, Terrebonne which, at present, has 39,550 people, 31 municipalities and 18,300 voters.

You will note, sir, that the various populations, the number of municipalities and voters are about equal in all these counties; on the other hand, the government has a committee at its disposal to work out a scheme for the city of Montreal and elsewhere. Moreover, I state that when a county is annexed to another, one must bear in mind and moreover, endeavour to discover whether there has been any evolution, development or change in the population of these counties.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Has there been any in your county?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): Yes, there has been as I shall prove to the hon. member.

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): Carry on!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): In 1867—you will note, sir, that I have gone away back in my search for information in connection with the evolution and development of the rural counties north of Montreal—the county of Argenteuil had a population of 12,896; and in 1931 almost a century later, the population was only 18,580, an increase of about 50 per cent.

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): Not bad!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): The county of Two-Mountains, represented by the hon. Postmaster General, had in 1867 a population of 18,400; in 1931, the population was only 14,284.

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): Shame! shame!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): It will interest the hon. member who interrupted me just now to know what was the population of the county of Terrebonne which I have the privilege of representing. In 1867, it had a population of 19,300; in 1921, 33,900 and in 1931, 39,500, namely, double what it had at confederation.

An hon. MEMBER: (Translation): Hear! hear!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I suggested, sir, to drop the scheme of annexing l'Assomption to Terrebonne, and joining it to another county because the county of Terrebonne has the required unit of representation, however the committee refuses to give up their scheme in connection with Ste-Thérèse and St-Janvier.

It may astonish hon. members when I state. . . . .

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): What was the scheme submitted by the representative of the Liberal party?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I do not know; the plans of the Liberal party were not submitted to me.

Mr. DORION (Translation): It is of little import that you should know them.

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I do not think the Liberal party would have submitted any

scheme with reference to the county of Terrebonne without consulting me. I submitted one and I was entitled to do so, as I represent the most important county of the district, so far as the population is concerned.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Apart from Berthier-Maskinongé.

Mr. PARENT (Trans.): At all events, sir, the committee thought proper, without any request from the Postmaster-General who represents Laval-Two Mountains, to annex to that county the parishes of Ste. Thérèse, St. Janvier and the town of Ste. Thérèse. I had an opportunity, since then, of visiting my county and discussing the matter with a few people of those parishes. They are greatly indignant over the whole affair. To such an extent that they forwarded to me a copy of a resolution adopted by the municipal council of the parish of Ste. Thérèse. It is as follows:

Ste-Thérèse, May 2, 1933.

Province of Quebec,
County of Terrebonne,
Municipality of the Parish of St-Thérèse.

At a general, monthly and regular, meeting of the Municipal Council of the Parish of Ste-Thérèse, held at the regular place and hour of its meetings, Tuesday, the second day of May, nineteen hundred and thirty-three, were present: His Worship the Mayor Mr. J. A. Coulombe and Messrs. the Councillors: Richard Hamilton, Jean Franc, Cyprien Charron, Elphège Dubois, Emilien Charron and Evariste Brosseau, forming a quorum under the chairmanship of his Worship the Mayor.

Whereas it is intended to annex this parish to the county of Laval-Two Mountains, in connection with federal matters,

Whereas this readjustment is not in the public interest and therefore not justified.

Therefore, this Council strongly protests against all measures or steps taken to carry out this division.

That copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. L. E. Parent, member for the county, with a request to strongly support it.

Certified true copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Municipal Council of the Parish of Ste-Thérèse.

Antonio Forget,
Sec.-Treas.

Will one single member of the committee on redistribution still persist in imposing on the hon. representative of Laval-Two Mountains, 6,000 people who, by this resolution passed by the representatives of the municipality, refuse to join the county of Laval-Two Mountains. May I point out that this resolution was adopted. . .

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): In what year?

[Mr Parent.]

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I shall inform the hon. member. It is exactly what I am looking at. It is dated May 2, 1933.

An hon. MEMBER (Trans.): At what hour?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): At the regular hour of the council's meetings. Since that date—Wednesday of last week—municipal elections were held in that locality and all the members of the council were re-elected. This resolution, therefore, expresses the wish of the people. Notwithstanding this fact, an attempt is made to transfer to the county of Laval-Two Mountains, 6,000 people who entirely refuse to form part of any other county than the beautiful county of Terrebonne, of which this parish has formed part since the county was established.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Will the hon. member permit me to ask a question?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Would the scheme proposed by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin), namely the merging of the county of l'Assomption-Montcalm with the county of Joliette, receive the approval of the hon. member for Terrebonne?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I certainly cannot object, my county is in no way affected; nevertheless, the intention is to deprive me of Ste. Thérèse and St. Janvier, and I am opposed to that. Will the hon. member allow Ste. Thérèse to remain in Terrebonne? First of all, is he authorized to give me a definite answer? If it were his neighbour, the hon. member for Quebec Montmorency (Mr. Dorion), chairman of the sub-committee on redistribution for the province of Quebec, I could rely more on such an answer—however, I do not expect an answer from him.

I strongly protest, sir, against the county of Terrebonne being gerrymandered, I resent any single parish being taken away from Terrebonne. And why? Because the county of Terrebonne is not a creation of recent date, in Quebec. It is one of the first counties established before confederation. It was established before 1825. It is an historical county because of the men who represented it. The following is a list of its representatives: In 1841, Terrebonne was represented in Parliament by the Hon. J. E. Turcotte; in 1844, by the Hon. L. H. Lafontaine; in 1848, by the Hon. L. M. Viger; in 1851, by the Hon. A. M. Morin; in 1854, by the Hon. G. M. Prevost; in 1857, by the Hon. L. S. Morin; in 1863, by Mr. Labrèche Viger and at Confederation by the Hon. Louis François R. Masson, who became Lieutenant-Governor of the province

of Quebec, and who represented Terrebonne until 1878. His successors were: In 1882, the Hon. Guillaume Alphonse Nantel, who later on was Minister of Agriculture in the provincial government; and in 1896, Mr. L. A. Chauvin. Up to 1896, all the representatives of this county formed part of that conservative phalanx of that period. To-day, it is proposed to detach from this county parishes which placed their trust in the Conservative party's predecessors. The Conservatives are acting thus because, since 1896, the county of Terrebonne changed its political allegiance. It was the Hon. Raymond Préfontaine who, in 1900, won this county to the Liberal fold. Since then, it was represented: In 1908, by Doctor Desjardins; in 1911, by the Hon. Wilfrid Bruno Nantel, who was a member of the government at Ottawa, for a number of years and later, a member of the railway commission. In 1921 this county was represented by the Hon. J. E. Prévost, who to-day is in the Senate.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Have you not forgotten the name of Sir Adolphe Chapleau? He also represented that county.

Mr. PARENT (Translation): He represented it in Quebec.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): You forgot to mention him just now.

Mr. PARENT (Translation): He represented the county in the Quebec Legislature. You have no knowledge of your parliamentary history. Purchase a dictionary and an encyclopedia, and study them.

The members of the committee, sir, do not seem to be greatly impressed by the principles laid down by the one whose name is often on their lips, and also by this great French-Canadian statesman who was a credit to our race and country, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to whom we often refer. Members opposite often quote Macdonald and, we also delight in hearing praises bestowed on this great statesman. Sir John A. Macdonald. Do you think, sir, that if the latter was present at this sitting he would advocate the same policy as the one we have just heard uttered by the right hon. Prime Minister?

What was Sir John A. Macdonald's policy? According to Hansard of 1872, p. 929, referring to the policy of preserving the identity of counties, Sir John A. Macdonald expressed himself as follows:

> It is, I think, a grand system that the people of Canada should have the opportunity of choosing for political promotion the men in whom they have most confidence and of whose abilities they are fully assured. All that great advantage is lost by cutting off a portion of two several counties and adding them together for electoral purposes only. Those portions so cut off have no common interest: they do not meet together and they have no common feeling except that once in five years they go to the polls in their township to vote for a man who may be known in one section and not in another. This tends towards the introduction and development of the American system of caucusses by which wire-pullers take advantage of their political ability only, and not from any personal respect for them.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Then, why did the hon. member change his political allegiance?

Mr. PARENT (Translation): I was never a Conservative. I wonder whether you, yourself, changed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order, please!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): If the hon. member never changed, it is because his heart is in the wrong place.

Three municipalities, sir, are to be detached from the county of Laval-Two Mountains. The reason, so far as it affects Laval, is to justify the annexation of three municipalities of the county of Terrebonne to that of Two Mountains. I closely followed, this afternoon, the hon. Minister of Marine who stated that when it was a question affecting Vaudreuil-Soulanges, there could be no discussion about crossing the Ottawa river over two bridges so as to secure a few votes in the county of Jacques Cartier. The hon. minister is quite aware that there are two bridges spanning the river des Prairies and leading to Pont-Viau, l'Abord-à-Plouffe and Laval-des-Rapides, three municipalities situated across the river. Why does he state it is not to the advantage of Vaudreuil-Soulanges? It is neither to the advantage of Laval. Why oblige voters to cross a river? I cannot follow his argument; however, I state that the same principle should apply everywhere, an if one is wrong, so is the other.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): The right hon. Prime Minister, this afternoon, with all the eloquence we agree he possesses . . .

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. PARENT (Translation): . . . stated in the course of his remarks, that he had recommended to the committee to respect the boundaries of counties as regards Nova Scotia.

Does not this principle apply as well to Quebec? If the boundaries of the counties

of Nova Scotia were respected, why were not the demarcation lines of the counties of Terrebonne and Laval-Two Mountains respected? The same principle should apply as much in one section of the country as in the other.

In his remarks on redistribution the hon. Minister of Public Works stated:

> Redistribution should be based on the proportion of population with no greater disturbance than necessary.

Is it not, sir, disturbing a county to detach a section comprising three municipalities? Bear in mind that the parishes of Ste. Thérèse and St. Janvier are crossed by the national highway from the intersection of the railway at Ste. Thérèse, as far as St. Jérôme, and that the highway which now crosses the county of Terrebonne from its southern portion to its northern extremity will be shortened by 14 miles, just for the pleasure of annexing three municipalities of Laval-Two Mountains. The Ste. Thérèse railway, the first built in a northern direction, that famous line, the work of one whom many of you know by reputation, the "curé" Labelle. If the latter was in the house this evening, as he so often was in Quebec to defend the rights of the settler and help colonization north of Montreal—he was then known as the "King of the North"—what would he think? He would feel shocked; no words would express his indignation because of the transfer of the parish and town of Ste. Thérèse from the county of Terrebonne; because of the removal of the only classical institution from the county of Terrebonne. Are such reasons not sufficient to convince the committee that they should reconsider their decision?

The first reason I set forth is that the hon. Postmaster General, who represents the county of Laval-Two Mountains, does not request Ste-Thérèse or St. Janvier. He perhaps does not state that he objects to them, but he has not made the request. Why hand them over to him if he does not request them? Permit me to keep them, because I want them. They form part of the county, and if they have not been as faithful to our cause as I was entitled to expect, nevertheless I foresee that there will be a change at the next election. At the last Dominion election, the town of Ste-Thérèse gave the Liberal candidate a majority of 263 votes; while the parish of Ste-Thérèse unfortunately outnumbered this majority. Why? Because the Conservative party had placed their election agents throughout the rural districts of Quebec. They did not neglect the county of Terrebonne and told our good farmers that they had been forsaken by the Dominion government so far as the tuberculin test of their cattle was concerned and furthermore that they were not receiving for their butter the price to which they were entitled. They promised them 40 cents per pound for their butter.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. PARENT (Translation): My time has expired. I trust that I have sufficiently pleaded my cause, and that I shall be permitted, in all fairness, to retain Ste-Thérèse and St. Janvier.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption-Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak I am not so conceited as to think that I shall convince my hon. friends opposite who are on the point of perpetrating the monstrous injustice embodied in this bill, as the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) recently put it, that the measure must be carried even if to do so, the brutal force of the majority must be resorted to.

I cannot do less, however, than protest in the strongest way possible, against this shameful injustice of blotting out from the electoral map of this country the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm, by annexing the county of Montcalm to that of Joliette and the county of L'Assomption to that of Terrebonne. The committee seems to ignore that the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm has a population of 29,188, and that it could have been possible to suppress another county, among the twenty others that have a smaller population.

I wish to make it clear to the house that in the attitude I take I am not prompted by personal gain and I have two excellent reasons for that: first, after devoting almost half of my existence to public life and served to the best of my ability according to my humble gifts, my county and country, I cannot expect that I shall be spared many more years in politics. Another reason, perhaps as important as the first, from a personal viewpoint, is that the annexation, as embodied in the bill, of the county of L'Assomption, where I reside, with the county of Terrebonne, where I practised my profession as notary during the first seven years, cannot but appeal to me on more than one score, because I am certain of finding there a great number of my old friends with whom I fought for the great cause and contributed my quota in electing the hon. Raymond Préfontaine, Jean Prévost and Doctor Desjardins, all three of whom I cherish the memory.

However, above all personal interest, and speaking purely and simply as the faithful servant of those who for a quarter of a century have honoured me with their confidence, I cannot do otherwise than to state in the house and before the country that the injustice that the present leaders of the Conservative party are on the point of perpetrating is most iniquitous and greatly to the detriment of the best interests of these good farmers of L'Assomption-Montcalm, whom I have the privilege of representing in the house.

First, when in 1914, the Conservative government of that date thought proper of merging the counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm, they recognized that this section of Quebec was bound by the same interests and differed from most of all other rural counties of our province, because a special industry, that of tobacco, proper to that district, made of the two counties of L'Assomption-Montcalm a necessary entity.

Later on, always bearing in mind the special industry of this part of Quebec and the particular interests of the tobacco growers who are so numerous in these two counties, the government, at the cost of many hundred thousands of dollars, established and maintained an experimental farm of tobacco which to-day is the pride and has benefitted the entire farming community of L'Assomption-Montcalm and the neighbourhood.

May I add, sir, that there exists another primordial reason which tends to promote the union of the two counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm, it is the numerous associations existing in this county, such as the Tobacco Growers' Association of L'Assomption-Montcalm, the Co-operative Tobacco Society of L'Assomption-Montcalm and others.

By its new scheme the Conservative government also disregards the boundaries of the judicial district, detaches the county of L'Assomption from the Joliette district so as to annex it to the district of Terrebonne and thereby tends to destroy the mode of life, customs, judiciary relations, etc., of the people of L'Assomption to which up to this day the natural course of life has linked them. What will be the result of this new scheme? The present population of the county of Joliette is 27,585, that of Montcalm 13,865, which will give the new county of Joliette-Montcalm a population of 41,450.

The population of the county of Terrebonne is 38,611, that is when the 5,651 required by the Postmaster General (Mr. Sauvé) are deducted. I say required by the Postmaster General, although my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Parent) just stated that he did not ask for them. One thing certain is that he will not give up this annexation to his county. Therefore, by removing from the county of Terrebonne the 5,651 people of Ste-Thérèse, town and parish, and St. Janvier, the population of Terrebonne is thereby reduced to 32,960; then, by adding a population of 15,323 from the county of L'Assomption, the new county of L'Assomption-Terrebonne will have a population of 48,283. You will admit, sir, that these figures are rather large, if compared to those of a great number of counties of Quebec but especially to those of the county of Argenteuil, even after being increased.

What are we to think also of the 155 square miles area or more of the new county of L'Assomption-Terrebonne? It will certainly be an imposing county which, owing to its large population and area, will certainly do honour to the one who will represent it. However, you will agree with me, sir, that this county seems to have too large a population and an area of unreasonable size. Why not allow the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm to remain as it is with its population of 29,188?

I cannot therefore think otherwise that the present bill, so far as the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm is concerned, is most unfair, cannot be justified and will be greatly detrimental to the people of this county as a whole, and more especially to the tobacco growers. The particular interests of the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm require that it be not split up, and as a last resort, I think that, in order not to harm the material interests of L'Assomption-Montcalm, it would be infinitely better for it to be, as a whole, annexed to another electoral division, if hon. members opposite persist in their desire to see it disappear, because it has opposed their policy.

I deemed it my duty to protest against the serious consequences which will have to be borne by the good farming community which I have the honour to represent in the house. In closing my remarks I again strongly protest against the despicable iniquity and incredible injustice which is being perpetrated against the constituency of l'Assomption-Montcalm.

Mr. L. DUBOIS (Nicolet) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, at this late hour, I do not intend to delay at length the house in discussing the present bill. Moreover, the interests of my county, as well as those of Yamaska, were admirably defended this morning and this

afternoon by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin).

I, however, wish to protest on behalf of my constituents against this bill known under various names, which, however, I shall simply designate for the present, as an unfair measure, so as to remain within the bounds of a frank and loyal discussion.

Useless to state that I resent the odium of this redistribution bill, since I protest against this gerrymander which the opposition want to inflict on the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska. You will allow me, sir, to state what took place in committee, since the present bill was introduced. The first scheme, sir, conceived by hon. members opposite was to annex Yamaska to Drummond and Nicolet to Arthabaska; moreover to detach from the county of Nicolet the town of Nicolet, the principal town of the county, the parishes of Ste-Perpetue and Ste-Brigitte-des-Saults so as to annex them to the county of Yamaska-Drummond. The intention was to also detach from my county the parishes of St-Pierre, Ste-Cécile and Ste-Sophie so as to annex them to the county of Lotbiniere. The scheme was absurd. On May 9, in the presence of Mr. Alfred Gaudet, advocate of Nicolet, my opponent at the 1930 election, and Mr. Comtois, defeated candidate in the county of Yamaska, I met the hon. members in charge of the sub-committee on redistribution. After giving my explanations, the members of the committee decided to reconsider their decision. Finding that the first scheme was absolutely absurd, the committee decided to make the present changes, at the suggestions, probably, of Mr. Comtois.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): He is the future candidate.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Instead of adhering to the first scheme, the committee decided to annex Nicolet to Yamaska. I was in fact requested to effect a compromise in the matter.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): You were wrong.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): It is unfair for the majority to ask for a vote; however, if such be their wish they possess the power to do so. If the majority of the house wishes to complete the shameful deed begun in the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska, it is free to do so. I do not intend to say unpleasant things to my hon. friends opposite. I shall put off doing so until we discuss the bill item by item.

[Mr. Dubois.]

Meanwhile, I intended to discuss matters with our good friends and request them to reconsider their decision and weigh every circumstance and reason which tend to favour the complete merging of the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska and not those that tend against the annexation of parts of these counties. I hope to reach an understanding with our friends. When they hear the reasons I shall set forth and after pondering over those given this morning by the hon. member for Richelieu, I am sure that they will find it only fair, reasonable and right to preserve intact the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska by merging them. I have no objection that Yamaska and Nicolet be merged. Under present circumstances, this merging would be but natural, because the county of Yamaska has not actually a sufficient population to remain on the federal map. Moreover, I have among the people of Yamaska a great number of friends both Conservatives and Liberals. I shall take pride in seeing them form part of the county of Nicolet, and I am willing to welcome them with open arms, because these people have the same habits and characteristics as the people of Nicolet. They belong to the farming classes as do those from Nicolet; they have about the same needs, habits and mentality.

The committee should not detach from the county of Yamaska half of the small parish of St. Michel in order to place it in the county of Richelieu. No doubt that the people of Yamaska would find good friends in the county of my hon. friend from Richelieu, but why split in half this small parish which has formed part of the county ever since confederation. There is no more reason to do this than there is to detach from the county of Nicolet the parishes of St-Pierre, Ste. Cecile, Ste. Sophie, Manseau, Lemieux and Ste. Marie. These parishes form part of the county of Nicolet ever since Confederation. Why thus split up two counties where people have the same habits, the same mode of life, the same interests; two counties which form part of similar judicial districts and have the same provincial requirements? The county of Nicolet is a distinct entity in provincial matters, as well as the county of Yamaska. Why detach from these counties these six parishes and half of another. I beg of the committee, of hon. members opposite to be fair in this matter. By treating me fairly, they will, at the same time, show their spirit of justice to the people of these few parishes.

I broke the news of this division to my constituents as well as those of Yamaska, and I

received strong protests against, first, the cutting up of my county and then that of Yamaska. May I read to the house a resolution adopted by all the municipalities of the county of Nicolet, protesting against this readjustment that the committee is about to make in the county of Nicolet, as well as in the county of Yamaska:

Canada,
Province of Quebec,
County of Nicolet,
Municipality of,

Whereas a redistribution of the electoral seats in view of representation in the House of Commons is proposed pursuant to the last census.

Whereas it is proposed to split up the county of Nicolet, by detaching of said county the parishes of Ste-Pierre les Becquets Ste-Cécile de Lévrard, Ste-Sophie de Levrard, Manseau, St. Joseph de Blandford, Lemieux and Ste-Marie de Blandford in order to annex them to the county of Lotbinière.

Whereas the annexation of parts of the county of Nicolet, either to the county of Drummond or the county of Arthabaska or the county of Lotbinierè is contrary to the interests of the people of Nicolet as much from an electoral viewpoint as from a diocesan, judicial, commercial, farming and educational viewpoint.

Whereas the interests of the said various counties are not the same, but are rather opposed to one another and that the readjustment of the new counties such as proposed, might create regrettable and harmful conflicts of interests.

Whereas if there must be merging it should be carried out by the annexation of the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska which are two essentially farming counties, this annexation seems to be more advantageous from an economic, geographical, educational, religious and civic viewpoint.

It is therefore moved by seconded by that the council of the municipality of acting as the interpreters of the rate payers of the municipality of the strongly protest against splitting up the county of Nicolet as proposed, and humbly suggests to the Dominion government to maintain the county of Nicolet as a distinct entity, such as it is at present, considering that it has a sufficient population, and furthermore that, if merging is necessary, the two counties of Nicolet and Yamaska be merged as a whole, under the names of Nicolet-Yamaska, this last choice would make for the stability of the representation of this farming district, and thus the electoral representation would conform to the senatorial representation.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada, the member of the county of Nicolet and to the chairman of the committee on redistribution.

This resolution as I stated a moment ago, was signed by all the municipal councils of my county of which I shall give the list:

St. Pierre les Becquets—Moved by Henri Poisson, seconded by Arthur Pepin; mayor Edmond Trottier; sec.-treas., J. O. Archambault.

Ste. Cecile de Lavrard—Moved by Albert Tousignant, seconded by Alfred Tousignaat; mayor, Angelo Paquin, sec.-treas., Thomas Carignan.

Ste. Sophie de Levrard—Moved by H. Tousignant, seconded by Leonce Brisson; mayor, Joseph Drouin; sec.-treas., J. W. Leblanc.

Manseau (village)—Moved by Maurice Savoie, seconded by Calixte Gosselin; mayor, Arthur Bernier; sec.-treas., J. F. Pare.

Manseau (parish)—Moved by Georges Ouellet, seconded by Lucien Martel; mayor, Emile Charland; sec.-treas., J. F. Pare.

Lemieux—Moved by Georges Trottier, seconded by Edmond Drouin; mayor, Ernest Cantin; sec.-treas., Henri Deshaies.

Ste. Marie de Blandford—Moved by Francois Croteau, seconded by Wilfrid Martel; mayor, Josaphat Poisson; sec.-treas., Euclide Poisson.

Gentilly—Moved by Henri Mailhot, seconded by Edmond Tourigny; mayor, Arthur Deshaies; sec.-treas. Jos. Uld. Lavigne.

Becancourt (village)—Moved by Philippe Cormier, seconded by Donat Morissette; mayor, Ben Deshaies; sec.-treas., Joseph Hebert.

Becancourt (parish)—Moved by Philippe Cyrenne, seconded by Theodule Dumont; mayor, Emile Beauchesne; sec.-treas., P. E. Cyrenne.

Ste. Gertrude (village)—Moved by Alphonse Bourque, seconded by Maurice Masse; mayor, Alfred St. Cyr; sec.-treas., Nestor St. Cyr.

Ste. Gertrude (parish)—Moved by Omer Houle, seconded by Ernest St. Louis; mayor, Amedee Mailhot; sec.-treas., Paul Deshaies.

St. Sylvestre—Moved by Wilfrid Leblanc, seconded by Jeffrey Thibeault; mayor, Adelard Mayrand; sec.-treas., Joseph Janelle.

Precieux Sang—Moved by Placide Richard, seconded by Louis Abbott; pro-mayor, Donat Lacourse; sec.-treas., J. A. Tourigny.

Ste. Angele de Laval (village)—Moved by Eudore Levasseur, seconded by Zephirin Richard; mayor, J. F. Camirand; sec.-treas., Arthur Deshaies.

Ste. Angele de Laval (parish)—Moved by Edouard Helie, seconded by Alfred Mailhot; mayor; Alcide Tourigny; sec.-treas., J. L. Gelinas.

St. Gregoire (village)—Moved by Sosthene Leblanc, seconded by Onil Gaudet; mayor, Stanislas Helie; sec.-treas., E. Courchesne.

St. Gregoire (parish)—Moved by Hector Lupien, seconded by O. Bergeron; mayor, Elisee Beaulac; sec.-treas., J. A. Gauthier.

St. Celestin (village)—Moved by Lucien Vincent, seconded by Walter Thibeau; mayor, Vilmer Lacharite; sec.-treas., Emile Letiecq.

St. Celestin (parish)—Moved by Joseph Dufresne, seconded by Georges Doucet; sec.-treas., Omer Helie.

St. Wenceslas (village)—Moved by Herve Noel, seconded by F. X. Paquin; sec.-treas., Albert Simard.

St. Wenceslas (parish)—Moved by Philemon Vincent, seconded by Amedee Hebert; sec.-treas., Albert Pare.

St. Raphael D'Aston—Moved by Alfred Vigneault, seconded by Ernest Morin; mayor, Alexandre Gaudet; sec.-treas., Phil. St. Germain.

St. Eulalie—Moved by Ulric Rheault, seconded by Luc Tourigny; mayor, Arthur Gaudet; sec.-treas., Charles Desilets.

St. Samuel de Horton—Moved by Albert Lauzon, seconded by Rodolphe Godin; mayor, Georges Martin; sec.-treas., Pierre Prince.

St. Leonard D'Aston (village)—Moved by J. P. Beliveau, seconded by Henri Lamothe; mayor, J. R. Hebert; sec.-treas., Romulus Roy.

St. Leonard D'Aston (parish)—Moved by Omer Lamothe, seconded by Leon Hebert; sec.-treas., Romulus Roy.

Ste. Brigitte des Saults—Moved by J. E. Benoit, seconded by Eugene Faucher; mayor, Alfred Lambert; sec.-treas., Edmond Dionne.

Ste. Perpetue—Moved by Hector Alie, seconded by Borrome Chauvette; mayor, Hermann Lambert; sec.-treas., Wallace Lemire.

Ste. Monique (village)—Moved by Nestor Provencher, seconded by Zephir Boisclair; mayor, A. Descoteaux; sec.-treas., E. E. Belanger.

Ste. Monique (parish)—Moved by Arthur Rousseau, seconded by Joseph Mathieu; mayor, Omer Girard; sec.-treas., Henri Leblanc.

Nicolet (town)—Moved by Ed. Marchand, seconded by Moras Manseau; mayor, H. N. Biron; sec.-treas., Honore Grenier.

Nicolet (St. Jean Baptiste)—Moved by Louis-Felix Bourgeois, seconded by Phillipe Noury; mayor, Wellie Trudel; sec.-treas., J. Alfred Gaudet.

Nicolet (South)—Moved by Nazaire Lemire, seconded by Noel Fleurant; mayor, Pierre Roy; sec.-treas., J. Alfred Gaudet.

Mr. LAFLECHE (Translation): Will the hon member pemit me to ask a question? Would you object to the county of Nicolet being annexed to that of Arthabaska?

[Mr. Dubois.]

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I have just expressed myself very clearly on this point. What is most natural, at present, is the merging of the county of Yamaska with that of Nicolet. I consider that the annexation of the county of Nicolet to the county of Arthabaska such as advocated in the first place, is absurd.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): That would make too Liberal a county.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Will my hon. friend allow me to put a question? What will be the population of the combined counties of Nicolet and Yamaska?

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): The total population will be 47,000 and some hundreds. I have no objection to accepting a population of 47,000.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Does not my hon. friend consider this figure somewhat high, compared with the adjoining constituencies?

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I may say to the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) that it is not exaggerated at all. The hon. minister needs but to refer to the county of Drummond-Arthabaska, for instance, which adjoins mine, and he will find that it has a population of 53,338.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): The county of Richelieu will have 35,000, the county of Gaspe, 47,160, and the county of Charlevoix-Saguenay, after the present redistribution, will have a population of 55,594.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): No change is being made in Charlevoix-Saguenay.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): One parish is being added to it.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): That is not much.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Chicoutimi county, 55,724. I may therefore say to the hon. Minister of Marine that it would be in no way excessive to give me a population of 47,000, especially when the union is so perfectly natural. I have no objection to accepting that number of people, when it makes it possible for them to remain together, as they have done ever since confederation. I may point out to the hon. Minister of Marine that in giving to Nicolet-Yamaska a population of 47,000 he will be creating a constituency that will need no further changes, a constituency that will be practically everlasting.

I would further point out to the hon. minister that both Nicolet and Yamaska are

essentially agricultural and that, if we annex them together, we shall have the satisfaction of having set up in the heart of Quebec one of those fine farming counties that are the pride of our province.

The county of Yamaska having at present no representative in this House, I protest once more on its behalf against the transfer from it of one half of the village of St. Michel. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine will agree with me that this transfer is an injustice. However, in order to show you that I have well interpreted the feelings of the people of Yamaska in protesting on their behalf against the removal of half the village of St. Michel, I shall, with your permission, read a letter that I received this morning from a person of that county:

Pierreville, Que., May 20, 1933.
Mr. Dubois, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Sir,—

During the past few days I have had the opportunity of meeting the principal citizens of the county of Yamaska. They all seem satisfied to have the county as a whole joined to Nicolet, but they all strongly protest against the separation of the parish of Yamaska, the east and west sides form a single parish, having but one church, which is on the west side. We ask you to protest against the injustice that would result from placing this parish half in Richelieu and half in Nicolet.

We trust you will succeed in preventing the division of this parish, which bears the name of our county.

Believe me, dear, sir,
Yours truly,
Aimé Laperrière.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Was that letter written at your request?

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I thought the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé (Mr. Barrette) was very nice—

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation) —more intelligent than that.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): No, I would not say more intelligent, but he is usually nicer than he is tonight. The question is quite a serious one and I should think the hon. member could give me credit for other intentions than those. I am not acquainted with Mr. Aimé Laperrière, of Pierreville. I did not ask for that letter. Mr. Laperrière expressed the opinion of the county. It is natural for constituents to protest of their own accord against the injustice that would result from removing from Yamaska county—note how ridiculous it is—one half of the parish of St. Michel to place it in the county of Richelieu, when it has been part of Yamaska ever since confederation.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I have also received protests from the parishes directly interested, such as Saint-Pierre, Sainte-Cécile, Sainte-Sophie, Manseau, Lemieux, Sainte-Marie. These parishes have sent me petitions signed, I venture to say, by all their citizens, asking that they be retained in the county of Nicolet. Their petitions read as follows:

Whereas the House of Commons will shortly be called upon to consider the question of the redistribution of constituencies throughout the Dominion;

Whereas the plans, as drawn, would divide up the county of Nicolet and annex its parts to various adjoining counties;

Whereas St-Pierre-les-Becquets in particular, as well as Ste-Cécile-de-Levrard and Ste-Sophie-de-Levrard, are to be annexed to the county of Lotbinière;

Whereas the proposed changes would be inconvenient in many respects, both from the religious and the material point of view;

Whereas the proposed redistribution would reduce, in the province of Quebec, the rural representation in the House of Commons, to the detriment of the agricultural class;

Wherefore, we, the undersigned electors of St-Pierre-les-Becquets, earnestly and respectfully pray the members of the House of Commons:

1. To preserve the identity of the county of Nicolet;

2. To maintain the parish of St-Pierre-les-Becquets and its two neighbours in the county of Nicolet, to which we are proud to belong and to which we desire to remain faithful, our religious and material interests being closely connected with it.

This petition is signed by the tax-payers of the parish of St. Pierre-les-Becquets. I have others to the same effect signed by the tax-payers of the parishes of Ste-Cécile, Manseau, Ste-Sophie, Lemieux and Ste-Marie. The following one, bearing nearly 400 signatures, is from the Conservative parish of Ste-Brigitte-des-Saults:

We, the undersigned electors of Ste-Brigitte-des-Saults, declare that we are opposed to any change, in connection with the electoral redistribution, that would divide or dismember our beautiful county of Nicolet.

We do not object to the addition of other electoral divisions to our county.

We humbly submit this petition, with the conviction that our member, Mr. Lucien Dubois, will constitute himself the advocate of our cause before the governmental authorities.

This document was addressed to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, to the chairman of the redistribution committee and to myself. I trust they have taken cognizance of it and will consider the recommendations of these parishes, whose names I mentioned in order that they may be recorded in Hansard to serve as an acknowledgment of the splendid civic spirit and great fairness that

my good friends have shown in having resolutions passed by their respective municipal councils and in signing petitions protesting against the partitioning of the county of Nicolet.

I have sought, but in vain, the reason for not merging the county of Yamaska as a whole to the county of Nicolet. I fail to understand why the identity of both counties should not be preserved. I requested Yamaska, but I was told that the electoral division resulting from the union of those two counties would have too large a population. I am ready, as well as my constituents, to face an election in a county of 47,000.

I asked the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion) and the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) to cut up neither my county nor Yamaska. We seek a fair and rational redistribution, one that all the people of the province can approve. I asked the officers of the committee to give us a plan that would also command the approval of the thoughtful press of the province, but instead we have been given this altogether inacceptable bill. In order that they may understand the situation, I would request my hon. friends who sit to your right, Mr. Chairman, to put themselves in the position of the people of the parishes it is sought to remove from the counties of which they have formed part for more than one hundred years.

I have already given the reasons that render the integral merger of the counties of Yamaska and Nicolet advisable. I shall repeat them: Both counties are inhabited by a farming population whose interests, mode of life, customs and needs are identical. The two counties form distinct and complete municipal entities. Provincially, they are each a complete unit. Why, then, should we partition them? Why should we divide them? The idea is unacceptable.

When we are called upon to examine the bill in detail, I shall have changes to propose, and I hope that, after due consideration of the reasons I have advanced to-night, it will be found possible to get together and effect a fair, logical and reasonable union of the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska. I do not see why we should refuse to act in accordance with the wishes of the people of these counties. One-half of St-Michel, a Liberal parish, is being taken away from me, as well as six Liberal parishes of Nicolet county. Do my friends opposite think that by thus carving my county and that of Yamaska they will establish a Conservative stronghold? I urge them to dismiss that idea. Should the government carry through its intention to partition these two counties, the Liberal candidate's victory will be greater at the next election than it was in 1930.

The people, even the Conservatives, will feel compelled to convict a government guilty of such a shameful act. I am sufficiently acquainted with my constituents, with their mentality and their feelings, to state, Mr. Chairman, that Conservatives and Liberals will unite to give a unanimous vote to the Liberal candidate as a protest against the wrong inflicted upon them and of which they rightfully complain. I wonder if it is to gild the pill that the hon. Solicitor General said this afternoon: We are establishing, for our friends of the opposition, safe Liberal counties; why should we not establish safe counties for our own party in the province of Quebec? These are, roughly his words. Mr. Chairman, you who know what impartiality is, you who are conscious of your responsibilities as a representative of the people, can you tell us since when we, members of parliament, are entitled to traffic with the votes of the people?

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I think the hon. Solicitor General will regret these words, just as he will regret the last ones he uttered when he said that he did not want to see any further Liberal bloc in the province of Quebec.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): Liberal or Conservative.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Or Conservative, if you wish. You do not want a solid Liberal bloc or a solid Conservative bloc, and you have taken this means to achieve your ends. Let me say to the hon. members opposite that neither they nor I control any solid bloc in the province, that it is the people who decide on polling day whether or not there shall be a solid Conservative bloc or a solid Liberal bloc. Let us respect the rights and privileges of the people instead of violating them.

I shall close my remarks. I hope my recommendations will be considered. I have submitted them in all possible sincerity and once more I ask the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion), the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) and especially the hon. Minister of Marine to put themselves for a moment in the place of the people of the parishes they seek to remove from the

counties of Nicolet and Yamaska. They will understand, for I think I may truthfully say that they are men with a sense of feeling, that these parishes should not be thus expelled. I do not say they will not find good friends in the counties to which it is proposed to attach them, but I do most energetically protest against their separation from the county to which they have belonged ever since confederation.

Mr. J. A. VERVILLE (Lotbinière) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the bill submitted to us will be carried by the vote of the majority in this house. We have been told it would be and we are certain of it. In so far as the county of Lotbinière is concerned, I wish to register my humble protest. If the members of the redistribution committee, actuated by a feeling of generosity, have sought to make a present to Lotbinière county by inordinately enlarging it, I have at least the right to protest, and I intend to do so. Since confederation, the boundaries of the county of Lotbinière have never been touched by any political party, whether Liberal or Conservative. Since 1867, the two great political parties have several times succeeded each other in the administration of the country and never at any time has a Liberal government or a Conservative government dared to lay hands on that county. We had to live in the present era, an era of depression—

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Is it a crime to touch your county?

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Perhaps it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Its name is Touch-me-not.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): We had to live in the present era to see such things.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): We have given you some beautiful Liberal parishes.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): This year, actuated by a very special zeal, animated by a blue flame, they have said: We must lay hands on every county that has not elected a Conservative in the past. By the way, I thank the members of the committee, especially my excellent friend the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion), my university confrère, for the beautiful gift he wishes to make the county of Lotbinière, of which I am to-day the representative.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): If you are satisfied, why do you protest?

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Come, come, senator.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Have you not understood? I said that I was protesting. Lotbinière has to-day a population of 23,034, living in 22 parishes and 11 villages. The bill now before us would add to it six parishes and one village, with a population of 5,336, taken from the constituency of my friend from Nicolet (Mr. Dubois). On the south side it would get, from Megantic, six parishes with a population of 4,532. From Levis there would be added to it five parishes with 3,943 souls.

Mr. FORTIN (Translation): Will you please state that the parishes from Levis were given to you at your own request, made in November, 1932, when I did not yet know there would be a redistribution?

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I shall have to insert a parenthesis here. One day, when the enlargement of Lotbinière county was in question, I happened to meet my good friend Dr. Fortin, now member for Levis, and I said to him that in the event of my county being enlarged, three parishes from his county; St-Nicholas, St-Etienne and St-Lambert, would quite naturally be transferred to it. There was not mention of St-Rédempteur. We met several times since and the three parishes I have just named were the ones in question. How is it that St-Rédempteur figures in this bill? Did you ever mention it to me?

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I know that I should address the Chair. I ask my hon. friend to state whether St-Rédempteur was ever mentioned.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): It has been given to you in addition.

Mr. FORTIN (Translation): Unfortunately, I have to contradict my hon. colleague from Lotbinière and to state on my honour that on three different occasions you told me that the Chaudière river would form the dividing line between Lotbinière and Lévis. On the first occasion when mention was made of giving me the parishes you named I had witnesses who are not very far away, for the deputy-speaker of the house was there. It is fear that prompted you to make the offer you did make to me, as there was talk at the time of annexing Lotbinière to Nicolet or. .

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): That is a good idea.

Mr. FORTIN (Translation): ..or Lotbinière to Arthabaska.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): In the first place, you should address the Chair when you speak in this house. You have made a statement on your honour. Perhaps my word is worth that of the member for Lévis.

A MEMBER (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I maintain that there was no reference in these conversations to the Chaudière river and that St-Nicholas, St-Etienne and St-Lambert were alone mentioned.

Mr. FORTIN (Translation): You admit that the parishes of St-Etienne, St-Nicholas and St-Lambert were mentioned, but not St-Rédempteur. Well, is it possible to annex these three parishes without including St-Rédempteur, which is bounded on the west by St-Nicholas, on the south by St-Etienne, on the north by St-Nicholas and on the east by the Chaudière river. . . .

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): It is bounded all around.

Mr. FORTIN (Translation): Would there be any means of communication between St-Rédempteur and the county of Lévis? There could be none. How, then could you annex these three parishes from Lévis county without taking in St-Rédempteur, which is surrounded by the parishes you yourself have requested?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Mr. Chairman. would you kindly render a Solomonic judgment in order to determine which of the two hon. members is telling the truth.

Mr. MERCIER (Translation): It is a most involved matter.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I must say that I never, under any circumstances, asked for these parishes. I simply told you, when I met you, that if Lotbinière county had to be enlarged, it would be rational to add to it the parishes of St-Nicholas, St-Etienne and St-Lambert. St-Rédempteur was never mentioned and I never asked for those parishes which form part of Lévis county. I demand a retraction.

Mr. FORTIN (Translation): I beg your pardon, you did ask for them; I call to witness the deputy-speaker of the house.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order. Hon. members must not address each other; they must address the Chair.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): He is the judge; he cannot be a witness.

[Mr. Barrette.]

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I maintain that I never asked for any parish from Lévis and that I never signed any arrangement in that connection. Furthermore, I never agreed that the four parishes from Lévis county that are presently being transferred to Lotbinière form part of the latter without my consent. I told the hon. member for Lévis that if it were desired to enlarge the county of Lotbinière the natural way would be to annex to it the parishes of St-Nicholas, St-Etienne and St-Lambert. There was no mention of St-Rédempteur. No reference was ever made to the river, nor to the removal of the boundaries in order to form an enclosed territory as the hon. member for Lévis has just said.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That is true.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): It is not a river, it is a brook.

Mr. MERCIER: (Translation): Let us dump all that into the Chaudière and get on with the bill.

Mr. FORTIN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I call you to witness; you were there. I hope that when you leave the Chair you will kindly bear testimony.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The hon. member for St-Henri and I were present at all the conversations and it is the member for Lotbinière who is right.

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): I do not recall the matter exactly, but it is highly involved. Let us dump it all into the Chaudière and get on with our business.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I hold the hon. member for Lévis in high esteem; I am aware of all the annoyances he has suffered since his election. . .

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): He has suffered annoyances?

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): . . . . I respect his integrity and his good qualities.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I have always considered him a truthful man and I should like to be able to accept his word, as I am at all times ready to do on any other point.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that on one side of the river there is being added to Lotbinière county the parishes of St-Lambert, St-Etienne and St-Nicholas. . . .

Sir EUGENE FISET (Translation): The school-children's patron.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Do you object to St-Rédempteur?

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Very much.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): I think it is your salvation.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, St-Rédempteur has a population of 657; St-Etienne, of 588; St-Lambert, of 1,188; St-Nicholas, of 851; Nicholas-Sud, of 659, which makes a total of 3,943 added to the population of my county. As representative of the county of Lotbinière, I am pleased to welcome all these people and to ask them to maintain the same feelings, the same ideas, the same customs. . . .

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): . . . .the same opinions, the same practices as when they belonged to the county of Lévis.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): With them you will be saved.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): From the Nicolet side, the county of my birth, the redistribution projected by my friends opposite brings to the county of Lotbinière a population of 5,386 with six parishes and one village.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): A beautiful village.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): St-Joseph-de-Blandford, 533; Manseau, the birth-place of my friend Savoie whom death has recently taken, 530; Ste-Marie, 574; St-Pierre-les-Becquets, 1,212.

Mr. DORION (Translation): St-Pierre-Becquets?

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): "Les"-Becquets, if you please, Ste-Cécile, 707; Ste-Sophie, 1,439; Lemieux, 341.

Mr. DORION (Translation): It is for the best.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I do not think it is for the best. That makes six Nicolet parishes annexed to Lotbinière. From an election point of view I do not think I need them. The matter was well explained just now by the hon. member for Nicolet: it is done in order to try to take away a Liberal majority of 730 which he had at the last election. . . . . .

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): You must have a great deal of influence.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): —and to place it in the county of Lotbinière. To that end they made an indentation so as to take in Lemieux and Ste-Marie. To all these citizens I offer, on behalf of the people of Lotbinière, a most cordial welcome. I already informed the hon. member for Nicolet that neither I nor the county of Lotbinière had asked for his constituents.

Mr. BRADETTE (Translation): He is not very sure of that.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, since the committee is giving these citizens of Nicolet to Lotbinière, I must tell the hon. member for Nicolet—and I ask him to transmit the message to his constituents —that the electors of Lotbinière are happy to welcome them, because they entertain the same sentiments and ideas, and they hope to see them continue as always to vote for the right party.

Certain manoeuvres affecting the county of Megantic have to be explained. The first plan laid before the committee would have placed in Lotbinière county the residence of the hon. member for Megantic. When my friends opposite noticed this was not sufficient to bring him into Lotbinière, they said: We will take this county seat, and they placed Inverness in Lotbinière. Following numerous discussions and adjustments and, I suppose, after invoking the Holy Spirit, the members of the committee concluded that the project was nonsensical. They left the hon. member for Megantic in his own county and they left him his county seat, but they insisted on transferring part of his territory to Lotbinière, and this is what they did: they took Lyster, Ste-Anastasie, Nelson township, Leeds, Leeds-East and St-Jacques-de-Leeds, with a population of 4,532, and placed them in Lotbinière. And, mark you well, in order to do that, they managed to carve out what I may call a flute with the county of Megantic, thereby joining it to Frontenac county. To these citizens of Megantic county, as to those of Nicolet and of Lévis that are being transferred to my constituency, I extend, on behalf of the people of Lotbinière, a most cordial welcome. May they always follow the example set by the people of Lotbinière.

I must further state, as the hon. ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) so eloquently said this morning, Nicolet has its natural neighbours: on one side, Nicolet, on the other side, Lévis, and on the south, Megantic. I have been lengthened, or, I should say, my constituency has been lengthened in the direction of Beauce.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): You have been extended.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): That would suit many people.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Your expression may be the better one; thank you. They have extended Lotbinière in the direction of Beauce and attached—some say annexed—to Lotbinière county St-Elzéar and St-Séverin.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Jack-knife factory.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): That makes 1,700 more of a population. The people of Lotbinière county will certainly be glad to learn that these good citizens of Beauce are going to join them. On behalf of my present constituents, I extend to them, as I did to the people of Nicolet, of Megantic and of Lévis, a most hearty welcome. May they, once in Lotbinière, share the views of the present citizens of that county.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Do not forget the elections.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I have made the round; I still have the horizon before me. I do not know whether you have ever travelled in my country, which is not very far from your own. Lotbinière county happens to be bounded on the north by the river St. Lawrence. While the bargaining in connection with the county's boundary lines was going on I often wondered whether some way would be imagined to pull a few parishes out of the river in order to attach them to Lotbinière. The former Minister of Justice stated this morning that that plan did not succeed, and I thank the members of the committee for having refrained from forcing me, or rather from forcing the people of Lotbinière to take steps to secure the erection of a bridge in order to fetch a few electors from Portneuf. Such a suggestion was made not long since and it seems to me it would not be any more ridiculous here than elsewhere.

I wish to state that this enlargement has never, in any manner whatever, been requested by the county of Lotbinière. Should some people call you to witness, Mr. Chairman, you are too honest not to tell the truth and you will therefore tell the truth. One thing is certain and that is that my friends opposite have said to themselves: Since confederation Lotbinière has always elected a Liberal; we have tried in every way to capture it, but in vain. We will therefore rearrange the constituency in such a manner that he who comes forward as a candidate will find himself faced with a discouraging task.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): To build a stronghold of it!

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I know the people of my county well enough to say that they never lose courage, especially in the defence of a just cause.

This afternoon I heard the hon. Minister of Marine say that there existed certain counties of which the municipal or judicial boundaries had never changed, and he mentioned Lotbinière. I would point out to the hon. Minister of Marine and to all those who would say like him that never, in the past, have the municipal boundaries of Lotbinière been adjusted to suit the provincial and federal boundaries. We have, of course, the county council which represent all the municipalities that elect the representatives to the Ottawa and Quebec parliaments. That has always been and still is, but it will no longer be under the new plan that is to be adopted. And now, Mr. Chairman, in order to show that, in the past, judicial, municipal, provincial and federal boundaries have been adhered to as much as possible, I shall quote a statement made many years ago by one who, when he spoke, knew what he was saying. The following statement of a former prime minister—Sir Wilfrid Laurier is to be found in Hansard for 1914, page 845:

> The selectmen in every county have to meet several times a year for the discharge of their judicial functions as jurors and their municipal functions as municipal councillors, and at these meetings they prepare themselves for the public life of the country. They discuss not only the matters pertaining to their judicial or municipal functions, but naturally the larger questions which concern national problems. It it evident that this predisposes men to proper and safe judgment upon all matters of public interest. It seems to me obvious that if you interfere with the lines of the county unit, separate those who meet periodically for the discharge of their municipal and other duties, and provide that they shall only meet once in four or five years to decide on political questions, you detract from, rather than add to, their appreciation of public questions.

The principle laid down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1914 holds good to-day, but you depart from it when you attach part of Nicolet, which belongs to the judicial district of Nicolet, to Lotbinière, which belongs to the judicial district of Quebec. By what right do you arbitrarily place people in a county belonging to a judicial district other than their own? I ask you to respect the estab-

lished municipal and judicial, as well as county, divisions. If you have to take one or two counties from the rural districts, take them, but join them in their entirety to others. Merge even four counties if you have to, but, at least, do not carve them. Do not split up parishes. Do not, for selfish political or personal considerations that are probably not worth the trouble, divide a village by a river that happens to flow through it. For Heaven's sake, respect established lines.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, would you kindly call it eleven o'clock.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, May 24, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Hon. E. N. RHODES (for the Minister of Labour): I desire to lay on the table order in council P.C. 980 passed pursuant to the provisions of the relief legislation.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

ELECTRIC COMPANIES—ALLEGED COMBINE

Mr. BUTCHER:

1. Was a petition for an inquiry under The Combines Investigation Act alleging that an illegal combine consisting of: Canadian General Electric Company Limited, Canadian Marconi Company (limited liability), Canadian Westinghouse Company Limited, Northern Electric Company Limited, Western Electric Company Limited, Standard Radio Manufacturing Corporation (now the Rogers-Majestic Corporation), Canadian Radio Patents Limited, is operating and has operated since January 19, 1927, filed with the registrar under the Combines Investigation Act, during the year 1930?
2. Did the registrar make an investigation and report to the minister?
3. Was the report of the registrar of such a character as to induce the minister to transmit the complaint, the petition, copy of the evidence taken at the investigations and other necessary documents to the Attorney-General of Ontario for appropriate action under section 31 (a) and (b) of the Combines Investigation Act?
4. In view of the fact that the Attorney-General of Ontario did not institute proceedings against the alleged illegal combine, has the minister considered the advisability of applying any of the other remedies enumerated in section 31 of the Combines Investigation Act, and what decision has he arrived at in connection therewith?

Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. Gordon):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes, but no further action is contemplated.

ALFRED, ONT., PEAT BOG

Mr. BERTRAND:

1. Is the government advised that an English company, Fuels Development, Limited, has decided to work the peat bog at Alfred, Ontario?
2. Has this company asked the government to grant a subsidy for the furtherance of the undertaking?
3. Will the government assist the development of such peat bog?
4. If so, in what manner?

Mr. BENNETT (for Mr. Gordon):

1. No.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

MONTREAL HARBOUR BOARD

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the government aware that the Montreal harbour board employs American subjects as timekeepers in the place of Canadian-born British subjects?
2. If so, what are the names of these American subjects, and were Canadian-born British subjects replaced by them?

Mr. DURANLEAU:

The following information has been furnished by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal:

1. All timekeepers on the staff of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, without exception, are Canadian-born British subjects.
2. Answered by No. 1.

BONAVENTURE COUNTY—PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Have any public works been authorized by the Department of Public Works, for the present year, in the county of Bonaventure?
2. If so, what are their nature, what amounts have been authorized, and in what localities?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Yes.
2.

St. Simeon Centre—		
To cut and bridge a gap in shore end of wharf..		$ 275
Port Daniel East—		
Repairs to wharf..	$2,600	
Removal of stone..	600	
		3,200

Miller & Mann (Hopetown)—	
To repair roadway approach..	100
St. Godfroy—	
Removing sand and gravel accumulated on wharf.. ..	25
Cross Point—	
Wharf improvements..	2,200

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

For a copy of orders in council P.C. 1947 and P.C. 1948, together with a copy of telegrams, cablegrams, letters and other correspondence relating to subject matter of said orders in council as at present on the files of the Department of External Affairs.

NORMAN JOLLIMORE

Mr. VALLANCE (for Mr. Ralston):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents, regarding the dispensing with the services of Norman Jollimore, mail carrier between Halifax and Lower Prospect post offices, and the awarding of the service to J. Bernard Umlah of Terrance Bay from the 1st of March of this year, and also with regard to changing the contract so that the services will be from Lower Prospect to White's Lake connecting with the mails from Upper Prospect.

RELIEF FUNDS—GLACE BAY

Mr. VALLANCE (for Mr. Ralston):

For a copy of all correspondence, evidence, reports, and other papers and documents respecting the investigation recently held regarding the administration of relief funds at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia.

POST OFFICE—FIELD, ONT.

Mr. HURTUBISE:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions, reports and other documents in possession of the government, respecting any change made since 1930 in the postmastership or in the location of the post office at Field, Ontario.

SUTHERLAND COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury) (for Mr. Gott):

For a copy of the report, evidence and all information obtained by the Sutherland commission, in the investigation into tobacco buying conditions in the province of Ontario, following alleged report of combine and application for investigation under the Combines Investigation Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think this had better stand.

Motion stands.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

COAL INQUIRY

Mr. WOODSWORTH (for Mr. Mitchell) moved:

For a copy of the report and evidence arising out of the investigations of Fred McGregor, registrar, under the Combines Investigation Act into the importation of British coal.

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Labour (Mr. Gordon) a few days ago made clear the position of the department with respect to this matter. The evidence in question has been transmitted to the attorney general of Quebec, and the report of the registrar upon the evidence would prejudice the position of any person who might be brought to trial. Under the general provisions of the law and the rules that regulate the conduct of government I submit that in the first place it is improper to ask for the papers and, in the second place, that the government would have to resist the motion because it cannot prejudice the position of any person who might be accused under the provisions of the act. The report of the registrar upon the evidence is calculated to prejudice the fair trial of any person who might be accused.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the Prime Minister if it has not been the practice in certain cases to publish such evidence, and if so why should there be any change of policy in this particular instance?

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot answer that question. If it has been done in times past that is no reason why the position of a possible defendant to a criminal charge should be prejudiced by the premature publication of comments upon the testimony on which he might be adjudged guilty or innocent.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member withdraw the motion?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is the only thing to be done, I suppose, if the government will not give the information.

Motion withdrawn.

PATENTS ACT RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

For a copy of (1) amended rules and regulations governing the administration of the Patents Act; (2) regulations and forms for carrying into effect the Unfair Competition Act of 1932, which were made effective September, 1932.

Mr. CAHAN: It would be impossible for me to comply with this order within the next twenty-four hours, but if the hon. gentleman will withdraw it I shall see that copies are

sent to him at the earliest possible date. Some of these rules are under consideration and are before council for modification, and I will send him the amended copies as soon as possible.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Very well; stand.

Motion stands.

CONFERRING OF TITLES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question arising out of the reply he made yesterday to my inquiry with regard to the government's view with respect to the conferring of titles. Yesterday the right hon. Prime Minister stated:

> . . . it is the considered view of His Majesty's government in Canada that a resolution passed by one house of parliament is legally effective only as an expression of the opinion of those who support such resolution in that house, and this is particularly true with respect to the prerogative of the crown.
>
> The sovereign can only be deprived of a prerogative right by statute of parliament, in very special form, which the government does not propose to introduce. There is apparently no opportunity at this time for discussion of the matters referred to by the right honourable gentleman.

The matter referred to by myself, mentioned in the last sentence, was as to whether the government would undertake to say that no titles would be conferred until parliament had been given an opportunity to discuss the matter anew. I wish now to ask the Prime Minister whether he will give the house the assurance that we will have an opportunity to discuss the question of titles before the government advises His Majesty in any way with respect to the exercise of the royal prerogative in regard to the conferring of titles in Canada.

I should like to add to my question, if I may, that the reason I urge that this assurance be given is that the house has all along been under the impression, until the reply of the Prime Minister was made, that a resolution of this house would bind the government. The question with respect to titles was asked at the beginning of this part of the session, I think, but was answered only a day or two ago so really no opportunity has been given the house to discuss the question as I am sure it would have wished to do had the opinion of the government been made known.

I might add further that, as my right hon. friend will recall, on February 14, 1929, the house refused to entertain a motion of the present hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan) that a special committee be appointed to inquire into the question of titles with a view to considering whether the resolution of the House of Commons of May, 1919, should not be rescinded. That motion was voted down by a very large majority, I think it was 114 to 60. In view of that fact, and because on two occasions the house has expressed itself as opposed to the conferring of titles, and also since there has been an understanding on the part of hon. members that the resolution of 1919 would be binding, no intimation to the contrary having been given until yesterday—

Mr. BENNETT: Some days ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I accept my right hon. friend's correction; I believe the statement of the government's position was made a day or two ago, but the question as to opportunity being given hon. members of discussing the matter was not answered until yesterday. I do not imagine hon. members would wish to discuss the matter at this stage of the session; before, however, His Majesty is advised to exercise the right of conferring titles I think an opportunity should be given for a full discussion of this question.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): I regret that I am unable to give any such assurance with respect to any matter of that character. I can only add that personally I have never held the opinion that a resolution of this house had any effect upon succeeding parliaments, or that it was binding upon anyone other than the persons who were parties to it or who desired to be bound by it. A resolution passed by this house stands in exactly the same position as a resolution passed by any other deliberative body in Canada whether it be a city council or a town council, so far as the effect on the legal position is concerned. I do not care to give any assurance with respect to a matter of executive government or with respect to what might be, without governmental intervention, the exercise of the prerogative rights of the sovereign, which have not been limited in any sense by any action taken by this parliament, and which could be limited only in the special manner which I indicated yesterday.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny): I hesitate to interpose my remarks in connection with a question on which I was not consulted, but I was just wondering whether the resolution passed by this parliament, called the Nickle resolution, is not in direct conflict

with the statute of Westminster. That is a phase of the matter which should be looked into. It seems to me that the Nickle resolution was for the advice of the Imperial government, and that the king exercised his prerogative on the advice of the Imperial government. In view of the statute of Westminster I should think this resolution would become void because of the new position assumed by the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suppose it is not proper to debate this question at the moment, but the point just raised by my hon. friend shows the desirability of having the question debated by the house before any steps are taken. If he will permit me to do so I should like to say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that his reply raises an even larger question, inasmuch as I take it to mean that the prerogative of conferring titles may be exercised by His Majesty the King altogether apart from the advice of his ministry. I submit that the exercise of all the royal prerogatives are subject to the advice of the ministry, the one with regard to titles quite as much as the one with regard to pardons.

Mr. BENNETT: With Your Honour's permission I only desire to direct the attention of the right hon. gentleman, who is widely read, to the life of Mr. Asquith. My right hon. friend will recall the communication sent to Mr. Asquith by his sovereign, who made it abundantly clear that it was not on the advice of anyone that he asked Mr. Asquith to accept an earldom. The prerogative of the sovereign is still in existence; it has not been taken from him and can only be taken away in the manner I have indicated. I only mention that to be correct legally. My right hon. friend will recall another instance in which the same action was taken by the late Queen Victoria.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But may I say that the exercise of the prerogative in each of those cases was in accord with the well known and established custom at Westminster. The contrary is the case here.

Mr. BENNETT: As the right hon. gentleman will recall, that is hardly the fact. When the late Baron Parke left the bench it was recommended to his sovereign that he would be made a life peer and he was gazetted a life peer under the title Lord Wensleydale. The committee on privileges in the Lords met and decided that the prerogative of the sovereign could not be exercised to create him a life peer but only an hereditary peer. Accordingly his patent as a life peer was cancelled and he was made an hereditary peer, because it was ascertained as a constitutional matter that there was that limitation upon the exercise of the prerogative.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to deprive my right hon. friend of being made a life peer if that is the intention of His Majesty, but all I would ask is that before a title of that kind is accepted by himself or anyone else an opportunity be given this parliament to express its views with respect to titles in this country.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why say that?

Mr. BENNETT: As a matter of privilege I suppose I should say that if the right hon. gentleman thinks he has added to the courtesies of debate, or established for himself any firmer position in the regard and esteem of the people of the country, by the observations he has just made in answer to an explanation with respect to the limitation of the prerogative of the crown, I am content.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I am content also if my right hon. friend thinks his lecture will improve the amenities of parliamentary discussion. What I said was perfectly reasonable in the circumstances. It was a remark which was understood by members of the house and which will be received by the country in the spirit in which it was meant.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 106, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What are the amendments?

Mr. DURANLEAU: The only amendments made by the Senate are with respect to two sections. The first amendment has to do with the pilotage authority, a word or two having been added to the section. The section provided that in the absence of the minister the authority would be vested in the deputy minister, and the Senate has provided that it shall be in the absence of the minister from Ottawa. The other amendment is merely a minor change in the last section. Paragraph 12 of section 1 of the statute will come

into force at a date to be proclaimed by the Governor in Council and published in the Canada Gazette.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house resumed from Tuesday, May 23, consideration in committee of Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. LaVergne in the chair.

Mr. JOSEPH JEAN (Maisonneuve) (Translation): I had not intended to take part in this debate at its present stage, but, the statement having been made that the increased population of the island of Montreal is the cause of the extensive readjustments that the majority in this house is seeking to effect in 52 of the 65 electoral divisions of the province of Quebec, I thought it advisable to set forth the situation with respect to the island of Montreal, as it appears to me personally, without in any way binding my colleagues or my leaders, in order that it may be well understood that the changes it is necessary to make in the distribution of the Montreal constituencies in no way justify the almost general redistribution it is sought to effect in the remainder of the province.

I wish also to throw some light on certain points regarding the procedure that appears to have been followed in redistributing the Montreal island constituencies, in order that it may not later be said that we willingly accepted, or that we suggested, changes that are not rational and that do not conform to the interests and the views of the people of the island of Montreal.

We, the Liberal members for Montreal, have understood that the majority in this house would decide in the last analysis, and that it would be impossible to reach an understanding were we to insist on the application of logical principles in every case. We had nevertheless to take into consideration the wishes of the majority, to study the various plans submitted, to understand their import, and to protest against the most flagrant wrongs, leaving, for the rest, to our friends opposite the entire responsibility of the changes to be effected.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that we have approached the problem of the redistribution of the Montreal island constituencies and that we have reached. I shall not say an agreement, but more or less satisfactory conclusions, which, though lacking as they are in soundness and in conformity to common sense and to the interests of the population, reflect the opinion of the majority in this house, and which we have been obliged to accept as the lesser evil.

Various bases of redistribution, as regards Montreal, were possible. It was acknowledged in the first place that Montreal was entitled to a larger number of members, by reason of its increased population. It had in 1921 a population of 724,205, divided in thirteen constituencies, giving a unit of 55,700. According to the census of 1931, its population is 1,003,868. The unit of 1921 would yield at least eighteen constituencies. But, in order not to disturb too much the remainder of the province, it was agreed, I suppose, to increase the number of Montreal divisions to sixteen, or three more than in 1921.

The addition of three electoral divisions to Montreal should not, it seems to me, necessitate changes in more than six or seven rural ridings. However, I shall leave the discussion of this phase of the question to my friends representing the other counties of the province.

The addition of three electoral divisions to the island of Montreal would give an average population of 62,000 per constituency. It should have been easy to establish these three new divisions without upsetting the present constituency boundaries of the entire island. The thirteen present divisions of Montreal island have the following populations: Maisonneuve, the division I have the honour to represent, 116,311; Hochelaga, 87,096; St. Mary's 65,555; St. Denis, 140,940; St. James, 54,903; Cartier, 48,064; Laurier-Outremont, 88,579; St. Ann's, 60,696; St. Lawrence-St. George, 37,861; St. Antoine, 36,033; Mount Royal, 93,035; St. Henry, 44,019, and Jacques Cartier, 130,776.

Had we taken the three most populous constituencies of the whole Dominion, viz.: Maisonneuve, St. Denis and Jacques Cartier, which cover the entire suburban area of Montreal and which are practically the only ones where the population is likely to increase, and divided their combined population of 388,027 by the unit of 62,000 established for the sixteen electoral divisions, we would have had six constituencies instead of three. Such a division would have settled the Montreal representation without difficulty or acrimony. For I believe that the electors of the ten other Montreal divisions do not desire any changes and that their present representatives have no objection to retaining them as they are.

Apparently that did not suit our friends opposite, who set about to draw up all sorts

of plans, each one more fantastic than the other, until they came to the one now before this house. But it now appears that it is to be changed once more, at the request of the Liberal members, in order to adjust certain wrongs it contains.

I thought it well to ascertain for myself the division of population between the fifteen constituencies as described in the bill, and I wish to lay the figures before the house in order to throw some light upon the subject. According to the bill, the new constituency of Mercier, which is a detachment of the present division of Maisonneuve, would have a population of 68,560, and the new constituency of Maisonneuve-Rosemount, another detachment from my riding, would have a population of 62,558. Hochelaga has 82,100; Lafontaine, a new division, taken from the present constituency of St. Denis, 66,234; St. Denis, 77,259; St. James, 95,942; Cartier, 59,361; Laurier, a new division, detached from Laurier-Outremont, 66,356; Outremont, 50,948; St. Ann's, 41,556; St. Antoine-Westmount, 43,938; St. Lawrence-St. George, 46,632; Mount Royal, 63,451; St. Henry, 75,458; Verdun, a new constituency, 63,107, and Jacques Cartier, 45,544.

As I stated further back, amendments have been suggested to right the undeniable wrong committed in the bill as regards the constituency of St. Mary, and, if I am correctly informed, these amendments will distribute the population as follows: Mercier, a new division, 72,060; Maisonneuve-Rosemount, 69,534; Hochelaga, 76,742; St. Mary's, 76,555; Lafontaine would disappear; St. Denis, 83,949; St. James, 73,813; Cartier, 59,361; Laurier, 66,356; Outremont, 50,948; St. Ann's, 41,556; St. Antoine-Westmount, 43,938; St. Lawrence-St. George, 46,632; Mount Royal, 63,451; St. Henry, 75,458; Verdun, 63,107, and Jacques Cartier, 45,544.

This new plan is certainly more acceptable that the one contained in the bill and we are quite ready to agree to it in order to avoid unduly prolonging the debate. We had prepared, however, a far more suitable plan which we submitted, not as being an ideal one, but as being better suited to the needs of the people of Montreal and as meeting half-way the requirements of our friends opposite. I wish to lay it before you, such as we have prepared it, in order to show that, on this side of the house, for myself at least. . . . .

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to put a question?

Mr. JEAN (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): Was it not understood last week that the redistribution of the Montreal divisions would be effected following an agreement between the two sides of the House?

Mr. JEAN (Translation): I do not think there was any final understanding, although we reached certain conclusions. If my hon. friend can assure us that there are changes. . . In any case, I wish to submit the changes that we suggested and which are, I say, more acceptable than the one set forth in the bill. I wish to state that we have endeavoured to meet the requirements of our hon. friends opposite.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I would like the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to place his proposals in writing.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): Last week we decided to accept your conditions and we asked the clerks to insert the descriptions as agreed upon. I am greatly surprised to learn to-day that you have other suggestions to make.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Your verbal propositions are worthless.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): They are the propositions of honest men.

Mr JEAN (Translation): In the first place, I must say to my hon. friend that, in so far as I am concerned, I have neither accepted nor rejected these propositions. However, I am keeping an eye on my interests and those of my constituents in connection with this matter.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): Yesterday, I asked the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) to kindly submit the government's plan regarding the island of Montreal. He replied that he would do so later. I am in entire agreement with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier when he says that last week we had reached an understanding regarding the redistribution of the Montreal island divisions. Under that plan, St. Mary's was to remain and Lafontaine to disappear. The population of the latter was to be divided between Hochelaga, St. Denis and St. Mary's.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): And part of it was to go to Mercier.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): We accepted the representations of our friends on the committee, but we received no confirmation of this plan and that is why I asked the hon. minister yesterday, to tell us what the government intended to do regarding Montreal. If my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will tell us now that the plan

submitted last week is the one the government will submit to this house, I think the debate will be greatly simplified.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Marine has just left his seat. I must say that, up to last week, we had practically settled the redistribution of Montreal Island. If, in the course of the day, the Liberal representative on the committee, the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier) will kindly meet the hon. Minister of Marine and myself, we will be ready to continue negotiations with a view to reaching an agreement, if possible.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): I am ready to meet the hon. Minister of Marine and my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier immediately. Should we come to an agreement, it will be useless to pursue the debate.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): In that case, I shall ask the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Jean) to postpone his speech regarding the island of Montreal.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Let him finish it.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): I am willing to put off my remarks until the conclusion of the negotiations, but I should like to point out that, in the course of the observations I have made, I did not say that we rejected or that we accepted the proposals and the plan submitted to us. I set out the situation that is being created and gave figures that, I believe, will help to solve the problem.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): It seems to me that, having almost reached an understanding, it is not right to take advantage of the Montreal island situation to make political capital.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): I have no objection to postpone my observations, and, if we succeed in coming to an agreement, I shall be happy to say nothing more on the subject.

Mr. SAMUEL GOBEIL (Compton): Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the debate which has taken place during the last few days. The speech of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Jean), and those of yesterday and the day before, seem to justify the conclusion that it is impossible to come to any agreement in this matter. I had understood for the last four or five days, and my understanding was increased by the speeches of yesterday and the day before, that the question of the island of Montreal had been settled and that an agreement had been arrived at. Since the so-called conciliation committee has been functioning our work has been less direct but I understood that a suggestion had been made to hon. friends opposite with regard to the island of Montreal that had been accepted. But the discussion of the last day or two has led me to believe that it is impossible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion.

I was somewhat delighted and I must confess greatly surprised at certain remarks made the day before yesterday by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). If we are to take his word the members from Quebec on the special committee have been wonderful prestidigitators. According to him, they have succeeded in making Conservative constituencies out of Liberal constituencies. I must confess that I am not quite as optimistic as the hon. member for Quebec East, although I hope his prediction will be realized. He gave the principle under which he thought this committee should have worked, namely, not to disturb municipal, county or district lines. His exact words are reported on page 5309 of Hansard, as follows:

> —how deeply attached the citizens of that province are to their municipal lines, which have existed from time immemorial. That applies to the municipal lines, the county lines, even the district lines.

Before I go into my argument in detail, I must say right now that I disagree absolutely with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Quebec East. In disagreeing with him I find myself very much in accord with the opinion expressed yesterday by the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin). He admitted that in many cases it was impossible to do this, but I desire to go further and say that in most cases it is impossible not to change these lines. In my opinion municipal, county and district lines should be forgotten absolutely when we are arranging federal electoral districts. I do not intend to argue this point at any length, but how can we respect municipal, provincial and district lines in the province of Quebec when there are sixty-five federal constituencies, seventy-four rural county divisions, and ninety or ninety-one provincial electoral districts? I think these figures show that it is impossible not to disturb these lines and they should be forgotten when we are making a redistribution for federal purposes. But none of these imaginary boundary lines, if you wish to call them that, are being disturbed. The hon. member for Quebec East pointed out that the people should not be set apart. They are not being set apart. Municipal boundaries are not being disturbed; county boundaries are not being disturbed, and the

people will continue to work and meet together as they have in the past, whether the federal electoral district is extended or contracted. That will have nothing to do with municipal or county administration. Let me illustrate my point in a very few words by referring to my own constituency which has not been changed. As far as county purposes are concerned, Compton belongs to four different counties. For county purposes, a few parishes in my constituency go in with the county of Stanstead while others have to go to the Sherbrooke county council. In the eastern part of the county they go to the Frontenac county council, and the bulk of the county goes to the county council of Compton. Nobody has ever complained or found fault in regard to that. Yesterday an hon. member said that we were going as far as to divide parishes. I have that situation in my county too; one parish has been divided into two for a long time and nobody has complained. Therefore on that point I wish to give my opinion as strongly as I can. As I said before, I am very much in accord with the ex-Minister of Marine, that this action might have been taken now, but I am sure it will be taken when the next redistribution bill is drafted when county lines and, indeed, all lines should be forgotten.

I wish to make a few remarks in connection with population. It has been said by hon. members opposite and, in fact, by some hon. members on this side, that we in this bill have tried to equalize population. That is true. But as the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) said yesterday, this is absolutely impossible if we take the province as a whole. I wish to tell the committee the idea on which we worked in this redistribution. Some counties, for certain but not in each case for the same reasons, have not been changed. In the eastern townships practically no changes have been made because, in view of the fact that they are the only rural part of the province where the English speaking element can secure representation, not only was it a matter of agreement but there is in the British North America Act a provision whereby the county boundaries of the eastern townships cannot be changed except by the wish of the majority of the members for those counties; at all events, those counties have not been changed. Therefore we cannot take as a basis for the average population the counties of the eastern townships.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): Will the hon. member allow me to ask a question for the purpose of information? Does the reference made in the British North America Act to the counties of the eastern townships not apply only so far as provincial counties are concerned? I am not sure; I am asking that as a matter of information.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The hon. member is right; it applies only to the counties for the Quebec legislature.

Mr. GOBEIL: The hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier) and the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) may be right. I am not a lawyer, but I was told that; in fact, I read it in the act. It may be, however, it applies only for provincial purposes, but I am not going to discuss that.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): It is for the provincial field only.

Mr. GOBEIL: As I have said, the counties of the eastern townships have practically not been changed, so we cannot take the population of those counties as a basis on which to work. Some other counties like Vaudreuil-Soulanges and Argenteuil have not been changed, because it is almost impossible to change the boundaries, but the principle on which we work was to take a group of contiguous counties and try to equalize the population in that group. I am going to take only one group of counties to illustrate my statement, and I will take that consisting of Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska, four counties in regard to which we heard many arguments yesterday and the day before. My hon. friends opposite declare that L'Islet will disappear and that we should have joined L'Islet and Montmagny as a whole, leaving the other two alone. There was no one county that was bound to disappear, but out of that group of four it was understood that we were going to make three. What we have done is simply this. Instead of joining Montmagny and L'Islet, giving them a population of practically 40,000 and leaving the other two counties one on each side with a population of 21,296 and 24,085 respectively, we thought it was more practical to divide the population in that group of counties so as to make three counties with populations as follows:

Constituency—	Population
Bellechasse	27,480
Montmagny-L'Islet	30,869
Kamouraska	30,852

I am not going to argue this any further; I simply point out that this is the method we have adopted. I might take other groups of counties in other parts of the province and

find that the population was perhaps 5,000 or 8,000 or even 10,000 more than in this group, but it all depends upon the population of the surrounding counties.

The county of Chapleau was referred to yesterday by the hon. member for Richelieu. It is quite true that we have a new county there with a population of only a little over 21,000, while the other new county has a population of about 40,000. In the case of Chapleau, however, we took into consideration the fact that it is a new territory which has developed very rapidly. As every hon. member knows, in the Abitibi district fifteen years ago there was practically nobody. In view of the present colonization program which will very likely be further extended due to the present situation, we have considered that in ten years from now the population will probably be 50,000. Another reason for our course is the fact that the county is about 300 or 400 miles long, I am not quite sure which, but at all events not less than 300 miles. As to the other new county taken from Portneuf, Champlain and Three Rivers, which has a population of over 40,000, we thought in that case there was a question whether we should put La Tuque in the district of Portneuf in the new county or leave it out. But as this was almost entirely an industrial county in which the electors were all deriving their living from the pulp industry, we thought it was only logical we should put all that industrial section together.

Another argument advanced against us, as I said at the beginning, was this. The hon. member for Quebec East went so far as to say that we had succeeded in making Conservative counties out of Liberal. That may be true; I am not going to dispute the fact that Champlain and Three Rivers will probably be safer counties for Conservatives after the redistribution than they are to-day, but I would ask my hon. friends opposite to be fair and to recognize that if that is a fact it is equally true, that the new county of Lafleche-St. Maurice, if we take as our guide the vote of 1930, is a solidly Liberal county. We have not done anything to attain that. We have simply taken the population as it was, and according to the vote of 1930 this new county is a county in which the Conservative party has no fighting ground at all. The same remark applies to that other new county. We have taken the people who were in Abitibi. We have not changed their political faith at all, and I think my hon. friends opposite will admit that there too we have a solid Liberal county. But that question was not considered when we made this redistribution. We simply divided the counties the best we could. That was the thought we had in mind, and that is what we did.

The hon. member for Quebec East also said at page 5309 of Hansard:

> And I wish to say immediately that in any place or any constituency where any change was made, as my right hon. friend suggests, in 1924, which should not have been made—I go further, any change that was made either fairly or unfairly—I am quite willing to undo it. But it is not necessary to change the whole map of the province of Quebec for that purpose.

That brings me to a point which I wish to bring to the attention of the house. The hon. member for Quebec East also said in the same speech in regard to the county of Dorchester:

> St. Maxime de Scott was put there in 1924, so let him take it away if that is the purpose of this redistribution bill.

It is not my intention, nor could I do it in any event, to belittle in any sense the remarks of my hon. friend from Quebec East, but at the same time the truth is the truth and the facts are the facts. I say to my hon. friend from Quebec East that there was no change made in the county of Dorchester in 1924—none at all. I have here the official list of all the changes that were made in 1924, and it shows that none were made in the county of Dorchester.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): Then why make changes this year?

Mr. GOBEIL: If my hon. friend will wait for a moment I will show him that although the federal redistribution committee did not make any changes, there were changes made. Although the federal redistribution act did not make any change in the county of Dorchester, what do we find? We find that after the redistribution of 1914 the parish of St. Maxime was in the county of Beauce, and part of another township was in the county of Dorchester. We also find that another part of the territory shown here on this map was in the county of Dorchester. That was after the redistribution following the census of 1911. At the redistribution of 1924 no changes were made in that county, but when we look at the official map what do we find? We find that after 1924 this parish of St. Maxime is placed in the county of Dorchester, and we find that there was transferred—

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What is the degree of latitude?

Mr. GOBEIL: Never mind that at the moment. We find that another parish that

belonged to the county of Dorchester was transferred to Bellechasse. I am simply giving my own word that when I compared the official maps of 1914 and 1924 I found that changes were made in the province of Quebec which involved thirty-three counties, and when I looked to see the number of changes made by the redistribution committee I found that there were only seven. What happened was this: My contention, and I ask every member of the house whether I am right or wrong, is that changes of this nature did not occur in any other province of this Dominion except Quebec. What happened in that province was that between 1911 and 1921, the census years, or between 1914 and 1924, the years in which the Redistribution Act passed the federal house, the Quebec legislature itself made several changes in the boundaries of provincial counties. In fact, it is making changes almost every year in the boundaries of some counties. So in 1924 when the redistribution bill was before this house the changes that had been made by the Quebec legislature were incorporated in the federal Redistribution Act without any special mention of them being made in the act itself; but that act took as a basis the new county boundaries that had been made by the Quebec legislature. That is why I said at the outset that the provincial county boundaries should be absolutely forgotten for federal electoral purposes.

The hon. member for Quebec East also said that we were carving up the province of Quebec, and we have heard the same thing said a hundred times during the last few days. It has been said that we were making changes in almost every county in the province of Quebec. But I ask, is it fair that we should take as a basis of a federal redistribution the changes in the county boundaries that were made by the province of Quebec? In 1924 more than thirty-three such changes were made in the province, excluding the city of Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Might I ask if the hon. gentleman would mention in detail the thirty-three changes that he said were made in the province of Quebec?

Mr. GOBEIL: I will name the counties, if that is satisfactory to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Give the counties.

Mr. GOBEIL: The county of Bagot—

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What changes were made in the county of Bagot?

[Mr. Gobeil.]

Mr. GOBEIL: My time will not permit me to give the entire list of all those changes. I have only so many minutes left, Mr. Chairman, but when I have finished my remarks, if there is time left, I shall be glad to give those details.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but might I say this?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Shaver): If the hon. member permits the question.

Mr. CASGRAIN: May I put a question to the hon. gentleman with his permission?

Mr. GOBEIL: No, because you are trying to deprive me of the opportunity to say what I want to say.

Mr. MANION: He has the floor.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The hon. gentleman mentioned certain changes, I ask him to name those changes.

Mr. MANION: The hon. gentleman has the floor and has a right to retain the floor, he should not be interrupted.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) is advancing a very serious argument. He says there was an alteration made in 1924 in the redistribution in thirty-three counties. If his information is correct he should name the counties.

Mr. DUPRE: This reply has nothing to do with the point of order. The point of order is whether the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) has the right to interrupt the hon. member for Compton without his permission. Permission not being given the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay is out of order.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Are you the chairman?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Shaver): I ask the hon. gentleman kindly to allow the hon. member for Compton to finish his speech.

Mr. GOBEIL: I am willing and pleased to name the counties in which these changes were made, and if my hon. friends opposite want more details I will have those details typed for them and send them as many copies as they want. They are: Bagot, Beauce, Bellechasse, Berthier-Maskinongé, Brome-Missisquoi—here is another striking example —Charlevoix-Saguenay, Chateauguay-Huntingdon, Chicoutimi, Dorchester, Drummond-Arthabaska, Gaspe, Joliette, Kamouraska, Labelle, Laprairie-Napierville, L'Assomption-Montcalm, L'Islet, Matane, Megantic, Montmagny, Nicolet, Richelieu, Richmond-Wolfe,

Rimouski, Sherbrooke, St. Johns-Iberville, Shefford, Terrebonne, Yamaska, Wright. If my hon. friends opposite want more details I have here all the territories by square miles that were transferred from one county to another between 1914 and 1924 by the provincial government and incorporated in the federal bill without any mention of it in the bill.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to put a question?

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): He is more courteous to you than to me.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Is it because you represent a Tory county or because, having narrow views, you were able to do what is being done in the province of Quebec, that you were appointed to the redistribution committee?

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): I will say quite frankly, in answer to the hon. member for Lotbinière, that I am ignorant of the reasons why my colleagues made me a member of the redistribution committee.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): It is because we had confidence in you.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): I suppose my colleagues considered I would do as well as another. In any case, I was a member of the committee.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I must say they made a very poor choice.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): That is a matter of opinion. My colleagues selected me to represent them on the committee; they must have thought I would do the work satisfactorily. I acted to the best of my knowledge and ability, and I am convinced that the bill, as it now stands before the house, is fairer to the people of the province of Quebec than the one—I was on the point of uttering an unparliamentary word—of 1924, which hypocritically effected changes in 26 Quebec counties. These changes had been made by the provincial government and should never have been effected.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I prefer a hypocritical settlement that gives justice to one that does not give justice and is made by a hypocrite who does not name himself.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): I have not the least objection to answering reasonable questions put to me by my colleagues. I have never understood, however, that this house is a suitable place to exchange remarks in language that would not be tolerated elsewhere. I can say only this: the member for Lotbinière, I have not the slightest doubt, fulfils his parliamentary duties conscientiously and to the best of his knowledge, and the member for Compton has done and will continue to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I am through with my remarks. It was not my intention to go into details in making these few statements. I just wanted to place before the house the rules or ideas under which we worked and to deny certain allegations made in this house by hon. members who have spoken before me. I wanted to place before the house these injustices, as I see them, that were perpetuated in the redistribution of 1924. I will have something more to say later on in connection with the schedule, but at present I am through.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, I will now conclude the speech which I started yesterday evening.

The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) said that one parish in his constituency was divided, that he had only part of it in his constituency, that part is in the township of Hereford, which has belonged to his constituency since confederation and before.

Mr. GOBEIL: Mr. Chairman, I never said that.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member said he had part of the parish in his constituency. I have a note of it.

Mr. GOBEIL: I object, Mr. Chairman, I never mentioned constituency. I do not want the hon. gentleman to put in my mouth words that I never uttered.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We heard you.

Mr. POULIOT: I never heard anything so extraordinary. I have a note here that the hon. gentleman said he had the parish for a long time in his constituency; which is the case.

Mr. GOBEIL: Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: Then why deny it and disturb me when I speak?

Mr. GOBEIL: I never said "since confederation."

Mr. POULIOT: Perhaps the hon. member has forgotten, just as he has forgotten the name of the constituency of the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Verville). But I know the parish of St. Herménégilde in the township of Hereford which is part in Compton constituency and part in Stanstead. What I say is that the township of Hereford has belonged to

the electoral district of Compton since before confederation, and it is still there. The reason why it is still there is that the boundaries of the constituency of the hon. gentleman have not been changed since 1853. If he does not know that he can learn it now, it will be beneficial to him.

There is another thing. He repeated after the big guns, the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) and others, that municipal and provincial lines did not count. Did he say that or did he not? Yes, he admits it.

Mr. GOBEIL: I never said "did not count."

Mr. POULIOT: Did not count for federal purposes.

Mr. GOBEIL: No, I said should be overlooked.

Mr. CASGRAIN: That is the same thing.

Mr. GOBEIL: It is not the same thing at all.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, we call that hair-splitting, and as I am not a barber, I am not fond of it. Sir, let us say that the hon. gentleman contends that in a federal redistribution provincial and municipal lines should be overlooked. I take an entirely different point of view. It is a matter of mandate. The hon. gentleman has received a power of attorney from each one who voted for him. I say it is only fair that he should give an account of the way he has fulfilled his mandate, and that he will do, because there is no change in his constituency. The electors said to the hon. member for Compton, to the Solicitor General, to the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Fortin), to the minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) and to others, "Go to the House of Commons and represent us there." It is only fair, sportsmanlike and just that a man who has received such a mandate should go back to the same people and have the courage to face them, as the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) said yesterday. One who is not afraid to meet the people who accorded him such an honour will go back and tell them what he has done. What will my hon. friend from Compton say? "I recommended my brother to the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian government and others so that he could sell his jam." That is a fine way to fulfil a mandate, but that is what the hon. gentleman has done. The hon. member for Compton read a letter which he had received from a man named Vaughan or some other official of the Canadian National who is ready to lick the boots of any member on the government side in order to keep his job; in that letter information was given up to July of last year. Then my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion), who is listening to me now, refused to give the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Boulanger) the further information for which he was asked. I hope the hon. member for Compton, who was so busy selling jam for his brother to the Canadian government and the Canadian National Railways, will tell his electors how much time he devoted to that purpose, and how many of the 15 cent and 25 cent jars of jam were sold after the Canadian National complained that the quantity was not sufficient and that a larger jar must be sold for 25 cents.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Shaver): Order. I think the hon. gentleman is getting away from the question under discussion.

Mr. POULIOT: I have just finished that portion of my remarks, sir. I say this is why my hon. friend from Compton was in a jam when he discussed the matter in committee. I believe in sportsmanship, in fairness, in justice and in equity; that is why I say a man should have the courage to face those who sent him to the House of Commons without putting some of them in another constituency so that he may not have to face their wrath.

We have heard a good deal about the redistribution of 1924 from one of the executioners who were put on that committee for a special purpose. What happened in that redistribution? Yesterday I heard my good friend the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe)—and I will ask my hon friend the Solicitor General to keep quiet and listen to me, because it may bring good results—ask the members on the government side jointly and severally what change made in 1924 has been rectified in 1933. My hon. friend was unable to get an answer. In 1924 the boundaries of the counties were rectified so that they might remain the same for federal purposes. If we look at the description of the county of Dorchester we see that the line of demarcation made in 1924 has been very materially changed in the bill now before the house. I think it is rather needless to continue the discussion along these lines, but I shall be ready to meet any hon. gentleman opposite when we come to discuss the schedules to the bill. To-day the boundaries of the county of Dorchester are the same as they were before confederation. We were told yesterday that this electoral district was

created in 1791. That may be so; I do know that since 1853 those boundaries have been unchanged. To-day the population of Dorchester is 33,000, but by this redistribution it will be reduced to 27,000 in order to protect a friend of the government. That is what has been done, and for that change my hon. friend from Compton, my hon. friend from Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion) and every hon. member opposite who supports this bill is responsible.

I have before me, Mr. Chairman, some petitions coming from my constituency protesting against the changes proposed in this bill. The constituency of Témiscouata is the same to-day as it was in 1853; the only changes that have taken place have been made in order to rectify the ancient boundaries. When we go back to 1924 we see this description of Témiscouata county:

> Includes the county of Témiscouata, with the exception of that part of the municipality of Notre Dame du Portage formerly comprised in the parish of St. André.

Now let us go back to the statute of 1860, which includes the act of 1853:

> The county of Kamouraska will include that part of the parish of Notre Dame du Portage formerly belonging to the parish of St. André.
>
> The county of Témiscouata will include that portion of the parish of Notre Dame du Portage formerly belonging to the parish of St. Patrice de la Rivière du Loup. C.S.L.C. (1860), c. 75, Secs. 38 and 39.

The provincial statute is to the same effect. (13 Geo. V, c. 13.)

The provincial statute of 1922 and the federal statute of 1924 are to the same effect. No change has occurred from 1853 to date in Témiscouata or Kamouraska, either provincially or federally, except the splitting of Témiscouata division in two counties for provincial purposes.

I pointed out to the Solicitor General yesterday that the Quebec Liberal bloc of 1921 elected 27 Tories at the last general election. In 1867 a Liberal was elected by acclamation in Temiscouata, and in 1872 a Conservative was elected. In 1874 my grandfather was elected by acclamation. From 1882 to 1896 the constituency was represented by Mr. Grandbois, a Conservative. In 1896 my father was elected, but he died the following year. Then from 1897 to 1924 the constituency was represented by Mr. Gauvreau, a Liberal. In 1924 I was elected a member of this House of Commons at a by-election; I have represented this constituency since that time, and I shall continue to represent it notwithstanding any carving that may be done by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now let us consider the old act of 1853. This morning I looked up what was done at the session of 1852-53, and I will read it to the house in order to show the care that was taken by the old statesmen in order that no injustice should be done and in order that everyone might receive fair play, justice and equity in the redistribution of seats made that year. Mark you, sir, this is of the utmost importance, because there are several electoral districts which never have been described in full in a federal statute. That is well known, so let us go back to that year. On October 5 the house ordered the printing of 500 copies of the bill in order that all members might familiarize themselves with its provisions, and it was until March 2 that the debate was adjourned after the second reading. On March 2 the debate continued and Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Langton, proposed that the representation of the people in parliament should be based on the population and that the number of members of the legislative assembly should be gradually increased in accordance with the progressive development of the population, on a fixed proportion of the population, without regard to any line of division between Upper and Lower Canada. That amendment was negatived, 15 voting for and 57 against. The French speaking members who voted against it were: Cartier, Cauchon, Chabot, Chapais, Chauveau, Dubord, Dumoulin, Fortier, Fournier, Gouin, Jobin, Lacoste, Laterrière, Laurin, Leblanc, Lemieux, Mongenais, Morin, Polette, Poulin, Prince, Sicotte, Taché, Tessier, Valois, Varin, Viger.

Sir John Macdonald did not vote.

The second reading was carried the same day by 58 to 14. No Quebec member voted against it. On the same day Mr. Morin proposed, seconded by Mr. Hincks, an English speaking Canadian, that the bill be sent to the committee of the whole, and that motion was adopted. On March 3 petitions to amend the bill were sent to the committee of the whole house. The house resolved itself into committee and considered the bill in committee for five days. On March 4, 15, 16, 18, and 20, five days, the house studied the whole bill and on March 21 the committee reported it with amendments. On the same day several motions to send it back to committee of the whole were negatived. Finally, on the motion of Mr. Lemieux, seconded by Mr. Fournier, it was ordered that the bill be referred once more to the committee of the whole to have it amended for the purpose of annexing the parish of St. Nicholas to the county of Levis and the parishes of St. Sylvestre and Ste.

Agathe to the county of Lotbiniere. The house resolved itself into committee, considered the bill, and it was reported with amendments which were adopted. On March 23 a motion to send the bill back to committee of the whole was negatived and the third reading of the bill was carried by 61 to 16. Sir John Macdonald and Sir Allan MacNab were among those who voted against the motion.

This, Mr. Chairman, is one page of history which shows us with what care these men in the old days drafted legislation affecting the electoral districts of Canada. It must be observed that at that time the constituencies were much less numerous than they are now and those statesmen gave all their time to the study of the problem. Mark you, sir, in 1872 Macdonald and Cartier had a majority in the house; in 1882 Macdonald had a majority behind him in the House of Commons. But, as I said yesterday, very slight changes were made in our electoral law, the main changes having been made in 1892. I will not dwell on this point for the moment. I will only repeat the flaming words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier with respect to the abominable gerrymander of 1892 by a moribund government—"This is a gerrymander with a vengeance." I hope that we shall not be able to say for very long, "This is a gerrymander with a vengeance, the gerrymander of 1933."

I observed the Prime Minister as he listened yesterday to the speeches which were delivered by my hon. friends, the member for Quebec East and the member for Richelieu. Those gentlemen made admirable speeches, and as the right hon. gentleman listened to them he had under his hand the census book and the Parliamentary Guide. He was following their remarks very closely and I am sure they made a good impression upon him. Now, let me say this. I do not appeal to the fairness of the Prime Minister; I do not make any appeal to him. I know very well however that he wishes to be posted on the facts—the real facts, the facts as they are—and that is why I am giving them to the house. I am giving the facts in order that the right hon. gentleman may have an opportunity to acquaint himself with them.

In 1903 Laurier had a majority behind him in the House of Commons. What did he do? The only thing he did was to rectify the gerrymander of 1892 by putting back old parishes into constituencies where they had been for a considerable length of time. In 1914 Sir Robert Borden, the greatest man alive of the Conservative party, had a majority behind him in the House of Commons. What did he do? Let me quote his words:

I am entirely disposed to follow the course which my right hon. friend pursued in 1903.

Those words will be found at page 617 of Hansard of February 10, 1914; they are the exact words of Sir Robert Borden. In 1924 the right hon. gentleman who is now leader of the opposition and my revered leader had a majority behind him in the House of Commons and he gave fairplay; and the evidence that he did so is the fact that these executioners of 1933 did not change one iota of the rectification of the boundaries made in that year.

Now, I put a question to the Solicitor General yesterday and I put it to him again to-day, because I want to have a direct answer from the hon. gentleman. He will be able to reply to me when I am through, because I have not much time and I must hurry on. We have been told that changes have been made in the rural seats because three new seats are needed in Montreal, and I want to know why this has been done. I do not wish to have the statement, in reply to this question, that it has been done. That is not an answer. I want to know the reason why. As reported at page 5314, of Hansard, May 23, I made this statement:

I ask the Solicitor General why it has been decided by the government to create two new rural seats, one in the Ottawa and the other in Three Rivers district. If three new seats in Montreal were too many, why did the government decide to create two new rural seats when there was no necessity for so doing?

We have heard the hon. member for Compton complaining like an infant about the difficulties he encountered in his redistribution. What was the matter? There was an increase in the seats in Montreal from thirteen to sixteen, that is all. And what did they do? They annexed Laprairie to Beauharnois, Montmagny to L'Islet and L'Assomption to Terrebonne. The problem was solved. Had they stopped there it would have been all right. I am tired of hearing so much about the unit of population. If there is a population unit let it be fixed for good from Gaspe to Ontario; if such is the case, let them divide the province by 44,000 and I am ready to accept it provided everyone is put on the same footing.

Mr. DUPRE: If that theory were accepted it would mean that the urban representation would be very great and the rural representation very small.

Mr. POULIOT: I am very glad to receive that answer because it shows the absurdity of this scheme. I wanted the hon. gentleman to give that answer.

Mr. DUPRE: My hon. friend does not seem to understand. He may be all right in theory, but if we followed that theory we should have to do as he suggests. But we do want to do so because we want to keep a fair and just representation in the rural centres.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, that is all right. I say however that everyone should be treated exactly on the same basis. That is my view of the matter. Now, in 1931, according to the census, the unit figure was 44,186. In 1931, according to the redistribution of 1924, in 49 constituencies 12 had a population larger than the unit, and thirty-seven had populations of less. In 1933, after the wonderful work of the brother of the jam manufacturer, there were forty-six constituencies, eleven of which had larger populations and thirty-five, smaller. In 1931, twelve had more than the unit and in 1933 with three constituencies less, eleven have more than the unit. In 1931, thirty-seven have less than the unit and in 1933, thirty-five have less. The unit of population did not count at all in their minds.

I shall not read the list of constituencies with less than 33,000 population which I gave yesterday, as this list may be found on page 5352 of Hansard. The following are the constituencies with populations of more than 33,000:

Beauce.
Charlevoix-Saguenay.
Chicoutimi.
Drummond-Arthabaska.
Gaspe.
Hull.
Lake St. John-Roberval.

These constituencies had more than the unit in 1931 and in 1933 they still have more than the unit. What did the brother of the jam manufacturer do about that? In 1931 Matane, Pontiac, Temiscouata and, Three Rivers-St. Maurice had more than the unit. They then created a new constituency called Lafleche-St. Maurice and another one called Three Rivers, both of which have more than the unit. What is the fairness in that? In 1933 Megantic-Frontenac will have more than the unit through receiving part of another constituency. A great mess!

I think I have time to show just what kind of a mess has been made in the province of Quebec by this committee and how ignorant of Quebec laws its members have proved to be. They have forgotten all about the provincial enactments. Although they have spent much time discussing this, that and other things in connection with the bill, there are fourteen provincial constituencies which have not been changed. These are Berthier-Maskinonge, Brome-Missisquoi, Chicoutimi, Drummond-Arthabaska, Joliette-Montcalm—this is a transposition but the provincial boundaries remain the same—Lake St. John-Roberval, Shefford, Sherbrooke and Stanstead. There are three constituencies which have been carved up. If the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) does not like that word I will use it again—carved, carved, carved! These are Champlain, Levis and Temiscouata. There are two electoral districts in the latter for Quebec but they have forgotten about those.

Let us see the extent of the gross ignorance of the members of this committee in connection with the legislation of 1931-32, 22 George V, Chapter 16. They have a constituency called Lake St. John-Roberval. That is all right, but the description is wrong. It is stated that this constituency consists of the counties of Lake St. John East and Lake St. John West. I ask my hon. friend not to spend so much of his time in recommending his brother's jam and study the legislation. The names of the provincial counties are Lake St. John and Roberval. I regret that a man so unfamiliar with the law was appointed by the government to sit on this committee. He was not qualified. Témiscouata is mentioned, but not the provincial counties of Riviere du Loup and Témiscouata. This committee ignores that. What about the provincial county of Gatineau? Is it in whole or in part in Hull, Wright, Labelle and Chapleau? That is not mentioned here. In Gaspe they put Gaspe East and Gaspe West, while in the province it is Gaspe North and Gaspe South. These people would be unable to vote. Does Laviolette belong to Laflèche-St. Maurice or Champlain? There is no excuse for such mistakes being made because now the name of the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) appears on the bill. I said yesterday that the bill did not contain the name of a junior member, but that it contains the name of the right hon. the Prime Minister himself. How can he trust these men who sat on the committee when their work is full of such gross mistakes of form and fact?

Does the committee realize how many fractions of constituencies have been put together to form thirty-seven constituencies in the province of Quebec? Ninety-nine fractions have been put together to form thirty-seven constituencies. That is the work of the hon. gentleman. That is the gerrymander; that is the jig-saw puzzle, the casse-tête

chinois. That is what they have been working on for such a long time. They wanted to take a little parish from this one and a little one from that one. The Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) thought it would be just as well to put certain electors in Lévis as he might decide to run there. It was just like a bunch of children running after some candy or jam. They were all asking for something, they were all rejecting something else. They were asking for something and grabbing something. That is how they did this very fine work. It is the most stupid thing that has ever been submitted to any parliament in any country.

Here is how they used the fractions to make up the constituencies. In Argenteuil there are three fractions; the county of Argenteuil, part of Two Mountains and part of Papineau. In Beauce there are three; county of Beauce, part of Dorchester and part of Frontenac. In Beauharnois-Laprairie there are four; part of Beauharnois, part of Laprairie, part of Chateauguay and part of Huntingdon. In Bellechasse there are four; part of Bellechasse, part of Lévis, part of Dorchester and part of Montmagny. In Bonaventure there are two; county of Bonaventure and part of Matapedia. In Chambly-Rouville there are four; the county of Chambly, part of Rouville, part of Vercheres and part of Laprairie. Champlain is part of a whole. In Chapleau there are three; part of the county of Abitibi, part of St. Maurice and part of Champlain. In Charlevoix-Saguenay there are four; the two Charlevoix, Saguenay, New Quebec and the island of Anticosti and Montmorency. In Chateauguay-Huntingdon there are four; Chateauguay, Huntingdon, Beauharnois and St. Jean. In Compton there are four; Compton, part of Stanstead, part of Sherbrooke and part of Frontenac. I do not blame the hon. gentleman for this for as it is it represents the federal boundaries.

Mr. HACKETT: It has been that way for thirty years.

Mr. POULIOT: For eighty years. I do not blame the hon. member for that, but it is an exception to the rule. In Dorchester there are two; Dorchester and part of Bellechasse. In Gaspe there are two; the counties of Gaspe East and Gaspe West and part of Matane. In Hull there are three; part of Hull, part of Papineau and part of Laval. In Kamouraska there are three; Kamouraska, part of Témiscouata and part of l'Islet. In Labelle there are two; part of Labelle and part of Papineau. In Lafleche-St. Maurice there are two; part of St. Maurice and part of Champlain. In L'Assomption-Terrebonne there are two; L'Assomption and part of Terrebonne. In Laval-Two Mountains there are three; part of Laval, part of Two Mountains and part of Terrebonne. He seems to have forgotten about the Laurent parcel post contract. I wonder if the Prime Minister sent anyone to the court house in Montreal to look over the files and obtain more details. I think they would find out the truth and what was well known to the public.

Levis consists of part of the county of Levis. In Lotbiniere there are five; Lotbiniere, part of Nicolet, part of Levis, part of Megantic and part of Beauce. This is the winner of the race. Then there is Matapedia-Matane, two fractions, part of Matane and part of Matapedia. Why not put those two counties as a whole together? Then there is Megantic-Frontenac, three fractions, part of Megantic, part of Frontenac and part of Wolfe; Montmagny-L'Islet, two fractions, part of Montmagny and part of L'Islet; Nicolet-Yamaska, two fractions, part of Nicolet and part of Yamaska; Pontiac, three fractions, Pontiac, Témiskaming and part of Abitibi, and I wonder whether there is not something else.

Then we have Portneuf, two fractions, part of Portneuf and part of Quebec; Quebec-Montmorency, three fractions, part of Quebec, part of Montmorency and part of Portneuf; Richelieu-Vercheres, three fractions, part of Vercheres, part of Yamaska and part of St. Hyacinthe; Richmond-Wolfe, two fractions, Richmond and part of Wolfe; Rimouski, two fractions, Rimouski and part of Témiscouata; St. Johns-Iberville, three fractions, Iberville, part of St. Johns plus the county of Napierville; St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, three fractions, part of St. Hyacinthe, part of Rouville, and Bagot; Témiscouata, a fraction; Three Rivers, two fractions, part of St. Maurice and part of Three Rivers; Vaudreuil-Soulanges, two parts, Vaudreuil and Soulanges; Wright, two fractions, part of Hull and part of Labelle.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): That makes a good salad.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I hope the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinongé (Mr. Barrette) who retains his counties complete, shares our indignation at the partitioning of the other counties of the province. It is an unwarranted indignity. I trust this iniquity will not be consummated and that the Prime Minister will look into it, as he will look into the affairs of Mr. Laurent, of Montreal, who has a contract for the transportation of postal parcels.

Mr. POULIOT: Intact counties number fourteen; fractional counties, three, and added fractions, ninety-nine, making a total of 116. This is without counting the electoral seats for the city of Quebec and Montreal. This is a fine mess. Have you, Mr. Chairman, ever seen anything like it. Would you, sir, who come from Ontario, stand for it? How is it that the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinonge (Mr. Barrette), whose favoured constituencies are not touched, does not stand with us to condemn the awful and abominable work that has been done by the hon. member for Compton who is bold enough to smile when I cut his suspenders with the scissors of truth? He was so mixed up that when he had to address the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Verville), who now has parts of five constituencies, he could not remember the exact name of that hon. gentleman's constituency and he confused it with Nicolet; his mind is dizzy; let us pray for him.

I will conclude by saying this, that in 1917 we had the Wartime Elections Act and in the sister provinces there was a united cry: Let us be through with Quebec; Quebec shall not dominate Canada. But there was a comeback to this. In 1921, who gave the majority to my revered leader? It was the province of Quebec. There is a comeback; there is sometimes an appeal to prejudice, but it never lasts long; it is a straw fire. Opinions change; the constituencies that have existed for years and years in Quebec have at different times elected members of different political faiths, but the electors were the same people who were judging the parties on their programs, their promises and the way in which they had fulfilled expectations. In 1930, twenty-five constituencies in Quebec chose to elect twenty-five members on the government side, but I am sure that if this bill is passed as it is, correcting the errors of form but leaving in it the gross error of facts, the province of Quebec will assuredly not elect a single member for the Conservative party.

Mr. MANION: Then why worry?

Mr. POULIOT: That is not the point. I do not worry about the results of elections. I am here to condemn an injustice which is presented to the house in the name of the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) who apparently ignores the existence of that injustice. If the right hon. gentleman knew how constituencies had been carved in order to create that gerrymander, he would have told the hon. member for Compton: I shall at once give orders to the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian government not to buy a jar of jam from your brother.

Mr. GOBEIL: And to the Canadian Pacific also.

Mr. POULIOT: What I have to say now as a final word is this, that the reason some hon. gentlemen opposite want to create a gerrymander in my constituency is that they wish to sell jam; they desire to sell rotten timber for the wharf at Cap St. Ignace; they want to purchase rural mail boxes at $2.75 from Amédée Lesieur when they cost only sixty cents.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Shaver): The hon. gentleman has spoken for forty minutes.

Mr. POULIOT: I have a great deal to say.

Mr. J. A. BARRETTE (Berthier-Maskinonge) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, hearing yesterday the hon. member for Terrebonne enumerate the members who had represented with honour that beautiful county in the federal house and noticing that he had forgotten a man who had held a most important place in Canadian public life, I asked him why he had omitted the name of Sir Adolphe Chapleau. The following are the exact words exchanged on the subject:

Mr. Barrette: Have you forgotten Sir Adolphe Chapleau? He, also, represented that county.
Mr. Parent: He represented it at Quebec.
Mr. Barrette: You forgot to mention him just now.
Mr. Parent: He represented the county in the provincial parliament. You do not know your parliamentary history, my friend. Buy a dictionary, an encyclopedia, and study.

Well, I consulted the Parliamentary Guide since last night. I knew that Sir Adolphe Chapleau had represented Terrebonne county in the federal parliament, having replaced Mr. G. A. Nantel, who had resigned in his favour, and I knew also that, in 1882, he had been elected by acclamation in Terrebonne. Later, in 1887, he was elected by the same county to the federal parliament by a majority of 785, and again, in 1891, by a majority of 704. I would ask the hon. member for Terrebonne to take note of these facts and, particularly, to study the Parliamentary Guide.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): What page?

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Page 302.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Which edition?

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): 1932. If my hon. friend from Terrebonne has not a copy of the Parliamentary Guide at hand, I shall lend him mine immediately; that will keep him from making false statements. I shall have to ask him to retract; otherwise he will be considered as unfair or as an ignorant man.

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Saguenay): With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) I think it is necessary that I should refer to the British North America Act to settle the question whether or not the eastern townships are supposed to be changed under our constitution. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, edition of 1927, at page 432 cites section 80 of the British North America Act as follows:

The legislative assembly of Quebec shall be composed of sixty-five members, to be elected to represent the sixty-five electoral divisions or districts of lower Canada in this act referred to, subject to alteration thereof by the legislature of Quebec: Provided that it shall not be lawful to present to the lieutenant governor of Quebec for assent any bill for altering the limits of any of the electoral divisions or districts mentioned in the second schedule to this act, unless the second and third readings of such bill have been passed in the legislative assembly with the concurrence of the majority of the members representing all those electoral divisions or districts, and the assent shall not be given to such bill unless an address has been presented by the legislative assembly to the lieutenant governor stating that it has been so passed.

In the second schedule annexed to the British North America Act, which will be found at page 460 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, the names of the various constituencies are mentioned as follows: Pontiac, Ottawa, Argenteuil, Huntingdon, Missisquoi, Brome, Shefford, Stanstead, Compton, Wolfe and Richmond, Megantic and the town of Sherbrooke.

If we look to the legislature of the province of Quebec it will be found that some of these seats have apparently been changed, but if so it was with the assent mentioned and according to the provisions contained in the British North America Act. I have read the British North America Act rather hurriedly since the hon. member spoke, and I can find no provision that states that none of the seats of eastern townships are to be changed or that they have to stay exactly as they are and not have their boundaries changed in any way, shape or form in any electoral redistribution such as the one we are now making. As a matter of fact there were changes made in the year 1924 when the counties of Brome and Missisquoi were merged. Chateauguay was also merged with Huntingdon, and minor changes were made with regard to the county of Pontiac I think. In those days when reservations were made as regards certain townships in the eastern townships where an English population predominated, they were made from the point of view of what concerned the legislature of Quebec only and not as regards the merits of any federal redistribution. So I think that the hon. member for Compton, when he states that under the constitution these seats are not to be touched in any federal redistribution, is not right in his contention.

I think we can find one reason why these seats were not changed in the explanation which was given yesterday by the right hon. the Prime Minister, when he said that the party in power wanted to take the best advantage that could possibly be taken in all changes and readjustments made in this redistribution, and that there was nothing wrong or anything to be ashamed about the party in power having its own say and taking the best advantage it could in such a matter as that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The old saying is, to the victor belong the spoils. That is a cry to which the Conservatives used to object and they have said that they would not take advantage of power to take the spoils. Now we find that seats in the eastern townships which might very well have been merged with no trouble at all have not been merged. Bagot, for instance, might have been added to Shefford without any trouble at all, and then that riding would have had the quota under the present redistribution, but the reason why those seats have not been changed and why the government want them to stay as they are at the present time is that most of them are represented in this house by hon. members supporting the government. Only one or two of them—I speak subject to correction—are represented by members sitting on this side of the house. I have no objection to hon. gentlemen representing those seats and sitting on the opposite side of the house because I number some of them among my friends; but the real reason why no changes were made in those seats was to give the members who now represent them as good a chance of being elected as they had in 1930 by the same population.

The hon. member for Compton also made reference to certain changes that were made in the year 1924. He mentioned that when the Redistribution Act of 1924 was passed there had been thirty-four changes made. When I asked him to specify those changes he mentioned certain counties, and I asked him for the details of the changes in these counties, but apparently he did not have them at hand and said that he would supply that information a little later. I would like to have that information because I think it is

vital. I have here, and I am giving them subject to correction, some of the changes that were made in 1924, and I consider that they were about the only major changes that were made in the Redistribution Act of that year.

There was the fusion of the two counties of Berthier and Maskinonge, and the fusion of the counties of Brome and Missisquoi, and the county of Chicoutimi-Saguenay was divided into two, and Chicoutimi made a county by itself, Saguenay being merged with Charlevoix, to form Charlevoix-Saguenay. The county of Charlevoix-Montmorency had its name changed to Charlevoix-Saguenay, and part of the district of Saguenay with a population of thirteen thousand was added to the county formerly called Charlevoix-Montmorency to form the present Charlevoix-Saguenay. I think that those realignments were absolutely necessary on account of an increase in population that had taken place in certain districts. They were changes that ought to have been made, and I do not think it could be charged that the party in power made those changes for any political advantage to themselves. Other minor changes had to be made in certain electoral divisions, more especially as regards the island and city of Montreal on account of its increase in population. Its representation was then fixed at thirteen members, and the present bill increases it to sixteen. Those were the modifications most essential which were made in the year 1924, and if there were any others of capital importance or of such great moment as the hon. member for Compton seeks to convey to the committee, I think in all fairness he ought to bring them before the committee. Yesterday when the hon. member for Quebec East placed his case before the house on behalf of the Liberal party he explained the situation in the province of Quebec, starting from its eastern boundaries at the county of Gaspe and going right across the province to the border of Ontario. All the changes that are being made in this bill, changes made at the instance and upon the demand or request of members supporting the government, were explained in detail, and none of those changes made by the committee which has prepared this legislation were made simply with a view to correcting errors or mistakes that were made by the previous Redistribution Act of 1924. I heard with my own ears the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) say; If you can show us that the modifications or changes were made to correct mistakes or errors in those counties in the district of Quebec which I represent, I will be ready to approve of those changes. But what do we find? We find that the changes and modifications contained in this bill now before us are not such as to remedy or alter or improve the conditions complained of by hon. members supporting the government, but, as pointed out by the hon. members for Quebec East, Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) and Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) yesterday, result in nearly every instance in one hon. member getting an advantage in this way and another hon. member being relieved in another way, hiving together in some centre all the Grits, all the Liberal supporters, in order to give political advantage to members who support the present administration. This is the reason why I wanted to ask, before you were in the chair, Mr. Chairman, from the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) not only the names of the counties which he claimed were affected by the redistribution in 1924, but each and every parish or township that was changed or moved from one county to another, so that we would be in a position to change and remedy those mistakes of 1924 which they say injuriously affect the people of the province of Quebec.

If there were slight modifications made in 1924 everyone here who was in this house at that time recalls the fact that the Hon. Mr. Boivin, who represented the province of Quebec, on that committee, who was I think at the head of the Quebec section of the committee, stated on July 15, 1924, when this bill was before the house, that the changes made were only of minor importance and that the modifications made were absolutely necessary on account of geographical conditions and the large increase of population in certain districts. In most counties the redistribution committee of 1924, including at that time Progressives, Conservatives and Liberals alike, recognized the principle that we should not change the boundaries of provincial constituencies, but should adhere as much as possible to the old lines, provincial and municipal. We find reference to that in the speech of Hon. Mr. Boivin as it appears in Hansard, session of 1924, volume 5, page 4534.

We listened yesterday to what was said by the hon. member for Quebec East and the hon. member for Richelieu. Those two hon. gentlemen, who are leaders of public opinion in the province of Quebec, men of high responsibility, would not have taken upon themselves to present the case they did and to place the figures and statements upon Hansard that they did unless they were sure of their ground. I noticed yesterday, when these

hon. gentlemen were speaking, that the right hon. Prime Minister took great care to listen and take note of what they were saying; I think in the bottom of his heart he felt that what is before the house at this time under his name is not so good and so accurate as he would have chosen to make it. I think the spirit of fair play so moves him that he will give careful consideration to the remarks of those hon. members, and will favour some of the modifications that have been suggested by them.

When we compare the redistribution of 1924 with that of this year we find that in 1924 there was practical unanimity. It is true, as suggested by some hon. members opposite, and the Prime Minister laid great stress upon the fact, that at that time there was no representative of the Conservative party on the opposition side to act as a member of that committee. But those who were here in that parliament will recall that there was on that committee the able gentleman who now sits with the government, the member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) who was at that time looking after the province of Quebec as well as the eastern provinces. I find at page 4530 of Hansard of that year, volume 5—I have only the French version here—what he said when the report was presented to the house:

> I have no doubt, however, that the redistribution for the province of Quebec is probably as fair as any that could be arrived at under the method adopted, and I for one propose to stand by the report of the committee in this regard.

Mr. GAGNON: May I ask when those words were uttered?

Mr. CASGRAIN: In Hansard, 1924, volume 5, page 4530. I read it myself the other day. At that time the report was practically unanimous. It was agreed that certain slight modifications had to be made and they were made. But, Mr. Chairman, in the redistribution that we have before us to-day we have wholesale changes. Boundaries in the province of Quebec have been shifted about from county to county, and we have now all these discrepancies.

Mr. DUPRE: May I be permitted to put a question to my hon. friend? At that time there were no members from the province of Quebec sitting on the Conservative side?

Mr. CASGRAIN: If my hon. friend had listened to me he would know I just referred to that. There was no member on the Conservative side from the province of Quebec, but, as I said, the hon. member for York-Sunbury was representing the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces. Also I remember having seen with my own eyes in those days most powerful and influential representatives of the province of Quebec, such as the late Mr. Monty, and Mr. Fauteux, who were here serving as advisers, as well as the hon. member for York-Sunbury, who in those days was charged with, I will say, the difficult task of looking after the interests of that province. No one would deny that those two able gentlemen, for whom I have great respect, would have seen to it that proper representations were made before the committee in order that justice should be given to the minority at that time, the Conservative element in the province of Quebec. Also if the redistribution made in 1924, about which there is so much complaint to-day, was calculated to help only the interests of the Liberal party, how is it to be explained that in 1930 this redistribution helped hon. gentlemen opposite to the extent that they secured seats to the number of twenty-five? If this redistribution was so bad, if it was not fair, I do not think that many supporters of the government would be sitting here to-day. But the Redistribution Act of 1924 was as fair as any act could be made; and I think, Mr. Chairman, that only people seeking little political advantages could say that the act of 1924 was so bad that they had to recast it and change it completely when we have before us the demonstration by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) that no errors made in 1924 are corrected by the present bill, but new ventures and changes are attempted in order to promote the interests of the party which is now in power.

It is sad indeed to consider the difficulties confronting us at present when we remember that in 1924, in 1914 and in 1903, it was possible to effect redistributions which met with the approval of all political parties in this house. If it was possible in those three redistributions, why is it not possible to-day? Yesterday the Prime Minister said those redistribution bills did not go through unanimously. I speak subject to correction, but I think the Prime Minister was stretching the truth a little when he made that statement. History will show that at the beginning of the task there may have been small differences which later were adjusted, but at no time was there any situation such as we are confronted with to-day. At one time we were led to believe that Quebec and Saskatchewan were the only stumbling blocks, the only two provinces not satisfied. If my information is correct, however, there are differences in other parts of Canada as well. I believe there are certain grievances and troubles in the prov-

ince of Ontario, for instance, which as yet have not been satisfactorily adjusted so that the people concerned will get that measure of justice to which they are entitled. I need not labour this point at length; I believe it would be a disgrace to Canada and to the province of Quebec if it should be said that this bill was put through in its present form due to the brute force which the Prime Minister says he has supporting him and which he will call upon in order to force through this bill if it meets with continued opposition and we refuse to accept the changes and modifications which have been made by the members of that committee.

Those who supported the idea of having a committee of this house attempt to give justice to the various parties in the House of Commons advocated that idea because all parties would be given representation on such a committee. Apparently in the days of Sir John A. Macdonald the government brought the measure before the house and that was the measure that had to be adopted. The first time there was any departure from that practice was when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in the house. In view of the discussion that has taken place with regard to this bill I wonder if we would not avoid trouble and strife and bring about justice and equality of representation if we adopted certain principles that have been suggested and which I understand are in force in other dominions. In looking over the debate that took place in 1924 I find that certain practical suggestions were made; for instance, reference was made to the way the electoral map was changed in Australia. I understand that in that country a commission looks after this work. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read the statement to which I refer; I shall have to read it in French, because I have not the English version. At present it seems very difficult to secure books from the library which contain the debates with regard to electoral reforms; they appear to be in great demand. Many hon. gentlemen have those books now; I believe they are trying to improve the legislation now before us, and I hope they succeed.

Mr. LAVERGNE: What does my hon. friend suggest?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am going to read it to my hon. friend:

In Australia the redistribution is arranged by three distribution commissioners appointed by the Governor General, of whom one is the Chief Electoral Officer or an officer having similar qualifications—

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): What page, please?

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Page 4523 of Hansard of July 15, 1924, French edition.

—and, if his services are obtainable, one shall be the Surveyor General of the State or an officer having similar qualifications. I quote the following sections:

In making the proposed distribution of a state into divisions, the distribution commissioners shall give due consideration to—

(a) Community or diversity of interest,

(b) Means of communication,

(c) Physical features,

(d) Existing boundaries of division or subdivisions,

(e) State electoral boundaries;

and subject thereto the quota of electors shall be the basis for the distribution, and the distribution commissioners may adopt a margin of allowance, to be used whenever necessary, but in no case shall the quota be departed from to a greater extent than one-fifth more or one-fifth less.

What follows is interesting.

Before reporting on the distribution of any state into divisions, the distribution commissioners shall cause a map with a description of the boundaries of each proposed division to be exhibited at post offices in the proposed division, and shall invite public attention thereto by advertisement in the Gazette.

Objections or suggestions in writing may be lodged with the distribution commissioners not later than thirty days after the first advertisement in the Gazette of the proposed distribution, and the distribution commissioners shall consider all objections and suggestions so lodged before making their report.

From this it will be seen that under the system in force in Australia there is much less chance of that taking place which we find in Canada to-day. Here we have people who represent a minority of the members coming from a certain province but who support the majority in this house, using that power and support which is brought about by a majority from other provinces in order to change the boundaries of the electoral divisions where they do not possess the majority.

Mr. LAVERGNE: What is the date of the Australian act?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not know the date, but I quoted what was said in 1924. Even though the system to-day may not be quite the same I think my hon. friend, who is fair, will admit that possibly if the suggestions there contained had been adopted, we would not have all the difficulties with which we are faced to-day.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I agree with my hon. friend, and I was wondering why he had not thought of all that in 1923.

Mr. CASGRAIN: At that time I was not myself in charge of the revision of electoral maps.

Mr. DUPRE: But your party was in power.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes; and if my party at that time did not act as hon. gentlemen opposite suggest they should have acted, I would point out that it is time for the party in power now to rectify matters, because it is the party that has always claimed to do better than other people. The right hon. gentleman now leading the government has many merits and good qualities and he claims to be able to set everything right. Well, I think that, having a large majority behind him in this house, he would be well advised to bring about a fairer and more satisfactory redistribution and one more equitable to all parties concerned.

Mr. BENNETT: Since the hon. gentleman has mentioned my name, may I direct his attention to the fact that no such suggestion was made on the second reading, and the house unanimously referred the bill to the committee.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes. Let me point out however that, after the example that was set in 1903, in 1914 and again in 1924, when apparently everyone in the country was satisfied with the redistribution that was effected, no one thought for a moment that this government, with a respectable majority behind it, would take advantage of its position to try to bring about changes in the constituencies in certain provinces as indicated in the house yesterday and again to-day. It is well to repeat these things. If it was not done in 1923 it is only because at that time we were following the system that had been adopted in the past and which had given satisfaction, and there was no reason to suspect that it would not prove equally satisfactory again. But to-day there are difficulties which present themselves in the form indicated to this house, and I think it is only right to bring the matter to the attention of hon. members, because it may serve a useful purpose later on. In the next ten years many of us may not be here, but those who succeed us would be able to take advantage of any improvements we might make, and any body of men not so much in touch with members of the house, and not influenced by the inclinations and ambitions that might be evident in various districts, would be able to effect a better solution of the problem. After all, Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that affects every home, every district, every part of the country in every province in Canada to-day. No one can deny that this bill we are called upon to pass now will stand for the next ten years and will fix the limitations in the various districts throughout the country. This will be the act under which those who follow us will be returned to the House of Commons when the next general election is called by the Prime Minister. On this question of redistribution we have been reasonably calm, but there may be certain persons who have been influenced by personal motives and who in some cases have perhaps sought too much political advantage for themselves, as suggested yesterday by those who replied to the hon. member for Quebec East and the hon. member for Richelieu. At one stage of the discussion yesterday there was some exchange of words between certain members on both sides of the house with regard to some possible changes that might be brought about, and there was a good deal of discussion with regard to L'Islet and Montmagny. But I sincerely point out that if there are minor difficulties in regard to certain parishes they should be adjusted. Any difficulties that could be set aside should be set aside in order if possible to allow the committee to proceed in the usual way with this bill so that it might receive as far as possible the unanimous support of hon. members on all sides.

Mr. GOBEIL: I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to misquote me or to misrepresent what I said. He has quoted me as having said that 34 changes were made in the redistribution of 1924. That was not what I wanted to convey to the house. I hope I shall be clearly understood—

Mr. CASGRAIN: If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, I took down his exact words as he uttered them. He said, "33 changes were made in 1924."

Mr. GOBEIL: All right. My contention is that between the redistribution of 1914 or 1913 and that of 1923, concluded in 1924, there were at least 26 or 27 changes made by the provincial government of Quebec in provincial boundaries, provincial redistribution, which were incorporated in the federal bill of 1924, without being mentioned in detail in the bill. If I am correct, and I think I am, the bill refers only to 7 changes made in rural counties in the province of Quebec —I mean the bill of 1924. But when we com-

pared the two official maps in connection with the redistribution of 1914 and that of 1924, we found that the boundaries were not the same, and the changes made by the Quebec government were incorporated in the federal act of 1924 without being mentioned in detail in the act at all.

Mr. POWER: Doesn't the same thing exist in this act?

Mr. GOBEIL: I am afraid it will, and I say that the principle is wrong. I do not think the province should have the task of making a redistribution for federal purposes.

Mr. POWER: Section 5 of the act to readjust the representation of the House of Commons, passed in July, 1924, is identical with section 5 of the bill which is now before us. Does my hon. friend know that? Perhaps the hon. gentleman will pardon me for referring to what he said, but if those who carried the redistribution in 1924 acted surreptitiously—which I think is a euphemism for the translation of hypocritement, which he used a few moments ago—then those who carried it out this year must have acted in the same way.

Mr. J. T. HACKETT (Stanstead): The point is this. Changes have been made which have resulted from provincial legislation. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain), I merely wish to point out, without being drawn too far into the discussion, that the government of the province of Quebec, whose function it is to determine county boundaries, has continuously redrafted these boundaries, with the result that a county defined by the legislature of the province needs only to be referred to by name in the federal act, and in this way a complete realignment may be effected.

Mr. POWER: Not between the periods of redistribution.

Mr. HACKETT: No, not between periods of redistribution.

Mr. POWER: It reads, as it exists at the time of the passage of the redistribution act.

Mr. HACKETT: Yes; but let us assume that a county in 1923 contained five townships, and that by provincial statute two other townships were added. When reference is made to that county in the federal redistribution act it will have two additional townships without any specific reference being made thereto. According to my information there were thirty-four—I have been told there were actually thirty-seven—changes made in the redistribution of 1924 in the alignment of Quebec counties.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, you are wrong.

Mr. POWER: Will the hon. gentleman—

Mr. HACKETT: If the hon. gentleman will permit me. They included seven made by federal legislation and twenty-seven made by provincial legislation. I do not wish to be drawn into the controversial aspect of this discussion but I think we can assume that the party which has been in power in Quebec for nearly forty years was not entirely negligent of its own interests when redrawing county boundaries. I am going to ask the committee to bear with me for a moment while I point out, not all the twenty-seven changes which were made by provincial legislation but two or three of them which came within my personal knowledge.

The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) will recall that the counties of Brome and Missisquoi were put together at the last redistribution. He will find that the only reference in the federal act is to the fact that these two counties become one. Yet the boundaries of these counties had been changed by provincial legislation. For instance, they took from Missisquoi a substantial part of the parish of Farnham and added it to Shefford. I do not know anything about the political complexion of this parish but this seems to have been a more or less reasonable thing to do. At least it can be said that it rounded out the contours of that locality. But at the same time they took a most peculiarly shaped section from the county of St. Johns-Iberville and added it to Missisquoi by the provincial statute 11 George V, 1921, chapter 14. Without any visible reason, unless it was because of the political inclinations of the parishes, these two substantial changes were made by provincial legislation in the riding of Brome-Missisquoi without any reference to them in the federal act.

It may seem strange that I should speak for the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne) when he is capable and competent of speaking for himself, but I shall refer to his constituency. I find that a transfer was made to Bellechasse from Montmagny of a substantial area along the confines of Bellechasse. It may not be said that that was done to straighten the line, because it crooked and curved the line.

Mr. FAFARD: What year was that?

Mr. HACKETT: I think that was in 1921. But at the same time a knob was put on to Montmagny by projecting into Bellechasse an area which appears to be about two miles wide and two miles long. I ask the hon. gentleman to look at the map and see if there is any possible reason that can be given for so distorting the outline of the map other than political. There is no road, there is no river, there is no parish boundary and there is no county boundary to justify the change.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Kamouraska?

Mr. HACKETT: I am not attempting to justify anybody. But I do not want the committee to become scandalized and I am trying to show what has been done in the past. I want the committee to be fully conversant with the facts.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): The hon. member is speaking at random.

Mr. HACKETT: I am not speaking at random.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Were there any people settled along those miles?

Mr. HACKETT: I would assume that in the prosperous section along the frontier between Bellechasse and Montmagny there would be people and I trust that they voted in a manner not entirely disappointing to those who brought about the changes.

Will the hon. gentlemen bear with me for a moment while I take up the constituency of another hon. gentleman who is well able to speak for himself, the constituency of Dorchester? We find that the county of Dorchester was mutilated by provincial legislation. It will be found that a portion which had been in Beauce was added to Dorchester in 1924. It may be that there was some reason for making this rectification. To one unacquainted with the area it might appear that there was some reason to round out the territory by drawing a line across. But I find that by 15 George V, chapter 12, there was added to Dorchester a very substantial area which had previously been in Bellechasse. The whole point and purpose of my remarks is to show hon. gentlemen that if at any time there was a desire or intention to gerrymander, my friends opposite had a very willing, compliant and successful agent in the government at Quebec. Any and all changes which they wished to have made—I assume it is fair to say that none were made without their consent—were made for them. Out of thirty-four changes made, twenty-seven were made at Quebec and only seven at Ottawa. Nevertheless, those changes made at Quebec were made as effectively as if they had been made here. I am not addressing the committee for any reason other than to let hon. gentlemen know it is not well to feel too complacent or to be too self laudatory when one has a past.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We consider this a very serious matter. It has been said that there were made by the province of Quebec twenty-seven changes which automatically applied here. This will go out to the public. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to give us those twenty-seven instances?

Mr. DUPRE: They were given this afternoon.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We want to have it pointed out where they are.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) gave them this afternoon.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is not so.

Mr. MANION: He gave the names.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Absolutely not. Take, for instance, his own county.

Mr. HACKETT: I would say to the hon. gentleman that I have drawn to his attention seven or eight changes made in three counties.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was nothing in them.

Mr. HACKETT: There is something in them, and if the hon. gentleman cares to trace out the statutes he will find that those changes were effectively made. If he is sufficiently interested to take the map of each constituency, I have no doubt he will find the number that is given. So far as that goes, if it will be of any particular assistance to him, I shall be delighted to cooperate with him in tracing the origin of those thirty-four changes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is making assertions. Let him make good what he states here. I repeat what I said yesterday: We would be quite willing to accept any changes that would rectify what my hon. friend claims has been done by the province of Quebec.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE (Montmagny): I shall be very brief because I gave to my colleagues the time in which I intended to speak and the discussion was very interesting; I do not suppose the committee has lost anything. It would seem as if the committee this year were doing something absolutely new, something unexpected which had never taken place before. I have

been listening to the debate; I have heard many challenges, many assertions of injustice, many claims that geography, history and all moral principles were being destroyed. But I must honestly confess that so far I have not heard a fact brought before this committee to justify any such affirmation.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member was not in the house all the time.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I was not in the house all the time, and I may say that when I was out of it—and I shall come to that in a minute or two—it was to grant what my hon. friends opposite call concessions, as I did willingly. I have noticed that after one point was settled, another and then another came up, but I shall not discuss that because it is to me too small a matter.

The people of Canada are entitled to representation, and the province of Quebec with sixty-five members being the pivot, the representations must be adjusted on the basis of that number. It does not matter very much to Jean Baptiste whether he votes on this side of a tree or this side of a street or this side of a brook as long as he has his vote. If you take the maps which have been drafted by one party or the other in the past, at first glance sometimes they certainly present a very queer appearance, but I have never heard a complaint, for instance, from people who geographically belong to Bellechasse that they had to vote in Montmagny. I have never heard a complaint from men who lived in the very county of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), and on the very same street, that they had to vote in Quebec East or Quebec Centre, so long as they were entitled to record their votes. It seems to me as if this whole debate resembles that comedy of Shakespeare called Much Ado About Nothing, because that is what is taking place in the house. Nobody is being deprived of his franchise; not a citizen will not have a right to go to the polls and record his approval or condemnation of the government. We have heard speech after speech from hon. gentlemen opposite, for what purpose? What suggestion have they brought forward? What liberty has been compromised? What injustice has been created? What violence has been done to geography? We have heard nothing except this, which we have heard repeated again and again: This might create a Conservative majority or it might make safer a seat which is Liberal at the moment. Is that what the people of Canada expect from us?

Mr. DUPUIS: No, indeed.

Mr. LAVERGNE: No, they will expect to vote and give their opinion, and whether it be the opinion represented by my hon. friend living in this parish or by one of his colleagues living in the next parish, so long as the people have the right to vote on the deeds of this government, whether the opposition is represented by my learned confrere and hon. friend or by his neighbour to the right, it makes no difference and the people will have no complaint.

Mr. DUPUIS: This argument could serve against the government.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Undoubtedly, and I would be the last one to deprive the people of this country of the chance of condemning the government, if they wanted to do so.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why change?

Mr. LAVERGNE: Precisely, why change?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why not leave things alone? ?

Mr. LAVERGNE: Yes, and then Montreal will not have the representation to which it is entitled.

Mr. CASGRAIN: You can give the representation to Montreal and not change the other constituencies.

Mr. LAVERGNE: And not change the other constituencies—

Mr. CASGRAIN: You can change some of them.

Mr. LAVERGNE: —so according to the whip of the Liberal party, as by the constitution Quebec must have sixty-five seats, we will give ten or fifteen more to Montreal which is entitled to them and we will not change the boundaries of the others.

Mr. CASGRAIN: That is not what I meant. What I had in mind, and what my hon. friend knows is that, as was so well pointed out the other day by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin), some small counties could be put together instead of being split into two or three pieces, and then there would be room for three more seats in Montreal.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Very good. We shall put two or three counties together. Then who is to decide about the boundaries? I say that those who are entitled to decide —and I am not a strong party man—are the party in power which has the confidence of the Canadian people.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I did not intend to prolong my remarks much beyond eight o'clock, but unfortunately I had only five or six minutes before six o'clock. I intend to accept and to answer the suggestion made by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain).

I do not know whether you have noticed, Mr. Chairman, how extraordinary it is that our Liberal friends on the other side are always coming forward with some wonderful suggestion in the public interest which they never thought of before, when they are in—I will not say the valley of humiliation—but the regions of opposition. This suggestion of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay is certainly one of the most interesting we have heard. Unfortunately it comes rather late in the season. It is strange that the hon. member never thought of it in the redistribution of 1924. There was another suggestion from the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay, a sort of mathematical one, which speaking for myself I would be willing to accept but for this, that under that plan to give Montreal the number of seats it would be entitled to according to its population we would have to work in somewhere seventy-five seats for the province of Quebec instead of the present fixed figure of sixty-five. Otherwise I must admit that the suggestion of the hon. membe for Charlevoix-Saguenay is perfectly acceptable. If he can find a way to work it out, I for my part have no objection.

But what are we discussing, Mr. Chairman? What is the question before the committee? What are our differences? What gross injustice, what great geographical error has been committed? I have waited and listened and heard none. I listened to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin), the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) and others, and I have not yet heard where or when any injustice or geographical mistake has been committed.

Mr. TOTZKE: You have not been listening, then.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I have been listening very carefully, and I challenge hon. members on the other side to get up and state one case where the people of this country are going to be deprived of their vote or of their right to vote as they want to. I repeat my challenge—show one case, only one, where a man is going to be deprived of his vote or of the right to vote according to his convictions.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is not what redistribution is for, is it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Very poor.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Of course it is very poor, because the hon. gentlemen so far in my province at least have been used to manipulating elections, and when they could not win them according to the convictions of the people, buy them; and when they could not buy them, steal them; and when they could not steal them, have a dirty piece of legislation like the Dillon bill.

Mr. DUPUIS: Is the hon. gentleman looking in a mirror? I think he must be looking at his own side when he says that.

Mr. LAVERGNE: If I looked at a mirror it would prove one thing, that there is at least this difference between the hon. member who interrupted and myself, that I can reflect. Let the hon. gentleman get up and state where and when the people of this country have been deprived of their prerogatives—when and where. I have listened to the Liberal members on the special committee on redistribution. I heard the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier) speak of the county I have the honour to represent, and what was his argument? A party argument, that if you divide this county the member for L'Islet (Mr. Fafard) would be deprived of five hundred of a majority. Maybe. I said, "If you can divide it otherwise I am willing to accept it." No answer. I will appeal to the hon. member for L'Islet himself. They came to me and said, "Will you agree to give us this parish?" I said, "Yes." We made that one concession, and it was final. Then there was a second concession asked. I accepted again and it was final. Then a third one. I accepted again, and it was final. But the hon. gentlemen are not yet satisfied.

Mr. FAFARD: I spoke to my hon. friend only twice during the session, so I could not have met him on three occasions.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Spoke twice, but he spoke twice for three different parishes.

Mr. FAFARD: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman has to take my word for it. I never asked him for anything. What was asked to-day was asked

by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion), who asked for one parish only. I did not ask for anything and I will not ask for anything.

Mr. LAVERGNE: The hon. member came to me with the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency, and I granted what was asked.

Mr. FAFARD: Not my demand.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Tourville, Sainte-Perpetue and Saint-Damase, which makes three—one, two, three—and the hon. member himself asked for Saint-Damase, which was granted.

Mr. FAFARD: The hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency asked you. I did not ask for anything and I do not want anything. I want both constituencies together.

Mr. LAVERGNE: You were there.

Mr. FAFARD: Yes, I was there.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Did the hon. member accept? Does he accept it now?

Mr. FAFARD: I will give you an answer when you are through.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I want an answer now.

Mr. FAFARD: I want both constituencies together; that is all.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Habemus confitentem reum—the accused party is confessing. The hon. member wants the whole thing. There is the whole county of L'Islet—

Mr. FAFARD: Throwing the counties of L'Islet and Montmagny together.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Very good. I will accept that principle for one second, of L'Islet complete annexed to Montmagny complete. If I were a strong partisan or had the same spirit as the hon. members opposite I might say, Well, the principle is good, and we are going to apply it. We will annex the whole of L'Islet to Montmagny and attach it to Kamouraska.

Mr. FAFARD: There are 24,000 in Kamouraska.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Together with Montmagny that would be 55,000.

Mr. FAFARD: No, 39,000.

Mr. LAVERGNE: No, 55,000. Half of L'Islet and Montmagny make 30,800. L'Islet and Montmagny together make 45,000, and Kamouraska alone 22,000.

Mr. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman, why should not hon. members opposite leave us to make our speeches uninterrupted? Yesterday the hon. member for Quebec East, whom I respect very much, was speaking and he did not wish to be interrupted and we did not interrupt him, but members from this side of the house are always interrupted by French-speaking members opposite, while the English-speaking members opposite, if not out of respect and courtesy, at least because of a calm and peaceful spirit, allow us to make our speeches uninterrupted.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that yesterday, during my speech, the hon. member for Montmagny, who is now speaking, interrupted me at least ten times.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): He asked permission.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I interrupted the hon. member twice to ask questions. But on the point of order, I have no objection to interruptions from hon. members, none at all, because the more they interrupt the more they show the weakness of their position. And they know that although I am a strong Conservative in doctrine I am not a very strong partisan. They know very well that the only reason they have given to this committee so far has been their own narrow, parochial partisanship.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Well, hon. members can laugh, but I repeat my challenge. It would be far braver and more honest on their part to accept it. Show us one case of injustice, just one. Show us one case where counties have been put in that sort of salamander dragon figure referred to by the hon. member for Quebec East, and as far as I am concerned I have enough love of justice and fair play to accept the verdict. Not one can be shown. The people want to be represented, they want to vote and vote for their principles and their beliefs, whatever the government in power may be. In 1917, in 1921, in 1925, and 1926, in spite of all gerrymanders or redistributions, the people of Quebec voted as they wanted to vote. In 1930, in spite of gerrymander—I grant that to the hon. members on the other side—they returned twenty-five seats to the Conservative party. As far as I am concerned I do not believe gerrymanders or redistribution amount to a row of pins. If some gross injustice had been committed, some geographical error, it should be corrected, but I repeat, hon. members cannot show one case, one instance where this redistribution has been

unjust. There may be, as one finds in all human enterprises, some imperfection, some case where one parish should have gone to another county. On what principle? On what ground? Why should Ste. Rose du Dégelé be in the county of Témiscouata instead of in another county? On what principle, what ground of justice? There can be only one determining principle—geographical boundaries. There is not one instance in this bill where geographical boundaries have not been respected; quite the contrary. And the only reason offered by hon. members so far has been: Oh, but our party is going to be affected. Outside of this house who in the country cares a rap about the party of the hon. gentlemen? Let them go to the country with their party and their doctrine, which has varied so often—

An hon. MEMBER: We are ready to go.

Mr. LAVERGNE: —and I am a judge to speak about variation. When I questioned the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont the other night in this house, what was his argument? The hon. member is going to have a minority of 500—no other reason. But is that a reason? I take the position of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay; Quebec has to be divided into sixty-five districts. If we must add new counties to Montreal, Montreal would be entitled to twenty more seats. We cannot actually grant them; where are we going to take them from? Some rural seats must disappear. My seat is affected. The other day I accepted the challenge of the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont; annex Montmagny to Bellechasse. Mr. Chairman, you will grant that there I was more just, more generous, more patriotic than the hon. member; I accepted the challenge. Yet when we want to divide one county into two, hon. members say: "You cannot do that; it will split a Liberal seat." Well, sad things have happened to our country in the past; it has survived a great deal; it has passed through conquest, through war, through famine, through ruin, but this is the first time that I have heard that the splitting of a Liberal seat is going to disrupt confederation. Do hon. members think the Liberal party is the whole of Canada? Why, Mr. Speaker, for thirty years they have come here with a solid bloc from the province of Quebec, although forty per cent of the population of that province were Conservative. How did it happen? I ask the hon. members, how did it happen? One of two things, either gerrymander—and they have been accused of that—or the population of Quebec was voting Liberal. Well, changing a few parishes will not change their situation. If they believe in their doctrine, if they are so sure of their position, let them go to the people of Quebec with this map—which is nothing extraordinary, which represents concessions granted to them one after another, and yet they are not satisfied. Do they want us to resign and grant them power without making a fight? As far as I am concerned I cannot go that far, because I feel it my duty to my beliefs, to my country, to my people, to go and tell them that for twenty years in this house they have been betrayed.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): It is a funeral oration.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Yes, the funeral oration of the Liberal party. I do not know whether I am going to run at the next election. I am indifferent—I may run; I may not. If I obey my doctors I shall not run. But as long as I have a breath left in my body I shall stand up in this house to defend what is right, what is true. We have been fighting here, spending the money of the people for two weeks, without one fair suggestion from the other side, without one clear case of injustice having been shown, but just because hon. members are afraid that if their gerrymander of 1924 is changed they will not come back with a baker's dozen from the province of Quebec. They know it.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I will put just one question; in this house, so far as my province is concerned, the Liberal party have ruled for the last twenty years, have been masters federally and provincially. When the people tried to revolt against their rule they had their friends in Quebec bring in that unheard of piece of legislation called the Dillon bill, which is the most disgusting piece of legislation to be placed on any statute book, taking as it does eighty-two ridings out from the courts of justice of this country to be administered by their friends in Quebec, the very friends who brought them to the valley of humiliation. I ask now—and these are my last words—who is afraid? Let us go to the people; they are the masters.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAVERGNE: I hear some hon. gentlemen opposite say, "hear, hear." If they are so anxious to go to the people let them pass this bill and then the people will decide.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to repeat my remarks of yesterday. I listened to the hon. member

for Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne) before the six o'clock adjournment, congratulate the government on the dismemberment of the counties in general and also state that the government was well advised to use force in order to pass the bill we are discussing.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Yes.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I do not agree with him and that what I want is not a dismembered Montmagny, or a dismembered L'Islet, but the union of these two counties, for the reasons I gave yesterday.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It is to be merged with Kamouraska.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The hon. member now asks why it should not be merged with Kamouraska; I shall tell him why. The hon. member for Montmagny objects to the union of Montmagny and L'Islet counties because the combined population would be too great. Mr. Chairman, the combined population of Kamouraska and L'Islet would be at least 5,000 greater.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It is absolutely the same.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The hon. member has evidently not studied the facts when he states that L'Islet and Montmagny have a combined population of 55,000. The hon. member is not in earnest. In 1931, L'Islet county had a population of 19,404 and Montmagny county, 20,239, which makes a total of 39,643. That is not excessive when there are in the province of Quebec 36 counties with a population of over 40,000.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Granted.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): There are the counties of Matane, Bonaventure, Gaspé, Charlevoix-Saguenay, Témiscouata; in fact, we are surrounded by constituencies of more than 40,000. The hon. member insinuated that I tried to bargain with him.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): No.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I am glad he denies it, as I am not in the habit of bargaining. I stated in this house that I wished to see the counties of Montmagny and L'Islet joined together, inasmuch as their combined population would be only 39,643.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): What would be the population of Kamouraska-L'Islet?

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): 44,000.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is not so very much more.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Five thousand is a large number.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is a great many Liberals in the same constituency.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The hon. member for Montmagny says that this is a great many Liberals in one constituency, although he has stated that the government is not effecting the redistribution from a political point of view. The hon. member for Montmagny sees no harm in having people vote in one place instead of another, on the right side or on the left side of the street. He is perfectly satisfied that the people of Berthier and of Saint-François who voted for him, who elected him, should henceforth vote in the county of Bellechasse.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Absolutely.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): What will be the chances of survival, in a Liberal county like Bellechasse, of the 255 Conservatives who voted for the hon. member for Montmagny?

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I have more confidence in the hon. member for Bellechasse than in the hon. member for L'Islet. I think they will be very well off.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The people think otherwise.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): The hon. member for Montmagny and I are as one, for I, also, have more confidence in the hon. member for Bellechasse than in him. The hon. member for Montmagny says: Mention a measure by means of which we have prevented people from voting. I wish to recall to him a measure adopted in 1916, called the War-time Elections Act, by means of which thousands of men were deprived of their vote which was given to unknown persons in England.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Will the hon. member say when he denounced it in the house?

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I was not here. I will recall to the hon. member that in that year he was, in the county of Montmagny, the candidate of the government that caused that measure to be adopted.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The hon. member is greatly mistaken. There was a Liberal candidate, Mr. George Blais; a Conservative candidate, Mr. Dechene, and an independent candidate, myself. Both parties acted together to bring about my defeat. I do not blame them.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): I happened to take part in that campaign in 1917. I spoke against the hon. member in the parish of St. Ignace.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That explains my defeat.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Perhaps not, but I certainly did not help you. The hon. member for Montmagny was a Nationalist until one week before nomination, when he became the Conservative candidate.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The hon. member is mistaken once more.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals): I should like to take just a few moments of the time of the committee, Mr. Chairman, to reply to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) this afternoon. Since the hon. gentleman quoted the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), who was not and is not in the house, I think perhaps it might be well for the committee to know just what attitude was taken by the hon. member for York-Sunbury.

The hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay referred to the hon. member for York-Sunbury as having supported the redistribution of 1924 as a fair and reasonable measure, and I thought I would look up the speech of the hon. member for York-Sunbury to see just what he did say. In the first place it must be remembered that at that time we of this party did not have any members in the house from the province of Quebec, and the only reason the hon. member for York-Sunbury represented our party so far as Quebec was concerned was that he was one of the members from the maritime provinces, and therefore was put on the committee to represent not only New Brunswick and the maritime provinces but the province of Quebec as well. The hon. member knew as little as I know about the boundaries of the different constituencies in Quebec, and certainly I should not say I was capable of passing upon the boundaries of the constituencies there, and I do not intend to attempt to do so to-night.

The hon. member for York-Sunbury pointed out, at page 4517 of Hansard for 1924, the very fact I have just stated. He uses these words:

> —especially in view of the fact that for the most part I was ignorant of local conditions, particularly in the province of Quebec.

Then he goes on to enumerate some of the injustices which were being done by that legislation. He said:

> With regard to the province of Quebec I expressly reserved to myself and my colleagues the right to discuss the disparity between the urban and the rural representation in that province. If hon. gentlemen have examined the census statistics, and also if they heard the observations that fell this morning from the lips of the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault), they will at once agree with me that the work of the committee has not done full justice to the population of the city and district of Montreal.

Then he went on to mention some ten or twelve seats in the province of Quebec that had populations of less than 23,000, and he pointed out that in the city of Montreal the average was 56,000. I refer to these facts only to show that the hon. member for York-Sunbury did not agree that the redistribution was fair.

> There are 10 seats in the province, principally situated on the island of Montreal, which have a population in excess of 50,000, or two and a half times the population of the 12 seats to which I have referred. . . . It is not fair, it is not equitable, it is not in accordance with the principles laid down in this house by the Prime Minister himself or with the views of anyone who has given careful attention to the problem, that there should be this disparity. I admit that there should be some disparity, but I do not think it should be anything like the disparity that exists here. . . . You cannot prove it to my satisfaction or to the satisfaction of any fairminded man in this house. I think I know the underlying reason actuating our friends in the province of Quebec for not wanting to make this change.

I can hardly concede that to be an approbation of the redistribution of that date. But if you read any of the speeches made at that time on our side of the house, bearing in mind that we had then only fifty members, you will find that the same complaints were made with respect to the redistribution that was then effected as are being made at the present time, only they were more severe. Practically all the speakers on our side of the house complained of the treatment which they were receiving at the hands of the government of that day. I might quote from Mr. Donald Sutherland, not the Minister of National Defence in this house to-day but a relation of his, who represented the constituency of South Oxford. So far as the province of Ontario was concerned, he named seat after seat which was wiped out altogether, and the only reason he could give was the fact that they were Conservative seats. For instance, as reported at page 4514 of Hansard of 1924, Mr. Sutherland said, referring to the constituency of Mr. Stansell which was wiped out:

> We find one of the Elgin constituencies is eliminated. It is also somewhat significant how constituencies with a Conservative record were struck off. The constituency of East Elgin which had been Conservative in 1904, 1908,

1911 and 1917, while it went Progressive for a short time, went back into the old Conservative column in 1921. This was one of the first constituencies disposed of.

He named others that were wiped out because they were Conservative. Then he went on:

Then coming down further east in Ontario we find the constituency of East Peterborough is being merged with the two Hastings. This also was Conservative for a long time although it went to the Progressive party in 1921. East Hastings has been a Conservative constituency from 1904 to the present time. . . . I am pointing this out to show that the Conservatives on the committee were in a very small minority, and historic Conservative constituencies were ruthlessly eliminated as a result; that they were not in a position to exercise much influence, and were helpless to prevent the government from eliminating Conservative constituencies in accordance with their own desire. . . . There were four cardinal principles which he—

The then Prime Minister.

—laid down and asked the committee to adhere to. The committee have absolutely disregarded every one of them, and not in a single instance have they carried out the instructions which the Prime Minister issued to them. . . . The report of the committee laid on the table of this house on Friday, July 11, is very misleading, and I think the chairman of the committee should have explained the attitude of the minority more in detail than he did this afternoon. One would assume from reading this report that the committee were practically unanimous with regard to fixing the boundaries of these constituencies. That was not the case; but after we realized what the situation was, we finally consented under protest to a scheme of redistribution for the province of Ontario. It was the best we could obtain. It is not satisfactory, and if the government have any regard for their reputation in this country, they will take steps to see that a fair representation is made and that three constituencies in western Ontario will not have three representatives in the House of Commons with a less population than another county which is only to have one.

Mr. POULIOT: Is that a quotation from the hon. member for York-Sunbury?

Mr. MANION: No; I have just been quoting from Mr. Donald Sutherland, the late member for South Oxford. He made an elaborate speech on that occasion—

Mr. POULIOT: He always did.

Mr. MANION: Well, he was a very able member, and he was giving the Conservative point of view; just as my hon. friends have tried to show their dissatisfaction with the present redistribution measure, so Mr. Sutherland and other Conservative members in 1924 were complaining about the redistribution which was being carried out at that time. We have learned during the past two days that hon. gentlemen are not satisfied, and I have no quarrel with that; but I have read these extracts from the speech delivered by Mr. Sutherland on that occasion to show that there was as much dissatisfaction on the part of Conservative members at that time with the redistribution of that day as there is among hon. gentlemen to-day with respect to the bill now before us. And we should probably have been able to be more explicit and severe in our complaints with regard to the province of Quebec had the Conservatives been represented in that province. None of us however were from that province and consequently the only provinces with which we could deal effectively were those in which we had representation. I do not say this for the purpose of stirring up any ill feeling; I merely wish to impress upon the committee that the Conservative opposition of that day felt as strongly against the government as the present opposition feels against the government now in power, though I will add this, that I do not think they made speeches which were quite so impassioned as the speeches that have been made with reference to this bill by the Prime Minister and the hon. member for Quebec East. Other members opposite have made more reasonable speeches than the speeches which we have heard from the two gentlemen to whom I have referred, but the speeches that were made in 1924 by the Conservatives were very forceful and were intended to show the injustice that was being done.

Mr. POULIOT: May I say to the hon. gentleman that the Prime Minister did not make an impassioned speech yesterday; he was calm.

Mr. MANION: That was a slip of the tongue; I meant the leader of the opposition. I should have said the then Prime Minister. Possibly he may live long enough to be Prime Minister again.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MANION: I must add, however, that he will be much older than he is now. Let me quote another member of that day, Mr. Stansell, whose seat was wiped out. He represented one of the Elgins. As reported at page 4540 of the same Hansard, he said:

Under the present division nearly half the constituency of East Elgin is put into West Elgin, and the remaining part of the county, a little more than half, is attached to the county of Norfolk. I am not complaining because I am deprived of a constituency, but I am complaining on behalf of the people themselves. I am afraid that in the dying days of the session any protest on my part with regard to the arrangement would be futile.

Mr. Stansell's seat was wiped out. He never came back; his constituency was eliminated. He wanted them to retain the name of the constituency but this they would not do.

An hon. MEMBER: Mr. Stansell won the election in 1925.

Mr. MANION: Well, he is not here now. He won the election in 1925 but he lost the 1926 election, so that it does not make much difference. In 1925 the sweep was strongly for us and in 1926, heaven knows why, it was the other way. I could never understand why it was, because in the interval between the two elections there had occurred the customs scandal, and why the government of that day should have been returned in the face of that I do not know. At any rate, they were returned and Mr. Stansell's seat was wiped out in 1926. I wish to quote finally from the late Mr. E. M. Macdonald, who was a minister of the government at that time and was chairman of the redistribution committee of the day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He is still alive.

Mr. MANION: Well, he is "late" so far as being in office is concerned. That hon. gentleman was chairman of the committee, and I wish to show from his own words, as reported in the same volume of Hansard, his attitude towards the complaints that were then being made. I am bound to say his remarks do not show a spirit of great conciliation. At page 4541, after listening to the complaints made by Mr. Stansell, Mr. Macdonald said:

> If every hon. gentleman who feels that his constituency has been affected adversely by the redistribution owing to its being one of the smaller constituencies proceeds to move an amendment, we are going to have a very complicated situation. This committee is hardly in a position, on the complaint of an hon. member who does not want to have his constituency interfered with, to decide adversely to the report of the committee. . . . There are a great many hon. gentlemen who have greater ground for complaint than my hon. friend.

He was referring to Mr. Stansell.

> I am free to say that there are hon. gentlemen sitting in this house who have cases which on their face they might well complain of, but in view of the discussion which took place in the committee, I do not think my hon. friend has very much ground for complaint.

That was the nice sympathetic attitude adopted by Mr. Macdonald, the chairman of the committee of that day. That was the sympathetic attitude taken by the government of that day towards the complaints raised from our part of the house. In other words, he said: we are sympathetic towards you but we cannot do anything about it. And nothing was done about it.

The constituency of East Algoma was mentioned in the house the other night. I do not think there has ever been a constituency which has been changed as much as this one was during the last redistribution. It was not this government that did that, it was the late government. The hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) has lived all his life in the town of Chapleau, the chief town in the constituency. The old constituency line ran down west of the town of Chapleau which was included in the constituency. But to get around this they brought the line down and cut around the town of Chapleau and a couple of other little places. They even took the hon. gentleman's own mill and ruled it out of the constituency. The line then swung back again. In spite of that the hon. member succeeded in coming back in 1925, but like my friend, Mr. Stansell, he went down in the tight elections of 1926. There has never been a seat in Canada so unfairly dealt with as the seat of the hon. member for East Algoma was dealt with in that redistribution.

I do not mention this to stir up any ill feeling, as I think we have had enough acrimonious discussion in this debate. I have referred to only two or three of the speeches made at that time. I could quote every speaker on our side who took part in that debate in order to show that every one took the same stand as the Hon. Donald Sutherland and Mr. Stansell. We had fifty members in that house and we were represented on the committee as fifty is to one hundred and eighty-five, which I think was the number of the government and their supporters in the Progressive party. We got consideration in exactly the same proportion. We certainly did not get as much consideration as my hon. friends opposite have been given in this redistribution. I am informed that since the debate commenced there have been concessions made by hon. members from practically all the provinces. My hon. friends have received many more concessions than we received in 1924. When my hon. friends try to make out the government of to-day as being such terrible criminals they should remember how the little Conservative party of fifty was treated in 1924.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, it is always most pleasurable to listen to the genial Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion).

I have been to the library to try to get the fifth volume of the debates of 1924 but I find myself in the same unfortunate position as the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) who was unable to obtain certain volumes which had been loaned to other hon. members. The speech of my hon. friend was divided into two parts. The first was a quotation from a speech of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), and the second was a quotation from a speech of Mr. Sutherland, who is no longer a member of this house. The Minister of Railways and Canals quoted the hon. member for York-Sunbury to show that he had disapproved of the redistribution of 1924. My hon. friend is such a fast speaker that I was unable to take notes, but if my memory serves me aright he said that the hon. member for York-Sunbury said that the only complaint in the province of Quebec was the discrepancy which existed between the urban and rural populations and the fact that the urban population was much larger than the rural. My hon. friend can correct me if my quotation is not correct. This was very impressive and I shall attempt to show to what extent it made an impression upon the minds of Mr. Sutherland and the government of that day. The speech made by the hon. member for York-Sunbury was so convincing that the government, because of the increase in urban population, felt bound to reduce the number of rural seats in the province of Ontario as well as in the province of Quebec and at the same time increase the number of urban seats. The same thing is being done this year by this bill. Not only are the urban seats in the province of Quebec being increased by three but the rural seats are being increased by two. It was probably because of the strong speech made by the hon. member for York-Sunbury that the government of that day had to take the steps about which Mr. Sutherland complained so much. My hon. friend referred to the constituencies which have disappeared. Why does he not mention the constituency of Digby which will disappear? The hon. member now representing that constituency will be short a seat.

Mr. MANION: He will probably take the new one.

Mr. POULIOT: Probably so, but then the other constituency will not be represented; he will represent three together. The hon. gentlemen from Ontario who lost their seats following the redistribution of 1924 should have run in the new electoral districts which had been merged together.

I listened with great interest to something said by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne) just before recess. He said that it did not matter whether a man was put on this side of the tree or on that side. I have not read Hansard but I think that is what the hon. member said.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Whether he votes on one side of a tree or on the other.

Mr. POULIOT: Let us go to the garden of Eden. There was a tree of good and a tree of evil; if one side is evil and the other side is good, why not leave the voter on the good side?

Mr. LAVERGNE: Why give all the chances to the serpent?

Mr. POULIOT: Where is the serpent? I have no apple to offer my hon. friend and if I had I do not think I would dare to offer him the forbidden fruit. The forbidden fruit in this case is the argument the hon. gentleman has offered to us in a spoonful of sugar. The argument presented by my hon. friend is this: what does it matter if a man votes in this or that constituency as long as he is not deprived of his vote? I am glad the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) is in the chamber because I shall answer that argument at once. I shall be very brief in expressing my views. It is only a matter of fairness, it is only a matter of decency, it is only a matter of justice and equity and it is only a matter of course. Suppose that Joe in the parish of Berthier voted for the hon. member for Montmagny in 1930 after having listened to his speeches. Now that my hon. friend has spent a few years in parliament, thanks to the votes he has received from Joe, Paul, Tom and Jim, is it not natural that he has to go back to Joe, Paul, Tom and Jim, the same men who voted for him and who sent him to the House of Commons, and explain what he has done? If they are satisfied with him, then they will elect him again and, if not, they will send him back home. That is only fair. The names do not count, but I give them in order to explain my views on the matter. Those who vote for a member of parliament have the right to judge him after he is through with his mandate, after parliament has been dissolved, and it is those people to whom he has to go back to explain what has been done and each one of his votes in the House of Commons.

Mr. LAVERGNE: What about those who have moved away or who have died or who are not yet born?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: I do not complain about interjections from my hon. friend provided that he utters them in a voice loud enough for my ear to catch them. When a man dies, it is a case of force majeure and I shall not insist on my point in such a case. My hon. friend's idea is that a man who has voted for him once and who has helped to send him to parliament, has no right to judge him after he has fulfilled the mandate that has been given to him.

Mr. LAVERGNE: Where did the hon. member get that?

Mr. POULIOT: That is what I understand from my hon. friend's argument. He finds it absurd. I am expressing what he said as I understood it, and when he said it I found it most absurd. When a man votes for a candidate and when that candidate is by that vote and others elected to the House of Commons, he has to return to the same people to tell them whether he has been true to his promises.

Mr. LAVERGNE: What about those who have moved out of the county?

Mr. POULIOT: If my hon. friend will be kind enough to say that in a louder tone, I shall be glad to answer him.

Mr. LAVERGNE: What about those who have moved out of the county? Would he have them brought back to the county to vote?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Geary): I should be glad if the speaker were allowed to proceed without interruption.

Mr. POULIOT: I am pleased to answer questions to the best of my ability. If they decide to move out of the constituency, that is an entirely different matter, but when they remain in the same constituency, they expect their member to return and to tell them what he has done in parliament; they have a right to judge him; if they are satisfied with him, they will reelect him and, if not, they will send him back home. That is my viewpoint in regard to the matter and why I say it is a question of fairness. If you give a power of attorney to anyone he has to report back to you and not to your neighbour. This is an elementary principle of law based on common sense and this is why I find the contention of the hon. member for Montmagny most absurd and illogical. I do not see how he can explain it any further except by saying that he is afraid to go back to his electors; that is all.

[Mr. LaVergne.]

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier): I had no intention of taking any further part in this debate, but in view of the citations by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Manion) from the debate of 1924, believing that citations, like chickens, very often come home to roost, I thought it might be well to quote a little further from the speech of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). I have a copy of the 1924 debates; I am sorry if the fact of its being in my possession has deprived anyone else of its use, but I was very much interested in the debate and for that reason I still have the volume with me. I quite agree with the quotation made by the minister from the speech by the hon. member for York-Sunbury. The minister naturally, being who he is, quoted correctly and I notice that, as reported on page 4517 of volume 5 of Hansard of 1924, the hon. member for York-Sunbury said:

> As a member of the redistribution committee, and as a member of the subcommittees for the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, I must confess that I fully appreciated the responsibilities that were placed on my shoulders. The work was arduous and I desire at the outset to convey to the other gentlemen of the subcommittees my sincere thanks for the courteous treatment which was accorded me and for the consideration that was shown me as a member of each of the subcommittees—

And particularly by the members of the subcommittee for Quebec. I notice in this debate the main issue in so far as the redistribution in Quebec is concerned, was the same as it is now, the disparity between the rural and urban populations. The hon. member for York-Sunbury, as reported on page 4518 of the same volume, went on to say:

> With regard to the province of Quebec I expressly reserved to myself and my colleagues the right to discuss the disparity between the urban and the rural representation in that province. If hon. gentlemen have examined the census statistics, and also if they heard the observations that fell this morning from the lips of the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault), they will at once agree with me that the work of the committee has not done full justice to the population of the city and district of Montreal.

The same question comes up to-day. Montreal, like someone whose name should not be mentioned in polite society, is blamed for many sins, but I want to repeat that the main subject matter of discussion at that time was in reference to rural and urban representation. The hon. member for York-Sunbury, as reported on page 4525, continued:

> So that it will at once be apparent that with one or two exceptions there is a very great disparity between what might be termed the purely rural seats in the province of Quebec

and what might be termed the urban seats. That disparity is altogether too great and it will some day have to be corrected, because it is growing. I have no doubt, however, that the redistribution for the province of Quebec is probably as fair as any that could be arrived at under the method adopted, and I for one propose to stand by the report of the committee in this regard.

Mr. CASGRAIN: From whom is the hon. gentleman quoting?

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier): From the hon. member for York-Sunbury, at page 4525 of Hansard of July 15, 1924.

Mr. CASGRAIN: That is what I quoted this afternoon.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier): The hon. member for York-Sunbury goes on to say, and here he is very prophetic:

I would like to point out, however, that those who come after us ten years hence will have to grapple with this situation, and so far as I am aware there is only one possible excuse for maintaining the disparity that it is apparent now exists, and that is the question of sentiment. This, of course, is a very strong element. No member and no group of members like to see any particular historic constituency disappear, and the province of Quebec being in sentiment the most Conservative province in the whole confederation, probably that sentiment is stronger there than in any other part of Canada.

Further on he says, speaking of the county of Sunbury in New Brunswick:

The people of that county and the people of that province did not take to that change very willingly, but the force of events was so strong as to compel them to do so, and it will be necessary for the people of the province of Quebec to look forward, at least in the next redistribution, to seeing some of their rural constituencies disappear and be united with others of a like population if the disparity is not to continue.

In his concluding remarks the hon. member for York-Sunbury says:

That duty has been cast upon parliament, and while I have no doubt that in days gone by there have been what might be termed outrages, yet in my humble opinion, in so far as I have personal knowledge, the committee in this case, at least the subcommittees I have had the honour of serving upon, did their work in as fair and equitable a manner as was humanly possible, having regard to the fact that there were three divergent elements on every one of the subcommittees. On that very acount it has been no easy task to arrive at a settlement.

And again:

With the exception, therefore, of the disparity with respect to the urban and the rural constituency, I am free to say that, in the light of all these circumstances, having regard to the long and patient sittings of the subcommittees, in which the spirit of compromise at times had to be called into effect, and with the further possible exception of some individual cases of certain constituencies in different parts of the country, I believe that redistribution as now presented to the house in this bill is at least an attempt at a fair settlement of what, in any event, is bound to be a very difficult problem.

The present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Stewart) in the same debate, at page 4526 of the same volume of Hansard, says that the problems in the province of Ontario are more difficult than those in the province of Quebec owing to its geographical formation, and on the next page, 4527, the Minister of Public Works says:

This, however, is not so serious, and the objections which I desire to urge to this report are those with respect to the city of Toronto, the county of York, and the Niagara peninsula. I feel that something has been gained in the direction of removing some of the anomalies and inconsistencies that existed prior to our meeting. We have not had a full measure of success. There has been some compromise in which we have all been concerned; but subject to these reservations and criticisms which I have made I propose to support the report of the committee so far as it affects the province of Ontario.

And his concluding words were:

The work has been very trying indeed and very difficult to all concerned, but as I have said, subject to these objections and these criticisms, I intend to stand by the report of the committee.

Mr. VINCENT DUPUIS (Laprairie-Napierville) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I had intended replying in English to certain statements of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne), but, as he is not in the house at the moment and as the remarks I was going to make would require his presence, I shall speak in French on the subject that interests most particularly the riding of Laprairie-Napierville, which I have the honour to represent in this parliament. Just now, I heard the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion) bewail the fate of a former member whose constituency had been divided in 1924. I do not propose to ask any one's sympathy for my own person. It is quite natural that, from a personal point of view, I should somewhat resent what the party in power has done respecting the riding of Laprairie-Napierville; but allow me, sir, to rise above personal considerations and to discuss the question on its merits. Last autumn, towards the end of the first part of the present session, this bill was presented to this house, it was first suggested to merge Laprairie-Napierville with Chambly. Some time afterwards another plan was evolved by which Laprairie-Napierville was to be joined to St. John's-Iberville.

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to put a question? The hon. member for Montmagny is here now; do you wish to reply to his statements?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I do not look upon the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) as the guardian or protector of the hon. member for Montmagny. I consider the hon. member for Montmagny capable of looking after himself and, if need be, of helping the hon. member for Dorchester.

Mr. GAGNON (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): When the hon. member for Dorchester feels like speaking, he will have his turn.

Mr. Chairman, I was enumerating the various plans submitted respecting the riding of Laprairie-Napierville. I had mentioned the second one: the union with St. John's-Iberville. Subsequently, the party in power, that brute majority to which the right hon. the Prime Minister referred a few days ago, decided to add Huntingdon to Laprairie-Napierville. I shall refrain from mentioning in this house the influences that led the Conservative party to drop the second plan; however it may be, the third one was the Huntingdon-Laprairie-Napierville combination. A little later, the suggestion was made to join Laprairie-Napierville to St. Johns and Iberville to Brome-Missisquoi. Finally came the last plan, which, I am sure, will make the hon. member for Montmagny change his mind when he hears of it, the plan to join Laprairie and Beauharnois.

The ex-Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin) showed us yesterday how lacking in sense was this union from the geographical standpoint. The member for the new division created by the bill will represent a portion of the people of the province of Quebec whose virtues are many, whose prosperity is well-known, a people endowed with various advantages of which it may well be proud.

Let us, however, lay aside such considerations and consider rather what the hon. member for Montmagny has called a geographical monstrosity. May I be permitted to exhibit to this house the results of the efforts of the hon. member's friends. I hold in my hand the last part of this misshapen plan.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): All I can say is that it is beautiful compared with the riding of Quebec East.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): It is beautiful in comparison with Quebec East! Well, I am not accustomed to be satisfied with a thing because my neighbour has something worse.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It is not very beautiful.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): May I ask the hon. member for Montmagny what he would call this drawing, judging it by its shape, if he could not see the geographical map traced upon it?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): A rhinoceros.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I would have to know what it is. What county is it?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I thank the hon. member for Montmagny. I see that he does not understand it. His question shows that he agrees with me that it is a geographical monstrocity. I shall explain it to him: the portion of the map that I hold in my left hand represents the county of Laprairie, which extends this far. The white part is the Caughnawaga Indian reserve. The part enclosed by a red line constitutes what the ex-Minister of Marine called the famous corridor. Here it is. It would be dangerous for a drunken man to drive his automobile here, for the laws of Quebec are strict and he might fall out of the corridor and be severely punished.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): He should not let his horse run away.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): The corridor is detached from Chateauguay county. This portion is inhabited by very distinguished people. The other part, extending up to this one, which I do not dare to name, but which my hon. friend certainly recognizes, is the county of Beauharnois. This slice, cut off here from the lower end of Beauharnois county, is the parish of St. Etienne, with which the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon is so much in love. He wants some more Conservatives! This part is the parish of St. Etienne, which, in 1930, gave a Conservative majority.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It has been removed.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): The section I hold in my right hand—it interests the hon. member for Lotbinière very much—is Sainte-Barbe.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Does the hon. member want St. Etienne?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Were it only a question of St. Barbe! My beloved mother taught me always to invoke St. Barbe in stormy weather. I am happy to keep the parish that bears her name.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I am speaking of St. Etienne. Does the hon. member want St. Etienne?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Certainly. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I wish to discuss this question in an impartial, sensible and logical manner. I say it is absurd to detach this portion and to place the parish of St. Etienne in Beauharnois county. I think it absurd to take St. Barbe and attach it to the end of Beauharnois.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Will the hon. member show us the conformation of the county of Lapraire as it was prior to the bill we are now discussing?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Laprairie county was composed of this quasi-quadrilateral—

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): With this hanging tail?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): It is the parish of St. Jacques. The hon. Minister of Marine should avoid using such expressions in this house.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Does the hon. member think it is a fine conformation?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): The hon. Minister of Marine evidently does not know that this part represents the parish of St. Jacques le Mineur, which his political friends detached from the adjoining county.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): No, it has been replaced in Napierville.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): This parish having given a Conservative majority, it is sought to place it in Laprairie county.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have convinced the hon. member for Montmagny, at least, that the project of his political friends respecting Beauharnois-Laprairie is one of those that might well be called—I shall not say a geographical monstrosity—but, to say the least, rhinoceros-like. I am not ready to accept it.

Mr. ST-PERE (Translation): That is very moderate.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I asked the hon. member for Montmagny to say what he thinks of the shape of this cutting. Somebody said it resembled a rhinoceros. I am not ready to admit that, for I have to much respect for the citizens of the district in question.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The river passes there.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Yes, the river passes there, but it is not the cause of this cutting, as my hon. friend has found out.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): That is something I did not know.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): The hon. member for Montmagny is an expert on the shape of animals. As this seems to surprise him, he will perhaps permit me to recall an incident from the past.

Mr. CHEVRIER (Translation): Beaver!

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): In 1920, not very far back in the life of the hon. member—allow me, Mr. Chairman, to digress for a moment. In the days of my youth nothing could stop me from running away or from borrowing a horse from my father in order to go and hear the hon. member for Montmagny, who was then on the threshold of his political life. I had fallen under the spell of his eloquence, without sharing his political opinions. Like many of us, I admired a good debater, an eloquent speaker, and, as I said, I followed with great interest the hon. gentleman's career, particularly after his election to parliament. I liked the independent judgment he brought to bear on public questions, and I was glad to see him mingle with the Liberals of the Quebec Reform Club. I used to be happy to read the following day's newspaper reports of his speeches, so much so that I clipped the following article from La Patrie, of Tuesday, December 28, 1920, which summarizes the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Montmagny:

> The province of Quebec represents the Liberal party; that is what makes its strength. Liberalism has been able to draw from Quebec a solid bloc that we must refrain from undermining, for through it Quebec enjoys an enviable position of which it should make profitable use. The Liberal party has been the Canadian party, the party of Papineau, of Lafontaine and of Morin. It is still the supporter of the aspirations of our race. The party question is now simplified: the Conservatives of Quebec have been reduced to the form of museum fossils.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Very good. Did the hon. member notice one sentence in that quotation? "The Liberal party now forms a solid bloc of which it should make profitable use." Inasmuch as it has used it, as always, against the interests of our race, I abandoned it.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): It is not proper to question a man's convictions. I respect the political views of the hon. member for Montmagny, just as I respect those of my constituents who do not share mine and who voted against me. Whenever I have an opportunity to see that they obtain justice, I do so regardless of whether they are Conservatives or Liberals. I gather from the remarks he has just made that the hon. member for Montmagny came to the conclusion that the Liberal party did not stand for the views he held and consequently that he crossed over, once again, to the Conservative side.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): If it can be put that way.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I think I express his mind to a certain extent when I say that he is not permanently attached to his present party.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): No, no. When the solid bloc controlled the majority in this house and in the party, and the hon. leader of the opposition was prime minister, I judged that the time had arrived to do justice to our compatriots and to claim the things we requested this year but did not get.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): You have 19 members this year, but you are not doing anything in that respect.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): The hon. member may be right. These 19 members did not obtain what they sought, but can we blame 19 for failing to accomplish what 65 lacked the courage to attempt?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the opportunity will come to discuss the merits or demerits of the Liberal policy.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): I hope so.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): For the present, may I be permitted to proceed with my remarks concerning the riding of Laprairie-Napierville.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): Quite so, let us return to the question.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): If I recalled this incident to the hon. member—

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It is not distasteful to me .

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): —it was not with any intention of hurting his feelings—

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It is not distasteful to me.

[Mr. LaVergne.]

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): —but simply in order to ask him—I have reason to believe, judging from what I have just read, that he is an expert on fossils—if the form I now exhibit does not represent a fossil or the outgrowth of the fossils he must meet on his side of the house.

Mr. LAVERGNE (Translation): It is possible. It bears a striking resemblance to Montmagny as it was prior to the change.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I really admit that Laprairie-Napierville, with 21,000 of a population according to the census of 1931 is too small a riding. It is necessary to build it up by the addition of surrounding territory. But do our friends the Conservatives count as nothing the history of a county, its people, its business, the mode of life of its citizens? Are the customs of a people to be set at naught? Is it reasonable to separate two old counties like Laprairie and Napierville? As a matter of fact, Laprairie is one of the oldest counties in Canada, after Montreal, if not the oldest, for it was founded only a few years later than Montreal. If our friends opposite consider the customs of a people as a matter of some importance, why do they not take into account the fact that the citizens of Laprairie-Napierville have lived together for more than two centuries?

Mr. MERCIER (St-Henri) (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Laprairie was founded a few years after Montreal and its excess population spread out southwards to form the parishes of St. Philippe, St. Constant, St. Edouard, Napierville, St. Michel, St. Rémi. May I be permitted to say that one of the first families to settle at Laprairie was that of an ancestor of mine who, after leaving Paris in 1648 and spending some years in Quebec, arrived at Laprairie in 1668 and finally settled at St. Philippe, where his descendants have always resided. You will understand, Mr. Chairman, the close relations that unite these people, whom we find, if we go back to their origin, to be nearly all related to each other. As to their business relations, the farmers composing the population of the counties of Laprairie and Napierville have their markets either at Montreal or at St. John's. When have they business in Beauharnois county?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Never.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I know of only a dozen citizens of Laprairie-Napierville who, once a year, visit the Valleyfield

fair. No relations whatever exist between the citizens of Laprairie-Napierville and those of Beauharnois. They never meet. Supposing that at the next election a resident of the western end of Beauharnois county, of St. Barbe, for instance, were elected to this house, and that a citizen of St. Philippe had business with him. To see his representative this citizen would have to travel 70 or 80 miles and when he had done that the member would probably have to tell him that in order to obtain the position he seeks he must be within the age limit and possess the required qualifications.

If I may be permitted to use the expression, I would say that this merger, this marriage, is an absurdity. I appeal to our friends opposite, to their common sense, to their spirit of fair play, to their good judgment. Ever since I came to this house I have noticed that, no matter how just their claims, how serious the grievances they expose, members sitting on this side seldom succeed in obtaining justice for their people. It seems to me that every member should realize the consequences of the redistribution set forth in Bill No. 2 and which we have been denouncing. We all know that this measure, if adopted as planned, will prove so unpopular that, should the government sooner or later decide to appeal to the country, the wrongs inflicted by this bill, even were they the sole issue before the people, would suffice to bring about the downfall of our friends opposite and to assure to the Liberal party a large majority throughout the country. Our hon. friends on the government side must be aware of this; the thought must constantly haunt them. What consoles me when I appeal to their good judgment is the increased spirit of conciliation, the better understanding between the two parties, that I have observed in recent days. There seems to be a tendency towards mutual concessions, a readiness to yield certain points that had previously been insisted upon, with the result that grievances are daily diminishing in number. There are still some left, however, and, to my mind, the gravest of them is the one relating to the ridings of Laprairie-Napierville and Beauharnois. In the name of justice, of common sense and of sound logic, I ask that this wrong be redressed.

Allow me to recall to the hon. members opposite that a similar attempt was made in 1892 when the Conservatives, then in power, were effecting a redistribution of constituencies. There was then before the house a plan providing for the dismemberment of the counties of Napierville, Laprairie and Châteauguay. Up to the final days the intention was to leave the two parishes of Châteauguay and St. Philomène in Laprairie and to transfer to St. John's the parishes of St. Cyprien, Napierville and St. Michel. But thanks to the good sense of certain Conservatives, thanks to the spirit of justice and fair play of the leader, Sir John Thompson, thanks to the conciliatory methods of the then leader of the opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, better counsels prevailed and it was decided to unite the counties of Laprairie and Napierville without cutting them up, without scattering some of their parishes left and right, as it is sought to do now.

It seems to me that in the present case it should have been easy to yield certain claims based on political considerations. As the right hon. the Prime Minister said yesterday:

Is it not fair to say that hon. gentlemen opposite must recognize that fact and to recognize the further fact that when a choice has to be made in one of two given ways we must expect that choice to be made in the way that would be most advantageous to the party in power.

Notwithstanding these very human sentiments expressed by the right hon. the Prime Minister, it seems to me that, while taking into due account the legitimate convictions of all concerned, it should be possible to avoid going to extremes, it should be possible to preserve a happy medium and to act in accordance with the principles of common sense. Would it not be possible, while adhering to these principles, to unite Laprairie-Napierville and Chambly? I put this question to the hon. Minister of Marine. Does he believe his chances will be better in Rouville? He is an intelligent man, a man whom I hold in high esteem; I have never missed an opportunity of saying so in public and I do not hesitate to say so in this house. I consider him a gentleman and I know he is well endowed with good judgment, sufficiently, in any case, to realize that in such a matter one must not look only at the results of 1930, but that one must go further back in a county's history to ascertain the political leanings of the various elements of its population. If the hon. minister will look up the history of Rouville he will find that that county has always acted loyally and freely and has sent to this house men of distinction, like Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): The county has undergone transformations since then.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Yes, but the majority has always rested on the Liberal side.

I wish to speak frankly. If the hon. Minister of Marine will study the history of the

county of Laprairie he will find that it is not necessary to go very far back to see that, as recently as 25, 30 or 40 years ago, the Liberals in the town of Laprairie could be counted on the fingers of both hands. He will find that for 25, 30 or 40 years Laprairie county was represented by Conservatives, the last of whom, prior to 1896, was a friend of his and of mine, Mr. Conrad Pelletier, a former batonnier of Montreal, who resided in Laprairie. Would it not be in his own interest to join Laprairie-Napierville to his own county? I do not wish to leave the house under the impression that I am tendering bait to the hon. Minister of Marine. He knows human nature; he is not unaware of what has happened in Laprairie county at the last three or four elections. He knows that the citizens of Laprairie are not intense partisans; they are men of honour and I have no hesitation in stating that the spirit of liberty prevails in the constituency of Laprairie-Napierville.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Because of this spirit of liberty the citizens of Laprairie have given a Liberal majority. When they found out that the Liberal party was the party of liberty—with all due deference to the hon. member for Montmagny—when they found out that the Liberal party instilled a little more happiness in their life and gave their children a little more hope for the future, they voted Liberal. I am unable to foresee the destiny of my party. Should the day come—which God forbid—when the Liberal party finds itself guilty of the distressing blunders committed by the Conservative party in recent years, I am sure that the civic spirit and good judgment of the citizens of Laprairie will lead them to vote against the Liberals and for the Conservatives

In that event, will the hon. Minister of Marine find himself better off with the citizens of Rouville than with those of Laprairie?

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to put a question?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): We might as well dispose of the subject immediately. Does the hon. member consider that it would be fair, from the standpoint of the unit of representation, to join Chambly to Laprairie-Napierville? Does my hon. friend not know that the south shore, that is Chambly, is increasing its population from year to year? With this constant increase Chambly will likely have, within five years, a population from 20 to 25 thousand greater than it has now. Would it be fair to join Chambly to two other counties? I must say to my hon. friend that the committee took all that into consideration when it prepared the schedule to this bill. The question of political advantage or of whether the Minister of Marine would find himself in a better position at the coming election, should he be a candidate, did not enter into consideration at all.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): Let the hon. Minister settle the present; we will look after the future.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): My hon. friend is well aware of the high regard in which I hold him. I thank him for the kind words he uttered about me a moment ago. I may say that the feeling is mutual. What I said about the conformation of Laprairie county was spoken in jest. All the circumstances were duly weighed before preparing the schedule to the bill, and my hon. friend is well aware of the difficulties the committee encountered in respect of Laprairie-Napierville in its endeavours to effect a suitable redistribution. The hon. member admits that it was necessary to merge two counties in that part of the province in order to give Montreal a larger representation. Having gone through all these difficulties, the committee deemed it well to perform the marriage to which my hon. friend has referred and which is not such a bad one after all. I acknowledged yesterday that the arrangement was not a perfect one; but, in the circumstances, the committee considered it was the best it could do.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): Did the committee notice that it was placing two members of this house in conflict?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. Minister of Marine, I would point out that the combined counties of Laprairie, Napierville and Chambly would have a population of 47,601, which is slightly higher than the unit established by the 1931 census and far lower than that of many electoral divisions described in the schedule to Bill No. 2. My hon. friend entertains great hopes for an increase of population in Chambly. I readily admit that Chambly, like Laprairie, being contiguous to a large city, will likely increase faster than other counties, but I do not think that the next ten years will see its population increase as greatly as the hon. minister appears to think. In any case, we are legislating for to-day. I am ready to believe that, in the redistribution of electoral

divisions planned by the hon. minister and his friends, this factor of future increase in population was not taken into account. Why, therefore, should it be taken into account as regards Laprairie, Napierville and Chambly?

The hon. minister told us just now, in the course of his remarks, that he was not speaking for himself personally.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): He possesses the virtue of disinterestedness.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Yesterday, I heard the hon. Solicitor General speak in the same sense and go even further. He went as far as to say that the redistribution had been effected in such a manner as to improve the chances of the Liberals. See, he exclaimed, we have increased your chances in eight Liberal counties, while we have increased ours in two only! Indeed, if I have to accept the statements of my hon. friends opposite—I am obliged to do so in this house, for it is one of the principal rules of parliament—I shall be inclined to think that, seeing bankruptcy on the point of overtaking the country as a result of their policies, noticing the value of our money decline, in consequence of their disastrous administration, to a point where, within a few months, the Canadian dollar will be worth only 40 cents and perhaps less, foreseeing the fate that awaits them, they feel like doing all they can to bring about their eviction. If we must believe our hon. friends, they are the instruments of their own defeat. We Liberals have therefore but to sit still.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): We are all elected in advance.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): It is quite possible that, when the summons comes, not one of the members now sitting at the right of the Speaker will be a candidate. Therefore, if we must take their word, it is quite useless to further waste the time of the house and of all its members discussing this bill. However, without flatly contradicting the assertion of my hon. friends, I can at least say that when I try to look at the facts, not from the point of view of an irreconcilable Liberal, but in entire detachment from party politics, this is what I find: ever since this bill was laid before this house, our friends opposite have, as a primary consideration, sought to rid themselves of the parishes or the counties whose Liberal influence they feared.

Mr. BARRETTE (Translation): Why not?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Why not? My hon. friend from Berthier-Maskinongé is right. Why not? I understand him. He expresses his innate thoughts; they do not surprise me. Why not? Indeed, it is magnificent. I noticed what they were doing; who can blame me for seeing clearly enough to do so. Then I noticed that in order to provide new city divisions it was necessary to eliminate some rural counties in the province. Did they eliminate counties represented by Conservatives? Can they name me one? Can they name me a single electoral district represented by a Conservative which they joined to another one also represented by a Conservative, thus eliminating a Conservative county? They cannot mention a single one. I noticed that, and who shall blame me?

While they have selected for elimination no electoral districts represented by Conservatives, I notice that, on the other hand, they have taken divisions represented by Liberals, such as Laprairie-Napierville. From the south, they have detached Napierville and attached it to St. John's, which is represented by my good friend Mr. Rhéaume, a good Liberal. From the north, the county of Laprairie is to be joined, through the Thermopylae pass, to Beauharnois, which is also represented by a good Liberal, Mr. Maxime Raymond. They did that with the ulterior design—I stand ready to be corrected if I am not expressing the truth—of creating dissension in the Liberal ranks and with the inevitable consequence that one of the two Liberal representatives will thereby be eliminated, as in my case.

May I say here that, as regards my humble person, it matters very little. I am speaking from the standpoint of the general interest of the people of the counties concerned. It is evident that at the next convention, which will be held either at Beauharnois or at Laprairie, it is Mr. Maxime Raymond or some one else that the Liberals of Laprairie and of Beauharnois will select as their standard-bearer. It will not be Vincent Dupuis.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Why not?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Vincent Dupuis represents but a very small part of the population of the proposed riding. Vincent Dupuis is unknown in Beauharnois and, besides, the present member for that county deserves the confidence of his constituents. Some of my friends opposite may say, sarcastically, that it is an advantage for me not to be known, but let us face the facts as they are. I am not known in Beauharnois and it is evident that one of the two Liberal representatives will be eliminated.

Our Conservative friends, whose seats, from their own point of view, are in danger, have endeavoured to make them safe by buttressing them with Conservative parishes, as the hon. member for Châteauguay-Huntingdon is now

doing, and ridding themselves of Liberal parishes. I might mention the hon. member for Dorchester, who has carved out for himself a fine little county in the legitimate hope of coming back to this house, but not with the bravery of the knights of old. In this connection, I would like to say a word about the hon. Minister of Marine. I do not look upon him as a coward; I should like to consider him a "brave homme" (excellent fellow) . .

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): "Brave man."

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I know he is an excellent fellow ("brave homme") and I should like to consider him a brave man ("homme brave"). I should like to see him show the valour that characterizes Canadians of French descent. Our fellow-citizens belonging to other races possess many qualities indeed, but the Canadian of French origin is specially distinguished for bravery. I should like to see the hon. Minister of Marine display this trait. I am afraid, however, that he is not exactly what I should wish him to be, when I see him abandon the good people of Verchères. The citizens of Verchères, among whom live a large number of my relatives and of my friends, are people of excellent judgment, just as much so as the people of Laprairie and of Rouville. When I recall the facts of our history and the great bravery of the immortal Madeleine of Verchères, whose monument stands in the parish of Verchères, I conclude that the hon. Minister of Marine should be the last man to fail to perpetuate the gallantry that has distinguished our compatriots from time immemorial. I am ignorant of the reasons that prompted the hon. minister to abandon that county, but I venture to think cowardice is not one of them. Why did he exchange, why did he bargain, or should I say why did he jockey, the county of Verchères for the county of Rouville? Is it because of the mountain in Rouville? Does he expect the mountain to come to him? In order to believe that, he will need greater faith than he will need courage to keep Rouville.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): The mountain labours.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): The mountain labours, but not to the advantage of the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Larue), for I fear that at the next election the voters will put him on the street.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): For you, it will be the bottom of the well.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): From the bottom of the well generally come the greatest truths.

May I, sir, be permitted to draw a comparison regarding the attitude of my hon. friend. As Minister of Marine, he is our chief mariner, and seamen are brave in the face of storms. I wonder if he did not commit a capital blunder in trying to repair his small craft on the sides, when the leak is at the bottom. I am afraid he made a mistake and that he will miss his aim. At the next election he will not be able to say, with the fabulist Lafontaine, that it is the bottom that will be the least defective; I think it is the bottom that will be the most defective. Instead of grabbing Rouville and ridding himself of Verchères, he should have crossed the river and taken the part of Maisonneuve division that contains the Vickers dry-docks in order to be able to have repairs made to the bottom of his little boat. Mr. Chairman, I do not say those things with any intention of hurting the feelings of the hon. Minister of Marine. I know how good-natured he is—

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): The metaphor is rather far-fetched.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I know he can take a joke. I shall now revert to serious matters. It is some of my friends opposite who led me to jest.

I seek no favours, but only justice and fair play for the citizens of Laprairie-Napierville. Do not separate these two counties that have been united since 1892 and whose citizens have lived together for centuries. Let them continue together. Join to them, rather, citizens like those of Chambly, and your redistribution will be fair and just. These people live side by side, go to Bonsecours market together, belong to the same societies and attend the same meetings. It is natural for them to be united. As for me personally, it matters little whether you settle this question in the manner in which my humble judgment leads me to see it or whether you adopt the senseless plan submitted to this house. From the days of my youth I resolved to devote the best of my life, of my energies, of my small talents and knowledge to the service of my fellow-citizens. Since those far-away days I have not failed in the task. I have endeavoured, ever since entering public life, to work for those who did me the honour of making me the representative of Laprairie-Napierville, regardless of race, religion or party. Should this bill eliminate me from public life, it little matters; I shall continue, in whatever field Providence

assigns to me, to work for my people according to my capacity, if not in public life at least in private life.

May I be permitted to recall the advice given to some young students by the most illustrious of Canada's public men. These are the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

> Be gentle and kind to the weak; let your aim and purpose, in good report or in ill, in victory or in defeat, be so to live, so to strive, so to serve, so to do your part, to raise the standard of life to a higher and better sphere.

Mr. Chairman, such is my aim; such is the path I intend to follow, whatever may be my political future. If I am destined to return to public life, I shall strive to do honour to the people who will have given me their confidence. Should I not return, there will still be found on the map of the country the result of the iniquitous measure that has separated the citizens of two counties accustomed to live together in order to place them in other counties whose geographical situation prevents all close contact between them.

Mr. GAGNON: I have listened with a good deal of attention to the speech of my hon. friend from Laprairie-Napierville. I will not attempt to follow him along the line he took because it seems to me that when a member has to defend a just cause he need not employ abusive epithets and insulting insinuations towards members opposite in the expression of his views.

Mr. DUPUIS: On a point of order, I would ask the hon. member for Dorchester to cite the insinuations that were insulting to him, because the use of such insinuations was far from my intention. I am sure I did not use any, and when he maintains that assertion he must mention the word I used. Otherwise I would ask him to withdraw the remark.

Mr. GAGNON: The tactics are always the same. When a member on this side of the house, especially when he is a French speaking member, is addressing the chair he is always interrupted by hon. gentlemen opposite, who ought to remember that we never interrupt them.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: No one is interrupted more than I am.

Mr. GAGNON: The hon. gentleman has challenged me to quote some of the insulting insinuations he has used. First of all, he said in very clear terms that I was a coward, that I had not been a brave cavalier, in setting up for myself a safe constituency.

Mr. DUPUIS: On a point of order, may I say that I never said the hon. gentleman was a coward. I never said that and I do not want him to assert such a thing. I have never intended, here or outside, to insult any citizen of this country by the use of such an expression. The hon. member should not say what he has said.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): He simply told you you were building a fortress.

Mr. GAGNON: I am not at all offended because the hon. gentleman insinuated that I have not been brave in arranging a county. I merely want to point out to this gathering of gentlemen, this committee, that some hon. gentlemen opposite have defended their so-called just cause by using insulting remarks with regard to gentlemen on this side.

Mr. DUPUIS: I should like your honour to decide the point of order. I want a ruling on my declaration that I never said what the hon. gentleman has attributed to me. I have asked him to withdraw the remark and I should like to have the decision of the chair.

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): He never used the word "coward."

Mr. GAGNON: This afternoon we heard my hon. friend from Témiscouata—

Mr. CHEVRIER: On a point of order, an hon. gentleman has asked the chairman to give a ruling. Will not the chairman declare on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tummon): Unfortunately, being unable to understand the language in which the hon. gentleman was speaking, I do not know whether or not he used the word attributed to him. At any rate, the hon. gentleman says he did not say it.

Mr. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman, I am ready to comply with your ruling and withdraw anything that may have displeased the hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis). However may I say that my ears are still in good shape and I think I can hear.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The correction should be made without any reservation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tummon): I think the withdrawal is satisfactory. It is satisfactory at least to the chair.

Mr. GAGNON: The hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), who is always a very interesting speaker, began the exposition of his case by throwing insulting remarks at the members of the committee. He said that they were insipid and ignorant. He

referred to their ignorance in erroneously describing the constituency of Gaspe as being composed of the counties of Gaspe East and Gaspe West. He said also that they had erroneously described the constituency of Lake St. John-Roberval by saying it was composed of the counties of Lake St. John East and Lake St. John West. I would refer the hon. member to the redistribution bill of 1924 which was drafted by the skilful engineers of the Liberal party. I refer hon. members to 14-15 George V, 1924 at page 229 where the county of Gaspe is described as follows:

Gaspe consisting of the counties of Gaspe East and Gaspe West and the Magdalen islands.

The constituency of Lake St. John is described as follows:

Lake St. John consisting of the counties of Lake St. John East and Lake St. John West.

If the members of this committee have been ignorant and insipid because they have described the constituencies of Lake St. John and Gaspe in the manner in which they are described in the bill, they have only followed the language used in the act of 1924. I think it would be proper to throw back at hon. gentlemen opposite the expressions which have been used in referring to the members of this committee. It seems to me that this committee should be able to discuss a question like the bill now before us without entering into personalities and using abusive epithets and making insulting insinuations.

Mr. POULIOT: If the hon. gentleman is insulted, I am satisfied.

Mr. GAGNON: The seventh interruption. The bill which was prepared by this committee is a fair one. It gives fair representation to all the counties in the province of Quebec. This afternoon the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) made a clever exposition of his views by trying to quote only one part of a speech made by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) in 1924. I was happy to hear the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier) quote the whole speech to-night. If we refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont we will see that in 1924 the hon. member for York-Sunbury criticized the method employed by the government of that day in setting up the constituencies in the province of Quebec. I refer hon. members to page 4518 of Hansard of 1924. The hon. member stated that he was not conversant with the geography of Quebec, but he pointed out that there were many constituencies where the population was under 22,000 while in others the population exceeded 60,000 and went as high as 70,000. He gave the following constituencies as having a population under 22,000:

County—	Population
Argenteuil	17,165
L'Islet	17,859
Richelieu	18,764
Yamaska	18,840
Wright	21,850
Vaudreuil-Soulanges	21,620
Laprairie-Napierville	20,065
Beauharnois	19,888
Montmagny	21,997
Bagot	18,035
Bellechasse	21,190
Kamouraska	22,014

In showing the discrepancy which existed between the rural and urban constituencies, he quoted the following constituencies with their respective populations:

County—	Population
St. Denis	78,920
Hochelaga	73,526
Laurier-Outremont	72,047
Jacques Cartier	68,000
Maisonneuve	64,933
St. Mary	63,975
George Etienne Cartier	54,800
Beauce	53,841
St. Ann	52,049
Three Rivers	50,845

A reference to the map and the act of 1924 will show that hon. gentlemen opposite shirked their duty at that time to a large extent. They did not make a proper, a just and a fair redistribution. I think I have demonstrated that the new bill is more just and more fair towards the province of Quebec. I have studied attentively the work of the committee and I have divided the constituencies in this province into three groups. The first consists of those in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, the second of the rural constituencies and the third of the semi-rural and semi-urban constituencies.

The first group would include the constituencies in the city of Montreal but I shall not touch upon those because I am informed that certain changes will be made when the schedules are being considered. Anything I might say might prove to be superfluous. In connection with the city of Quebec, I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Quebec East say yesterday that on the whole the redistribution of the city of Quebec was fair. If I am not mistaken those were his exact words. If the hon. member for Témiscouata was right when he said yesterday that the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) had made a bed for himself, he was contradicting his leader, the hon. member for Quebec East, who was fair enough to pay homage to the

generosity and justice of the redistribution of the city of Quebec. But, on the other hand—

Mr. POULIOT: I did not say that for St. Sauveur; I said it for Levis.

Mr. GAGNON: The eighth interruption. The Solicitor General was careful enough to keep his constituency as it ought always to have been, as an urban seat, and to send away to the neighbouring county the rural parishes which belonged formerly to the counties of Quebec and Portneuf, and which parishes ought never to have been merged in the ward of St. Sauveur in the city of Quebec.

Let us take, for instance, the county of Quebec East. The hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Lapointe) cannot complain, because only very few minor changes have been made there. Yesterday I heard him trying to be very clever and funny in criticizing the map which was drafted by the committee and to explain that it was more or less like a jig-saw puzzle. Let me show some exhibits of the maps which were prepared by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1924 and let hon. gentlemen of the committee judge for themselves. Let me take first the map of Quebec East. Look at the beautiful map that was set up by the hon. member for Quebec East in 1924! Look at those curves, those protuberances and at the needle point! Was it a kind of dagger with which to stab Conservatives or was it rather a safety pin to try to retain the Liberals who were deserting the Liberal flag? I leave it to the committee to judge for themselves.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will the hon. gentleman kindly permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. GAGNON: Certainly. The ninth interruption.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does he not know this delimitation of Quebec East was made in 1914 by the Conservative government and retained?

Mr. GAGNON: It might have been. I have not studied the matter, but I use that argument to show that if there has been a jig-saw puzzle, this puzzle has satisfied the hon. gentleman for three elections and he did not change it in 1924.

Let us look at the jig-saw puzzle of Richelieu, the seat of the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin), who is going to interrupt me, and this will make the tenth interruption. Look at this beautiful little thing which I hold in my hand, and look at the needle points, protuberances and curves! Look at this protuberance! Is it a river, a mountain or a brook?

Mr. CARDIN: Why does the hon. member not show the present map?

Mr. GAGNON: Let us look now at the map of the county of Berthier-Maskinonge. What is that beaver tail which I indicate on this exhibit? What are those protuberances which were left by the Liberal party in 1924?

Mr. CARDIN: Why do hon. gentlemen opposite not have it changed? They have the opportunity.

Mr. GAGNON: Let us look at the map of the county of Chateauguay-Huntingdon. This is the shape of the constituency with which the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon had to be content when he was fighting in the last election. These are the jig-saw puzzles drafted and made by the Liberal party. Look at those ridiculous salamanders or snakes which have been left by the Liberal party!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. GAGNON: I would ask my hon. friends to take their own medicine. This part which I indicate, which is absolutely ridiculous is now taken away by the redistribution committee and joined to the neighbouring county.

Let us look at the map of the constituency of the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré). I ask any fair-minded, serious, man to tell me whether this is not the most ridiculous configuration.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Made in 1914.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The work of the Tories.

Mr. GAGNON: I am not surprised that the hon. member for Quebec East is wriggling like a fish in a frying pan.

Let us look at the map of Drummond-Arthabaska, at those ridiculous misdirections, those needles which represent strips of land taken from an adjoining county because there are Grits there who have to be taken in order to swell the majority of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am exhibiting the map of the constituency of Lotbinière, which is now being corrected by the redistribution in order that the map may be less ridiculous.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is untouched.

Mr. GAGNON: Let us look at the map of the county of Brome-Missisquoi. This was made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Let us look at the map of the county of Chambly-Vercheres, represented by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau). It has a beaver tail which has to be cut now in order to give a fair representation to the county.

Let us look at the map of the county of Richmond-Wolfe, in which the hon. member

for that constituency (Mr. Lafleche) has been obliged to fight against a former stalwart of the Liberal party.

Let us look at the map of the county of St. Johns-Iberville. Can hon. members think of anything more ridiculous?

Now I shall take the worst. Let us look at the map of the county of Beauce. The hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) is an expert in using an argument which can be thrown back to his own party when to-night he showed the map of his constituency. He tried to be funny, but nevertheless I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to show in the new redistribution such ridiculous figures as the one I am now exhibiting to the committee.

Let us look at the map of the constituency of Bellechasse, the county of my distinguished neighbour (Mr. Boulanger). Can hon. gentlemen find anything more strange than that? How can he explain the triangle, the protuberance which comes into my county, and all the curves and protuberances?

Now I am going to show the map of the county of Nicolet. I may say that a great number of the protuberances which are visible are being cut out in order to give a fair representation.

Mr. CARDIN: Not at all, to make it worse.

Mr. GAGNON: That is the seventeenth interruption. Of course when hon. gentlemen who live in other provinces look at the map of Quebec, they always wonder why the counties have been thus carved and are different from those in the other provinces. They need not be scandalized, because this can be explained to a certain extent owing to the tenure of the land. In the other provinces the land is divided into townships, whereas in Quebec many districts have been taken from the old French seigniories and the French settlers, instead of using square pieces of land, preferred to gather in a small village, so that when the counties were carved out, they showed some more or less strange shapes. I will be fair enough to admit that: It has been more or less the custom since confederation to have some strange carvings of constituencies, and in showing these exhibits I did not do so with the view of offending hon. gentlemen opposite or of trying to minimize their efforts, but rather to show that when they were trying to explain that our map was funny, it was much less strange and funny than the map which was drawn up by hon gentlemen opposite.

[Mr. Gagnon.]

May I try to prove the first proposition that I discussed before this committee, the proposition that the new arrangement that was made by the special committee was fair and was drafted in order to secure a more just and fair representation to the population of Quebec.

Before I tried to show the carvings of the past I was explaining that in the city of Quebec the distribution has been fair. It is true that the county of my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) has a much smaller population than the others, but hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that ever since confederation it has been the practice and the cherished custom to leave the county of Quebec South to the English minority in the province of Quebec, and this county has been represented almost I think since confederation by an English-speaking member. If this year we had taken away some parts of the county of Quebec West or of the county of Quebec East and merged them with the county of Quebec South, the hon. gentleman from Quebec South, who is a friend of mine and a distinguished gentleman, might have thought that the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) was desirous of being unfair to the Irish and the English minority of the city of Quebec. But when the French speaking people of all parts of Canada are asking that the English minority make sacrifices in order to give satisfaction to the aspirations of the French race, we are happy to say to them that in the province of Quebec we have always been fair and desirous of giving fair play to the English minority of the province of Quebec.

I must apologize to you, Mr. Chairman, if like the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) I sometimes speak in a high tone of voice. I know that small things cannot be compared with great, but nevertheless I have been made like him in that way. I have no desire to offend or intimidate in any way hon. gentlemen of this house.

I turn now to the other group of seats which I will call the rural group. If hon. gentlemen will bear with me for a few minutes I shall try to show that the rural seats in the province of Quebec have almost the same unit of population. For instance, Dorchester has a population of 27,156, and other counties as follows:

Country—	Population
Dorchester	27,156
Argenteuil	27,885
Bellechasse	27,480
Chateauguay-Huntingdon	24,412
Stanstead	25,118
Compton	31,858
Wright	27,107

County—	Population
Shefford	28,202
Montmagny-L'Islet	30,869
Brome-Missisquoi	32,069
Kamouraska	30,852
Berthier-Maskinonge	35,575
Portneuf	37,305
Lotbiniere	38,546
Laval-Two Mountains	31,896
St. John-Iberville	32,259
Richmond-Wolfe	36,568

Those are what I might properly call the rural seats of the province of Quebec. It is true that in some of those counties you will probably find a small city or a town but the largest town or city in these counties will have a population of less than five thousand people, and if hon. gentlemen have listened attentively to my humble remarks they will agree that in these rural seats the population on the whole does not vary by more than 1,500 people. Now is not that a fair representation, a fair distribution of population as between all the urban seats of the province of Quebec irrespective of their party affiliations?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): What are the figures for Gaspe?

Mr. GAGNON: I will come to that in a few moments. I have done my best, Mr. Chairman, to set out as just a grouping as possible, but you, sir, and hon. gentlemen of this committee will understand that the work of the special committee on redistribution has been very difficult because that committee was obliged to reduce into sixty-five counties the territory which for provincial electoral purposes formed ninety counties.

I now come to the third group, which I have called the group of semi-rural and urban seats. I will give the names of the counties and the population of each and it will be seen that in this group the distribution and representation has been as fair and as just as in the other groups:

County—	Population
Richelieu-Vercheres	35,782
Champlain	37,526
Sherbrooke	37,386
Matapedia-Matane	39,977
Joliette-Montcalm	39,154
Beauharnois-Laprairie	41,399
Pontiac	42,950
Chambly-Rouville	40,353
L'Assomption-Terrebonne	47,215
Beauce	51,614
Lake St. John-Roberval	50,253
Chicoutimi	55,724
Three Rivers	44,226
Drummond-Arthabaska	53,338
Hull	49,196
Rimouski	40,208
Lafleche-St. Maurice	46,787
Gaspe	47,160
Nicolet-Yamaska	39,338
Megantic-Frontenac	44,440
Quebec-Montmorency	40,152
Témiscouata	42,679
St. Hyacinthe-Bagot	42,720

It will be noted that in those counties the population does not vary by more than two or two thousand five hundred people. Is that not fair? The committee has been faced with the task of doing justice so far as possible to all these different groups of population.

Hon. gentlemen opposite will see that I have made an exception, that I have not mentioned the county of Labelle. I have not done so because the county of Labelle will be amended when the schedules are under consideration. Nor have I quoted the county of Levis, not because I was afraid, but because I have reserved Levis for a special chapter in order not to wound the delicate sensibilities of the hon. member for Quebec East.

The county of Levis has been left with a population of 28,548, which is almost the same as that of neighbouring counties. But the members of the committee have been willing to establish an urban seat in the region south of the St. Lawrence river. If the gentlemen of the committee will bear with me they will see that from Nicolet to the Gaspe peninsula there is not one big town or city with a population of more than 15,000 or 20,000 people. Why was it not fair to try to make an urban seat of the three urban corporations consisting of the city of Levis, the city of Bienville and the town of St. Joseph de Lauzon? It is true that in the new constituency some rural parishes have been left, but in these rural parishes such as Charny and Pintendre the population is composed of as many workingmen as farmers, because, Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that the corporation of Charny is a railway centre. The committee has been willing to make an urban seat of the city of Levis; in this the committee may have been wrong or may have been right. It is not my business to discuss what belongs to the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Fortin), but I will say that in so doing the committee has not been unjust or unfair to the neighbouring counties, because the parishes which have been detached from Levis to be joined to the county of Bellechasse will not endanger the chances of the hon. member for Bellechasse, and those which have been detached from Levis to be joined to Lotbinière will not endanger the chances of my hon. friend the member for Lotbinière (Mr.

Verville), who yesterday was fair enough to admit that he had no objection to the two or three parishes from Levis to be joined to Lotbinière.

Mr. POULIOT: It will not improve the chances of the hon. Solicitor General in Levis.

Mr. DUPRE: May I reply to the hon. gentleman and settle that question once for all? In 1930 I had the great honour of being offered the candidature in the county of Levis, which is my native county, and at the same time I was offered the candidature in the county of Quebec West, and for reasons of my own I chose to run in Quebec West. That settles it once for all.

Mr. POULIOT: That says nothing for the future.

Mr. GAGNON: It seems to me that the remark of the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) is most unfair and ungenerous when he tries to insinuate that the carving of the county of Levis has been done by the Solicitor General.

Now if I may continue, I have made three exceptions; there are three counties which have not been joined in that group. If I did not mention them I might be taxed with unfairness by hon. gentlemen opposite, so I hasten to speak of them. I refer to the county of Charlevoix-Saguenay, which has been left as it is, with a population of 55,594; and Vaudreuil-Soulanges and Chapleau. It is true the county of Charlevoix-Saguenay is a very large constituency, probably one of the largest, but, Mr. Chairman, if it is too large now, why did not hon. gentlemen opposite leave it as it was in 1924? Surely this committee cannot be accused of unfairness when they have left the county almost as it was in 1924. I will say immediately, if we had divided the county of Charlevoix-Saguenay into two counties the task would have been very difficult, because the population is not the same, and because in the county of Saguenay, which is a territory of more than 300 square miles, the population is too sparsely scattered to make a fair distribution by the separation of those two counties.

Now, Mr. Chairman, time is flying, and I would not like to conclude my remarks without replying to an insinuation made by the hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville that the member for Dorchester was willing to organize a special seat for himself. I will tell this committee that the hon. member for Dorchester is not afraid to be judged by the electors of Dorchester but will resent very much being judged by the electors of the county of Beauce. The hon. member for Quebec East yesterday was fair and generous enough to admit that in 1924 the former Solicitor General, Hon. Lucien Cannon, took the parish of St. Maxime and joined it to the county of Dorchester because he was sure of a Liberal majority of 250. I have decided, and have asked the committee—and I will not hide myself behind any committee, I am ready to take my own responsibility—I asked the committee to try to give back to the county of Beauce the presents they have made in the past. I have also asked the committee to give back to the county of Beauce the parishes of St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurélie which have always belonged to the county of Beauce for provincial purposes until 1931 and which were joined to the provincial county of Dorchester in 1931 and 1932 because they wanted to destroy the chances of the Conservative candidate in Dorchester in the provincial elections. I am sure my hon. friend from Bellechasse will ask me why I have deemed it wise to ask that the parish of St. Luc be joined to the county of Bellechasse. I will tell my hon. friend that in the county of Dorchester there is also a protuberance, a little square joined to the county of Dorchester like a postage stamp. This postage stamp, which has been made up of parts of the county of Dorchester and Bellechasse, I want to be given to the county of Bellechasse, and I will tell you why. When hon. gentlemen opposite made the redistribution in the past what did they do? They carved the parishes of Ste. Sabine and Honfleur, in dividing the population in two—half the parish votes in Dorchester and half in Bellechasse. If I had followed the same distribution as hon. gentlemen opposite I would have kept half of St. Luc and given half to the county of Bellechasse. I would not do such a thing. I am not for half measures, I asked that the whole parish go to the county of Bellechasse.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I have not hitherto taken any part in this discussion, because personally I have nothing other than perhaps an academic interest in it. Speaking for the constituency which I represent I had better thank the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) and the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) for their magnanimity and generosity towards the English speaking population of the city of Quebec, in allotting to them a smaller constituency than some of the others. But may I say to the Solicitor General, and he probably knows it if he has followed the elections

in the city of Quebec during the past few years, that as far as I am concerned I have never claimed election in the constituency of Quebec South on the ground that I was English speaking. I have merely asked my electors on every and all occasions—and the question has presented itself at every election—not to reject me on the ground that I was English speaking, but to give me the same chance as any other citizen of Quebec or of the Dominion of Canada. As far as the constituency being English speaking is concerned, I think the Solicitor General knows that the population has now shifted considerably, and I would say, without having looked at the census figures, that at least two thirds of the population are now French speaking. And if I may make a further personal reference I would say that of the one-third which is English four-fifths vote against me. I do thank the hon. gentlemen for their generosity, but as far as it affects me personally I hardly think I am likely to derive any benefit from the seat being made into a so-called English speaking seat.

Now I should like to take up for a moment some of the observations made by my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon). The hon. gentleman alleged that the profile maps which he showed were specimens of Liberal handiwork. I took down some of the names of the constituencies, pictures of which he showed to this house, greatly to the amusement of hon. gentlemen opposite. Quebec East was formed in 1914, when Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden was Prime Minister and when it is to be assumed that the late Hon. L. P. Pelletier looked after the redistribution of the seats in the Quebec district. Quebec West, to which my hon. friend complains certain rural centres were added, also was so constituted in 1914 under the guidance of the same hon. gentleman. In consulting the statutes of 1924 I find that Chateauguay-Huntingdon was allowed to remain as it was in 1914, so it also is a specimen of the handiwork not of hon. gentlemen on this side of the house but of the well-revered predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HACKETT: I think the hon. gentleman will find that two square miles was taken away from Chateauguay-Huntingdon, in the parish of Ste. Clothilde.

Mr. POWER: Would those two square miles have made the salamander-like picture exhibited by my hon. friend?

Mr. HACKETT: Provincial legislation in 1921 did the trick.

Mr. POWER: But I hardly think the ridiculous part of it, if I may use that term, resulted from the provincial legislation of 1921 as much as from the legislation of 1914. I understand that the changes being made now will not improve the picture even from a futuristic standpoint. As for Drummond-Arthabaska, I find that it was allowed to remain as it had been in 1914, with a very slight correction.

Mr. HACKETT: My hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. POWER: There was a slight correction in the township of Upton, was there not?

Mr. HACKETT: The change was made by provincial legislation.

Mr. POWER: I am referring to the federal statute of 1924.

Drummond-Arthabaska consisting of the counties of Arthabaska and Drummond, except that part of the municipality of St. Edmond lying in the township of Upton.

Mr. HACKETT: Those boundaries have been modified by provincial legislation.

Mr. POWER: But not sufficiently to make the picture shown us by the hon. member for Dorchester. As for Brome-Missisquoi, there was a change made by provincial legislation.

Mr. HACKETT: Two changes.

Mr. POWER: But generally speaking it was the same constituency, and it is being carried into this legislation as exactly the same constituency; if it was so ridiculous in 1924 it is equally ridiculous to-day. I understand the situation is the same with regard to Chambly-Vercheres and Richmond-Wolfe. In his opening remarks the hon. gentleman was somewhat severe with hon. members on this side of the house who had made some complaint with regard to the statutory accuracy of the descriptions given in the present bill. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) stated on the floor of the house that the description of the constituency of Gaspe, which in the bill was made up of Gaspe East, Gaspe West and the Magdalen Islands, was inaccurate in that the description should be Gaspe North, Gaspe South and the Magdalen Islands. My hon. friend took exception to that statement. I refer him to the 1930 statutes of the province of Quebec, which constituted two new constituencies in the county of Gaspe, one to be named Gaspe North and the other to be named Gaspe South. Section 5 of the present bill is identical with a section in the statute passed in 1914, which states:

Wherever in the said schedule any word or expression is used to denote the name of any

territorial division, such word or expression shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be construed as indicating such territorial division as it exists and is bounded at the date of the passing of this act.

Therefore if it is intended properly to describe the county of Gaspe one must describe it as including the counties of Gaspe North, Gaspe South and the Magdalen islands. In referring to Gaspe East and Gaspe West I believe my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) was referring to registration divisions, but I think in this bill we are dealing with territorial divisions, counties as represented for the purposes of the elections.

Mr. DUPRE: May I interrupt my hon. friend to refer him to section 40 of the British North America Act, which states:

Quebec shall be divided into sixty-five electoral districts, composed of the sixty-five electoral divisions into which Lower Canada is at the passing of this act divided under chapter two of the consolidated statutes of Canada, chapter seventy-five of the consolidated statutes for Lower Canada, and the act of the province of Canada of the twenty-third year of the Queen, chapter one, or any other act amending the same in force at the union, so that each such electoral division shall be for the purposes of this act an electoral district entitled to return one member.

In other words, the federal division is based on the provincial division.

Mr. POWER: Certainly it has been the custom to follow the practice which was followed in 1924. In this act itself we speak of the county of Matapedia, the county of Frontenac, the county of Papineau and a large number of provincial counties. We might as well be consistent all through the act; instead of describing the county of Gaspe as a registration division I think we should describe it as a provincial division for the sake of statutory accuracy.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, May 25, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

*TUG OCEANEAGLE

Mr. GARDINER:

What price did the St. John Dry Dock Company receive for the steel tug Oceaneagle, from the Department of Railways and Canals?

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. MANION: This question was answered directly to the hon. member the other day, by mistake, so I presume it may be dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

FRENCH FILMS

Mr. HURTUBISE:

How many French speaking films have been returned to France during the years 1931 and 1932 after being refused by the provincial boards of censors?

Mr. BENNETT: I think this will have to stand as an order for return, since it involves communication with all the provinces.

HUDSON BAY ROUTE—INSURANCE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine): I desire to make a statement with regard to insurance rates on the Hudson Bay route. The Imperial shipping committee, at their meeting held on Friday, May 19, decided to report that as the result of discussion between their chairman and the chairman of the joint hull committee, the rates and conditions governing insurance of hull and machinery of ships on the Hudson Bay route will continue for the 1933 season as they were in the 1932 season, except that minimum rates for suspending warranties will hold from August 10 to October 7, both dates inclusive, instead of to September 30. From October 8 to October 15, both dates inclusive, the rates will be increased as heretofore by 25 per cent. The full report of the Imperial shipping committee will be presented to the governments concerned.

STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. MURRAY MacLAREN (Minister of Pensions and National Health): A day or two ago the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) asked some questions in the house with regard to complaints that had been made to him concerning the hospital at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, and I said I would make inquiries. I have done so, Mr. Speaker, and I am informed that the officer in charge of the hospital and the chief medical officer have not heard of any of the complaints referred to. The officer against whom the charges are made is not a returned soldier,

but has been specially trained in diseases of the chest. He positively states that he did not give expression to the words mentioned and I think the language quoted by the hon. member for Temiscouata was such that no official in the hospital would be allowed to carry on his duties if it were found that these statements had been made. This official states emphatically and positively that it is not correct.

May I say that this officer has some knowledge of French, and my information is that when suitable opportunity offers he speaks to the French patients in their own language. In the ward there are about 35 patients, 7 or 8 of whom are French, and one of the ward nurses is French as well. I may tell my hon. friend from Temiscouata —and this may be of interest to other hon. members—that the nurses and officials generally in this hospital have been encouraged to speak to the French patients in their own language, and it has been pointed out that it is their duty and to their advantage to do so. I may say further that last winter classes were held for the purpose of improving their knowledge of the French language. The hospital is fortunate in having as full time chaplain a French speaking Catholic clergyman, who was kind enough to conduct the classes during the winter. He states that these classes were well attended, and that much interest was taken in them. I make this last statement of my own personal knowledge, because I may say in a modest way that these changes were instituted at the suggestion of the minister himself.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons.

He said: I desire to inform hon. members that an agreement has been arrived at with regard to the redistribution of seats in the province of Ontario, and with the agreements that were arrived at with regard to the other provinces through the efforts of the special committee, there remain only a small number of seats in the province of Quebec, I cannot say how many in the province of Saskatchewan, and possibly one in the province of Alberta. I would suggest that the house proceed in committee to dispose of the bill with the exception of section 3, which would enable the whole matter to be discussed further at large after the schedules had been settled. We should thereby be enabled to adopt the schedules in Ontario and in the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia, which has now been agreed upon; and Alberta, I fancy, cannot take very long; the whole of Manitoba and a number of seats in Quebec regarding which there is no contest, besides some at least of the seats in the province of Saskatchewan, leaving the matter in such a position that the whole question could be reconsidered and rediscussed under section 3. Section 3 would stand while we discussed the schedules.

That I think would conduce to the disposition of this matter which is now in the fourth day of discussion, which discussion has not been directed, except incidentally, to specific instances of constituencies mentioned in the schedules.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Replying to the right hon. the Prime Minister, I can assure him that I am as anxious as he is, and hon. gentlemen on this side are as anxious as hon. gentlemen opposite, to conclude the discussion on this measure. I would point out, however, that what the right hon. gentleman now suggests would very materially handicap some of us who are anxious that the house in its entirety should know the position we are contending for and should have it as fully discussed as possible.

I need not point out to my right hon. friend how many members are already absent from the chamber. It is not surprising that, having been here for over seven and a half months, if we include the two months of recess, members should be anxious to get away to their homes as quickly as possible. What has happened up to the present time is that as members have felt assured that their own constituencies were safe they have for the most part left the House of Commons and returned home. What the Prime Minister suggests now is that we should continue the process of eliminating members from the house—I do not say he suggests this in so many words, but that would be the effect of his proposal. The result would be that when we come to discuss the really contentious part of the measure there would be but a handful of members left in the house.

I do not think it is fair to follow that course; I do not think that in the long run it would make for justice. If what we are seeking in this matter is fair play, I think we can reach a conclusion quite as expeditiously by following the regular course with respect to this measure as by adopting any exceptional method at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: I can only say that the thought suggested by the right hon. gentleman had not even entered my mind. I would say, however, that in committee of the whole house it has always been the rule, and as a matter of fact I think the chairman would be within his rights if he endeavoured to do so, to confine the debate to specific matters; and section 3, as was pointed out by the former Minister of Justice, would be the appropriate section on which a general discussion could take place, because section 3 provides:

> The said provinces and territory respectively shall, for the purposes of the election of members to serve in the House of Commons, be divided into electoral districts, and be represented as provided in the schedule to this act.

We were proposing to adopt a plan that was not very acceptable to the government of the day in 1924, that is, to take the schedule constituency by constituency and province by province, commencing with the province of Ontario, and if it were desired that instead of proceeding with the next province after Ontario we should take some other the convenience of the house would be considered. I still think that is the correct and proper course to pursue in view of the fact that as regards all the provinces but two there is substantial agreement, and with respect to at least ninety per cent of these two there is also such agreement. So that it leaves a very small number, around which discussion could centre. However, if the right hon. gentleman takes the view that this would not be conducive to the further exposition of the views of hon. members I will do no more than direct attention to the suggestion, because that is all it is, that we should proceed to consider the schedules and pass those that have been agreed upon. If I adopted my right hon. friend's argument all I would say is that if it were pursued to its logical conclusion the only members that would remain in the house would be those from Quebec and Saskatchewan. That is what it would lead to logically.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What the prime Minister has suggested would mean that by taking up the schedules before taking up section 3—

Mr. BENNETT: Section 3 would stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —we should be confined to a discussion of one schedule at a time, which would prevent our discussing the entire province to which that particular section might refer.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): May I point out to the Prime Minister that there is no need to discuss section 3 at all—

Mr. BENNETT: Quite so.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): —if you settle all the provincial seats that are in agreement. If you did that, certainly section 3 would not be discussed so far as they are concerned, so that it would apply only to those in dispute. That being the case, of course the house would empty out. I would go home myself if I felt that matters were settled in that way. It is therefore quite natural to presuppose that only those members interested would remain.

Mr. BENNETT: The motion is that the Speaker do now leave the chair.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Stirling in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On Tuesday afternoon the Prime Minister spoke at some length with reference to the measure which is before us. I did not follow him at that time because the discussion had begun to centre round the province of Quebec and I was anxious not to interrupt it. For that reason also I made no further reply to the Prime Minister's remarks yesterday. I think however it is advisable that I should not delay beyond this afternoon in touching upon some of the matters which were referred to by my right hon. friend in the course of his speech.

One subject mentioned by the Prime Minister had relation to the representative character of parliament as effected by previous redistributions. The significant paragraph in that connection is one which appears at page 5339 of Hansard. I will read the paragraph in full and then comment upon it very briefly. The right hon. gentleman said:

> Let us pause for a moment, endeavouring if possible to be perfectly fair in this matter, and look at the position of the parties in this house, bearing in mind the conditions which existed in the province of Quebec. Let us for a moment look at what the position was in 1921. There were elected to this house from the province of Quebec sixty-five Liberals—see page 316 of the Parliamentary Guide—Conservatives none. So it would appear that when the redistribution was made the Conservative party was without representation in this chamber from the province of Quebec. Behold the result. In the succeeding election, notwithstanding the fact that the Conservative party polled between forty per cent and forty-five per cent of the entire votes, they did not elect any candidates. I ask this committee if that, in itself, does not give cause for thought. I am endeavouring to be as fair as a man can who has had some little legal training, and I shall stick to a recital of the facts.

Mr. BENNETT: I said between forty and forty-one; I did not say forty-five. I notice that that should be French speaking representatives.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The right hon. gentleman continues:

> Will any judge say that the fact I have recited would not, in itself, give cause for thought? Does it not cause every thoughtful man in this house just to ponder a moment on the situation?

The impression I got at the time the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) was speaking, and I think the impression left on the committee, as well as the impression likely to be conveyed to anyone reading this paragraph, was that as a result of the Liberal redistribution the province of Quebec had been left without any representatives in the House of Commons. While the paragraph does not say so in so many words, the manner in which the presentation was made would leave the inference that it was the redistribution made by the Liberal party in 1924 to which reference was made. The Prime Minister says that he is anxious to give the facts; let me give some. The fact is that the election of 1921 was fought on the redistribution made in 1914 by Sir Robert Borden. My right hon. friend, the Prime Minister, was a member of the committee that initialed the agreement which was come to at that time. In other words, if there was any injustice in the province of Quebec during the 1921 elections because of redistribution, it was the government of Sir Robert Borden and my right hon. friend who was a member of the redistribution committee who were responsible for the injustice.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no allegation that there was unfairness in 1914.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let us go a step further. The Prime Minister said:

> In the succeeding election,—

That was the election of 1925.

> —notwithstanding the fact that the Conservative party polled between forty per cent and forty-five per cent of the entire votes, they did not elect any candidates.

As a matter of fact they elected four candidates at that election.

Mr. BENNETT: French speaking candidates.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Prime Minister now says that he was referring to French speaking candidates. I am quite prepared to accept his correction but it does not appear on the record of his original statement. They did elect four candidates in the election of 1925 and they elected twenty-four in the election of 1930. Any candidates elected in 1930 were elected under the redistribution measure framed by the Liberal administration. The inference which the Prime Minister sought to draw from these two redistribution measures has not been borne out by the facts as to what took place under them. The truth of the matter is that the returns in these various elections bear out what has been said so frequently in the course of the present debate, that the issues at a general election are apt to be more important than the alteration of a redistribution map, all important as that may be, it being the basis upon which representation is obtained in this House of Commons. In 1921 the government of the day was just as unpopular as the present government is at this time, and the results disclosed the extent of the unpopularity of the administration. There were issues which came up in subsequent elections which helped to account for the changes which have since taken place but the fact is that so far as any inference is to be drawn from a redistribution measure under which the province of Quebec received no representation in this House of Commons must be drawn from the redistribution measure framed by the Conservative party itself, and by a committee of this house of which the present Prime Minister was a member.

I think it is important to do just what the Prime Minister has suggested should be done, pause for a moment and consider the significance of the facts. The Prime Minister says:

> I ask this committee if that, in itself, does not give cause for thought.

That is to say, that an entire province should have no representation in this house of one of its leading political parties. The Prime Minister might have added that in the general election of 1921, the Conservative party did not elect a single member in six out of the nine provinces in the dominion.

> I am endeavouring to be as fair as a man can who has had some little legal training, and I shall stick to a recital of the facts. Will any judge say that the fact I have recited would not, in itself, give cause for thought? Does it not cause every thoughtful man in this house just to ponder a moment on the situation?

With the Prime Minister's desire to pause for a moment and give thought I am in complete accord. Having given a good deal of thought to the matter I am more than ever convinced that the fact that a political party of an entire province should remain unrepresented in a parliament following an election indicates that there is something fundamentally wrong with the system under which our elections take place. It is not

merely redistribution; it goes deeper than that; it has to do with the method of electing members from single member constituencies. I venture to say that if there ever was a strong and unanswerable argument for the need of adequate provision for minority representation in parliament it will be found in what has occurred under the various redistributions which have taken place whereby in some cases certain provinces were without any Conservative representation and in other cases, certain provinces and large cities were without any Liberal representation. I believe that the only true method of securing a representative parliament is by a system of proportional representation properly worked out with regard to the dominion as a whole. The reform should commence with the cities and the larger municipalities in our country. When the Liberal government was in office we introduced into this house a measure of proportional representation in connection with city constituencies. It was fought for some little time, there was considerable opposition from the then opposition and the measure was not proceeded with. It was not re-introduced because the government of the day had not a majority in the other chamber which would ensure its enactment, and there were more pressing matters requiring attention. I might add the late Liberal government did not have a majority in the Senate all the time it was in office. If we had had a majority in the other house upon which we could have relied, we would have proceeded with our proportional representation measure. If we are ever returned to power a proportional representation measure will be a feature of the Liberal platform and program of legislation.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Will you do away with the Senate then?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), who has just interrupted, has a constituency containing about 70,000. He ought to be content with that and not interrupt.

Mr. CHAPLIN: You would not correct that in 1924.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to be drawn into replying to a lot of interruptions. I am anxious to present this matter, which I think is one of the most important with which parliament has had to deal, in as impartial a way as I possibly can.

Having stated what I believe to be the really important consideration, namely, the manner in which the representative character of parliament itself can best be brought about, namely by a measure of proportional representation rather than through the single member constituency plan which has existed up to the present time, may I now proceed to say a word with regard to the next point referred to by the Prime Minister and with respect to which I am inclined to think that neither he nor I greatly differ in opinion. The Prime Minister has referred to the trend of population from the rural to the urban centres. I do not know whether my right hon. friend will agree with me when I say that it is unfortunate that in a country with vast agricultural resources and other vast natural resources the urban population should come to exceed the rural. I think it is a trend in the wrong direction and I believe that greater prosperity and contentment on the part of the people as a whole will be found when they can be profitably employed in larger numbers on the land and amid the other vast resources of the dominion rather than becoming overcrowded in the urban centres. For that reason I believe that in this country policies which have to do with the shaping of our national development should be so fashioned as continually to keep in mind the effect which they are going to have upon the general trend of population. The fact that the urban population in Canada is to-day larger than the rural, notwithstanding the vast size of this country, is the strongest evidence that our industrial policies have been wrong; that the policy of protection has had the effect of bringing people into the cities, over-industrializing the manufacturing side of our country and as a consequence helping to deplete the rural sections.

I believe whatever difference of view there may be as to what I have just said as respects the wisdom and justice of giving the rural communities a larger unit of representation than is given to the cities, there cannot be a doubt in the mind of anyone who really for a moment considers the effect of the basis of representation in this parliament. Different arguments have been advanced why the unit of representation should be larger in the cities. One reason given is that in the urban centres so large a number of voters do not turn out to vote as is the case in the rural parts. I do not know that that argument appeals particularly to me; I have never cited it in giving the reasons why the unit of representation in urban centres should be larger, but it may nevertheless be a good reason. One reason, however, is is found in the fact that parliament exists for giving expression to the popular will, not necessarily to numbers of persons merely, but

to the prevailing opinion. I wish to submit that with respect to the opinion of urban communities there are a thousand and one voices which are brought to bear upon this parliament in its decisions and acts as compared with one voice which comes from a rural constituency. There is first of all the voice of the press. There is no other factor that plays so large and powerful a part in determining opinion in the country as the press, and particularly the daily press. There is no daily press in the rural parts; such press as there is in the rural parts is weekly, semi-weekly, by-weekly or monthly. But the daily press comes from the urban and particularly the large urban centres. May I point out another feature; the city papers are read in the rural parts and influence thought there, but the rural papers are not read to any extent in the urban centres. So you have urban opinion constantly making itself felt to a degree that is not at all possible so far as rural opinion is concerned.

In addition to that, there are a hundred and one agencies that exist in the cities for the purpose of influencing and organizing public opinion, and some of them for bringing their vews immediately before parliament. These are organizations of a character that are found only spasmodically in the rural parts. Take, for instance, the chambers of commerce, the boards of trade, the great social service organizations and the like; all of these are continually, by resolutions, meetings and in other ways, helping to formulate and to voice public opinion and to make that opinion find its echo in the House of Commons. There again the influence of the urban centres on opinion and thought in parliament is a hundredfold greater than is that of any corresponding number of persons, in the rural parts. There is also this further factor: it is not uncommon in this parliament to find on both sides of the house hon. members representing rural constituencies though they themselves come from and their business associations are entirely with, urban communities. You find many a member of parliament coming from a city who is a representative of a rural constituency, but you do not find except in a few rare instances one who is resident of a rural community representing an urban constituency. Therefore, if we take only these factors into consideration —and they are but a limited number—there is every reason that a much larger unit should be assigned to the urban than to the rural centres.

I have not mentioned another factor that is coming to play a very important part, and that is the radio. Radio broadcasting stations are all located in urban centres. There is no head office of a radio broadcast in the rural parts of the country, and those who are using the radio for broadcasting purposes are for the most part people whose interests and associations are entirely with the urban centres. These are all factors that are increasing materially in importance and influence and they must be taken into account with respect to a redistribution measure. So I say that a redistribution measure which assigns to a city a considerably larger unit than that assigned to a rural constituency is tending wholly in the right direction, and where that rule is not recognized, the redistribution cannot possibly be fair as representing public opinion.

Mention has been made of the island of Montreal as having the equivalent of almost half of the entire population of the province of Quebec. One might add to what I have already said the fact that Montreal, the largest city in Canada, is the nearest to this capital of any centre of importance in the whole of the dominion. The influence of Montreal as we all know—we have only to walk into the corridors in the evening to see it—is exerted day after day by gentlemen coming here from that city to have interviews with the Prime Minister and other members of the government, but those who come from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba, or from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, have to consider ways and means to a large extent before they can venture on a journey to the seat of government in order to make their views personally known to the ministry of the day. In these circumstances it is not fair, where the endeavour is to secure the expression of all shades of opinion, minority as well as majority opinion, that the island of Montreal should be accorded a unit of representation at all comparable with that which is given to the rural portions of the country.

I come now to the next remark of my right hon. friend which had to do with the method of arranging redistribution by a joint committee. The Prime Minister has given his views as to what, where their are alternative courses, should govern such a committee in its endeavour to reach a decision. Let me quote his words as reported on page 5341 of Hansard. He said:

> But knowing human nature as I do and knowing the instincts that govern men with respect to political matters I do say that I am perfectly clear that when there was a favour

possible by doing a thing in one of two ways, with either way just and proper, they would choose that method which gave the greatest benefit to themselves and their friends.

A little further on:

Undoubtedly where two courses were open our friends chose the course that was more helpful to them.

And further:

Is it not fair to say that hon. gentlemen opposite must recognize that fact, and to recognize the further fact that when a choice has to be made in one of two given ways you must expect that choice to be made in the way that will be most advantageous to the party in power.

I believe the Prime Minister in those remarks did not intend to convey that he was seeking in this redistribution measure, to see that the government got the advantage in every case. His language is guarded, but as one reads what is asserted there it is impossible to do other than believe that in the view of the Prime Minister, whatever government is in office, when a redistribution is being arranged, if there are two courses open then the course that is likely to give an advantage to the government of the day is the one to be taken.

Mr. BENNETT: Both parties being equally right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I notice what was said in that connection, but in matters of justice there cannot be two courses one of which gives an advantage, and both be equally right or just. There can be only one course. That is the essential feature of agreement; the feature we are seeking at the moment; agreement comes instantly the moment it is recognized by both sides that a certain course is right and just. As long as there is ground for debate between two courses, if the two sides cannot decide between themselves, it becomes necessary to call in an umpire to decide upon the fair and just course. It does not do to say that we have argued the matter up to this point and that we cannot agree and therefore we are going to give to the government the advantage of the position that it wishes to take. I do say I am afraid that the view expressed by the Prime Minister has prevailed to a very considerable extent in this redistribution. I will be perfectly frank and try to be as fair as my right hon. friend says he wishes to be and will say that in previous redistributions an element of the same kind has undoubtedly crept in with respect to some decisions. That brings up the whole question of our present method of settling the redistribution of boundaries of constituencies. It comes down, apart from the superior power which a majority possesses, very much to a matter of endurance, and physical endurance at that, a question as to which side can hold out the longest for a particular contention that is likely to be to its benefit.

I am going to show in a moment that when the redistribution of 1923 was made, I laid down, as the Prime Minister of the day, what I regarded as the view that should be taken as the basis of all decisions. Certainly it was in quite a different direction from that which has been taken by my right hon. friend, and from what he has said in the passages I have quoted.

But before coming to that, I wish to say that I think we might well consider whether the present is not the time for some statement to be made of considerations of which account should be taken in future redistributions. I do not wish to make this matter contentious by saying that this and that thing has been done at the moment, but no one can have been in this House of Commons within the last month or two, and especially within the last week, without knowing that those who have had to do with the arrangement of the redistribution map have been beset on every side by members of the house, no matter on which side of the house they are, wanting to make perfectly sure that their particular seats are going to be safe for them if at all possible, that in some way the map shall be arranged so that those now in the house shall come back again, whether they are on one side or the other. I say that that is not playing fair with the people of Canada as a whole. The constituencies of Canada do not belong to the members of this present House of Commons. They belong to the people at large, and the task of those who have to do with a redistribution map is not to see that those who are at present in the House of Commons shall be made perfectly sure of coming back again but rather that whoever does come back will come back with the knowledge that so far as the people themselves are concerned he is coming here as a result of a fair and just redistribution in a capacity truly representative.

Allied to what I have been saying is the theory—I might call it the practice advocated —of the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) with respect to what should govern in arranging a redistribution map. As I listened to the Solicitor General, what I understood him to say was this: There are some Liberal seats that as matters stand, are very strongly Liberal and we have made them even more strongly Liberal. On the other hand, there are some

Conservative seats none too strong, and we have made them a little stronger, and therefore we think we have been just to both sides.

What does this mean, Mr. Chairman? It simply means, if that has been the guiding principle governing the committee, that the parties who have been on it have been trying to dig in for themselves and others regardless altogether of the effect the redistribution is going to have on the complexion of the next parliament. Any principle of that kind is wrong and should not be countenanced. If that kind of thing is going to be thought of, I think that this house should give expression of its views upon it. We cannot do so now, but those of us who are here to-day may well leave on record our views as to what should govern ten years hence when another period of redistribution will come around. I shall avoid saying anything that may be referred to the present or to what may be done now. But in the light of what we have seen and heard in this house within the last month something ought to be said.

My own view, and I have come to it after observing pretty carefully what has been taking place and what has been said in debate in this house as well as in the corridors, is that redistribution should be taken out of the hands of the House of Commons, where the parties are immediately interested, and should be put into the hands of a commission of judges. I would have that commission composed of judges selected in equal numbers by both sides of the house. The redistribution, if it is carried out in a fair way has not to do with party advantage at all. It ought to have soley to do with seeking to effect a fair and impartial division of the constituencies, and if three judges were named from one side of the house and three from the other, and if the choice were made, if you will, from among those who have been in politics and who therefore may be presumed to know something about conditions generally as they exist throughout the country, I think a redistribution which would be regarded as fair might be arrived at. Probably it would not be perfect, and any report which the commission made would have to be submitted to parliament and made subject to discussion and debate in parliament. But I do think that something of that kind would serve to bring about a much fairer result. May I say that if the choice were made in the manner indicated the judges in my opinion ought to be chosen from different parts of Canada. The result would be that in the matters that came before them, there would always be a majority of the commission of judges from outside of the particular province whose affairs might be under consideration by the commission at the time a decision was to be made. It is impossible to get perfection in anything, but I do submit that part of the duty of every member of this house is to consider not only the problems of his own day, but as well the future of his country. I hesitate to think of the complexion of this house as it may be ten years hence. Looking back on the past ten years, the changes that have taken place in that period have been very many. I imagine that the greater part of those of us who are now here will before the time for another redistribution comes have, so far as continuing as representatives in this House of Commons is concerned, passed beyond its bounds. In the circumstances I think it a duty that those of us who have views as to what we believe would most be in the interests of our country should assert our views and leave them of record, that they may be there to guide future parliaments in so far as their members may wish to be governed by them.

May I now come to the point that I mentioned a moment ago, and this brings up a matter which was a subject of discussion earlier in the week. I said that at the time of the last redistribution in 1924 my attention had been drawn to the fact that the members of the joint committee were finding it difficult to agree because amongst other things no agreement could be come to with regard to the constituency of North York, a constituency which I was representing in the house at that time, when I was also holding the office of Prime Minister; that in reply to my inquiry as to what the committee thought should be done, I had been told they wished to add the townships of Markham and Vaughan in the county of York to the then existing riding, and that I had said that if that were the view of the committee, if they thought it was just, if it would serve to bring confidence generally, by all means that that should be done. At the time I made that statement I said that I believed that the result would be prejudicial to myself but that I did not intend as Prime Minister to take advantage of my position to seek to make secure the riding I then represented at the expense of any others.

My statement as to the result having proved prejudicial to my chances of election has been challenged.

The present hon. member for North York (Mr. Lennox), speaking in the debate of that day, made the following statement:

If it had not been for the assistance he received—

That is to say, which I received—

—from the new municipalities which were added, instead of having a majority of 494, I would have had a majority in the old constituency of 681.

Then, later, the Prime Minister, following what had been stated by the hon. member for North York, added these words:

—just as the right hon. gentleman had with respect to his position in North York. It turns out as a matter of fact that had it not been for the two townships that were added by the redistribution of 1924 he—

Myself.

—would have been beaten by a much larger majority than he was.

Then the Prime Minister added, characteristically.

I am not for a moment asserting that he made the misstatement deliberately. It is just one of those accidents that sometimes happens to one's memory, and I merely correct the misstatement in order that the record may be historically correct.

The historically correct record will be found in the report of the chief electoral officer for the fifteenth general election, 1925. I have that report in my hand, and I would refer hon. members to pages 179 and 180 in which the total ballots cast are recorded. They are recorded under the headings "Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King" and "Thomas Herbert Lennox." I shall read to the committee the figures as therein set forth, as respects all of the parts added by the redistribution of 1924. I shall read the figures as they go down the list in this book. Markham township gave me a majority of 71; Vaughan township gave Mr. Lennox a majority of 282; Woodbridge village gave Mr. Lennox a majority of 167; Richmond Hill village gave Mr. Lennox a majority of 58; Markham village gave me a majority of 16. These are all of the localities and communities included in the addition made by the redistribution of 1924.

What do they show? They show that of the total number of votes cast in two subdivisions I received a majority of 87, and in the three remaining subdivisions Mr. Lennox received a majority of 507. Subtracting the 87 from the 507, the majority for Mr. Lennox in the new part taken in in 1924 was 420. The hon. member is in his seat, and if I am making a misstatement I ask him to correct me.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Those are the facts. Out of that newly added part the hon. member received a majority of 420 votes. And I am not surprised that he received a majority, in the light of the knowledge which was before the committee at the time redistribution was under consideration. How did the probable results appear from the information which the committee had before it when they were preparing the redistribution bill? The latest figures were those of the general election of 1921. In that election there were three candidates in South York and in West York in which the constituencies of Markham and Vaughan were then situated. These were in parts of those constituencies which in 1924 were taken into North York. I shall place on record just what majorities were given to Liberal, Conservative and farmer candidates, respectively, in the election of 1921. May I say in a word that while there were three candidates running in South and West York, that is, in the parts to which I have referred, in every case except one where the majority was 3, the majority was against the Liberal candidate. Markham township in South York, gave a majority of 595 against the Liberal. Markham village in South York gave a majority of 3 for the Liberal candidate. Richmond Hill gave a majority of 86 against the Liberal; Woodbridge, in West York, gave a majority of 109 against the Liberal; Vaughan, in West York, gave a majority of 939 against the Liberal. In other words, in these parts which were added in 1924 to North York, in the election of 1921 a majority of 1,726 was rolled up against the Liberal candidate in that election.

Mr. BENNETT: Does that include the votes for both other candidates?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I referred to the three candidates. Those were the figures which the committee dealing with redistribution had before it in 1924. I have shown the results after 1924, namely that these new parts gave the present Conservative member a majority of 420. I did say that I had carried the old constituency of North York. It may appear that in that statement I was not wholly correct, but I shall point out to the house just exactly what I meant. I should perhaps have specially mentioned the persons who came up from Toronto to vote in North York, but who were not, in any sense of the word, electors in the old North York constituency.

May I point out that the majority of the hon. member for North York was 494. That would mean that in the old riding of North York the hon. member received apparently a majority of 74, having received 420 in the

added parts. As I have said, those 74 votes are more than accounted for by persons who came from the city of Toronto to vote in North York constituency. My hon. friend cannot deny that. I believe he has said that that was not the year in which they came up, but I say to him it was the year in which they came up and in which they came in large numbers. What took place was this: Many hon. members who are familiar with Toronto and the parts adjoining know that a large number of Toronto citizens, persons whose names appear on the voters' lists in Toronto, have summer residences in certain parts of North York constituency. The election in 1925 was held on October 29 of that year. The writs were issued on September 5, and according to the act as it stood at that time, although it was never contemplated in the minds of hon. members that anything of the kind should take place, those persons who had been in the constituency for a period of two months prior to the issue of the writ, and had been in the country for a year, were permitted to vote in that constituency. As I say, the persons who were in North York as summer residents only were not intended to be as hon. members in this house will understand, in any sense electors in the constituency of North York. They were voting municipally in Toronto; they were voting in general elections in Toronto—

Mr. HEAPS: Did they have two votes?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that many of them did vote twice—I do not think there is any doubt about it—voted in North York and Toronto as well. I know one person who told me he did. The point I make is that it was never intended by any parliament of Canada that persons on the voters' lists in the city of Toronto should exercise their franchise in a rural constituency. So much was that condition of affairs regarded as an outrage at the time, that I stated that if a Liberal administration was ever in power again we would see that before a general election took place the intention of parliament, as it undoubtedly had been understood, would be carried out to the letter.

Hon. members will recall that immediately after the election in 1925 there was no opportunity for the then Liberal administration to deal with the Dominion Elections Act. The government headed by the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen came into office for a short time in 1926, and conducted the general election of that year. Again summer residents voted in North York. A Liberal administration again came into power and before the election of 1930 the Dominion Elections Act was amended by this House of Commons, to meet the situation I have just referred to. The amendment reads as follows:

> No person shall, for the purpose of this act, be deemed to be resident at the date of the issue of the writ in quarters or premises which are ordinarily occupied only during some or all of the months of May to October, inclusive, and ordinarily remain unoccupied during some or all of the months of November to April, inclusive, unless—
>
> (a) he is occupying such quarters in the course of and in the pursuit of his ordinary gainful occupation; or
>
> (b) he has no quarters in any other electoral district to which, at the date of the issue of the writ, he might at will remove.

I am sure that was always the intention of parliament with regard to what should govern with respect to the franchise. So I repeat that what I said the other day is correct, that the constituency of North York as it was in December of 1921, when electors from Toronto could not go to summer residences there, was the constituency that returned me, and had only the residents of North York voted in the next election I certainly would have had a majority in my old constituency.

Now I should like to point out what the Prime Minister is reported as having said at page 5342 of Hansard:

> Undoubtedly where two courses were open our friends chose the course that was more helpful to them.
>
> Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.
>
> Mr. Bennett: Of course, just as in 1924 the course chosen was the one more favourable to the party then in power.

I say to the Prime Minister that the course followed in 1924, so far as I had anything to do with it, was one by which it was sought to be eminently fair and just to all parties in this house—

Mr. MANION: Not in Ontario.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —and with regard to my own constituency of North York, to which I have just referred, the irrebuttable evidence is that the course pursued was decidedly to my own disadvantage.

Now let me pass on to Prince Albert. For reasons best known to himself the Prime Minister seemed to take some exception to the fact that in my reference to Prince Albert I said that it had elected Sir Wilfrid Laurier and that it had a certain Liberal tradition. I imagine the Prime Minister spent a good part of the dinner hour in an endeavour to see what he could discover that might help appear to refute that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: You are mistaken there.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps just part of the dinner hour.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I knew it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend knew it from memory, then. I am surprised that, remembering so much, my right hon. friend did not remember that the people of Prince Albert, whom he has visited at different times, take to this day a great pride in the fact that they helped elect Sir Wilfrid Laurier as their representative. As hon. members well know, at the time Sir Wilfrid was elected the western constituency was much larger than it is to-day. In the contest of 1896, Sir Wilfrid Laurier ran for two constituencies, Quebec East and Saskatchewan. At that time the constituency of Saskatchewan included what is now Prince Albert, and the people of Prince Albert, as I think I can show in a moment, gave a majority to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In that sense—and it was in that sense I meant it—I said the riding had an association with Sir Wilfrid Laurier and that he had been elected in Prince Albert, just as my hon. friend said the other day that when he was first returned to parliament he represented the whole of Alberta.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I was defeated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend ran for the whole of Alberta; I am sorry I did not hear him say he was defeated. At any rate I do not assume that my hon. friend will deny that if Calgary was a part of the constituency of Alberta at that time, which I assume it was, he was a candidate in Calgary.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I was a candidate in the constituency of Alberta.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did Calgary have separate representation?

Mr. BENNETT: No, Edmonton, Calgary, Macleod and Wetaskiwin were all part of the constituency; Battleford was part of it also, when it was the capital of the old Northwest Territories.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then my right hon. friend would be quite correct if he said to-day that he had been a candidate in Calgary at that particular election. It was a larger constituency, but it included Calgary.

Mr. BENNETT: There was no constituency of Calgary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, the constituency of Alberta included Calgary, and if my hon. friend had been elected in Calgary —I do not know whether or not he was—I should think he would be very proud to mention that fact to-day and would not deny it. The Prime Minister sought to give particular emphasis to what he was saying by citing the Parliamentary Guide, but let us cite what the Parliamentary Guide indicates with regard to the question whether or not Prince Albert was represented by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and has a certain Liberal tradition. The constituency of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, is referred to at page 278 of the Parliamentary Guide, and in that connection there is this footnote:

> See Assiniboia, and particularly the reference under that head to the old electoral division of Saskatchewan.

Mr. BENNETT: I read that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, my right hon. friend read it, but he did not place on it the construction that I think should be placed there. Now if we turn to page 218 of the Parliamentary Guide, we find:

Saskatchewan
Record General Elections

1887—D. A. Macdowall, C..	166
1891—Macdowall, C..	283
1896—Hon. W. Laurier, L..	44

So the Parliamentary Guide itself links up the constituency of Prince Albert with the old constituency of Saskatchewan, for which Sir Wilfrid Laurier was returned by a majority of 44. I admit that the whole matter is a very, very small one, but I know also that Sir Wilfrid Laurier took a great pride in the fact that he had been elected to parliament in that particular part of Canada, and I do not see why my right hon. friend should want to have it appear that he did not represent the constituency which is now called Prince Albert. May I give these further figures, which place the whole matter beyond shadow of doubt. If we take the report of the eighth general election, 1896, at pages 316 and 317, we find recorded there the exact vote that was polled in the subdivisions of Prince Albert East and Prince Albert West, as follows:

	William Craig	Hon. W. Laurier	James McKay
Prince Albert, East.	10	143	102
Prince Albert, West.	7	68	90
	17	211	192

The majority for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in the combined subdivisions of Prince Albert East and Prince Albert West, was 19 over Mr. McKay and 194 over Mr. Craig. That is the parliamentary record with regard to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's election in Prince Albert.

As to whether or not I was justified in saying the constituency had a certain Liberal tradition, let me cite exactly what appears in

the Parliamentary Guide in addition to what I have already read. The first member returned in 1908 was A. W. Rutan, a Liberal, with a majority of 129. In 1911 James McKay, a Conservative, was returned with a majority of 355. In 1917 Andrew Knox, a government candidate, received a majority of 3,590. Everyone knows that Andrew Knox was a Liberal who supported the Union government; later he became a Progressive, but he never at any time sat on the Conservative side of any legislative body. In 1921 Mr. Knox was again returned, this time as a Progressive, with a majority of 3,578, but he was a Liberal-Progressive, and in 1925 Mr. Charles McDonald, a Liberal, was returned with a majority of 2,663. In 1926 I was elected with a majority of 4,095, and in 1930 again, the majority being 1,192. I need not refer to the by-elections; there were three of them. But that is the record of the constituency. There was one Conservative returned in 1911 and the Prime Minister says he sat here for so many years in parliament. It was the only one election in Prince Albert that had returned a Conservative. I must apologize for having taken even the time I have on this matter which is wholly incidental, but since the Prime Minister felt it necessary to endeavour to throw doubt on my veracity in relation thereto I thought I should place on record the precise facts.

Having begun to speak of the constituency of Prince Albert, perhaps I might say a word or two with regard to some of the things that have been said in the course of this debate with reference to my connection with the constituency. The Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Weir), seemed to regard it as necessary to make a particular attack upon me—a characteristically nasty attack; but everyone has his own style and method, and I cannot take exception to that. At page 5280 of Hansard will be found some of the statements that were made by the hon. member for Melfort, the present Minister of Agriculture. The first point he thought it necessary to dwell upon was the fact that I had, as he said, moved about considerably during the past few years. He has repeatedly said, in Prince Albert and elsewhere throughout the country, as many hon. gentlemen on the other side have said, that no constituency would keep me as its member very long—that I have had to move on from one place to another. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is quite true that I have represented a number of different constituencies. I have fought a good many political battles and have won a considerable number and lost a considerable number; but let me say that I am just as proud of the battles I lost as I am of those I won. I have the satisfaction of knowing that in the battles which I lost I stood for principles which I find hon. gentlemen opposite supporting to-day, principles which however they were denouncing at the time of those campaigns.

Let me give the hon. member for Melfort a statement of the reasons why I may have moved from one part of the country to another, a statement which I believe will appeal to hon. gentlemen in this house as being of a character such as I may well afford to regard with a certain degree of pride. I have not sought at any time to get into this House of Commons by an easy road, or on any occasion to shirk a fight. On the contrary, when I have run for parliament, in the major battles I have fought, I have chosen to contest a Conservative constituency; as hon. gentlemen well know, it frequently happens that a constituency won from the opposite party not infrequently swings back at a subsequent election. There were, however, reasons apart from this which, where I lost, readily explain what took place.

I entered parliament in the year 1908. At that time I was holding the position of Deputy Minister of Labour which I had held for eight years in the civil service of this country; a life position, if I had cared to have it such. I gave up that position to contest North Waterloo, which had been Conservative since 1896. It was the county in which I was born and had lived as a boy. In 1896 North Waterloo returned a Conservative, and hon. gentlemen opposite will remember who represented that constituency for so long a time—the late Mr. Joseph Seagram, who I think they will agree was no indifferent candidate to contemplate opposing. In 1900 Mr. Seagram was elected by acclamation and in 1904 he was returned by a majority of 306. When in 1908 I ran in that constituency I was tackling a constituency that had come to be regarded as strongly Conservative, and I won that constituency by a majority of 263. In 1911, at which time I was a minister in the cabinet of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I was defeated in North Waterloo as the result of the reciprocity campaign. I was standing at that time with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, loyally fighting for wider markets in the great country to the south. I am glad I was privileged to put up that fight. I do not have to change my coat to-day when I continue to fight for reciprocity. The right hon. the present Prime Minister appeared in all parts of the country denouncing reciprocity at that time. Well, I would much rather have gone down to defeat supporting my leader on

principles which I believed were right and sound, and which it so happens are being advocated in all parts of the country to-day, than to have won the seat by opposing those principles, the very principles which my right hon. friend opposite opposed at that time but which I understand he is supporting or supposed to be supporting to-day.

Having been defeated in that campaign I was out of parliament for a time. The next general elections came on in 1917. In 1917 we had the Union government in office, as hon. members will recall, and I believed then, as I believed in 1911, that in opposing conscription Sir Wilfrid Laurier was right in the position he took. Having been invited, I chose to run in North York in 1917.

Mr. LENNOX: In the reciprocity election Armstrong, the first Tory member, was elected by only 59.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In 1917 I ran in North York which, in the preceding election of 1911, had returned a Conservative and which was a Conservative constituency at the time. Not only was it Conservative at the time but, as hon. gentlemen know, the government of Sir Robert Borden, which had been formed to carry through the conscription measure, had supporting it a large number of Liberals as well as Conservatives. I knew there was very little chance, no chance in fact, of succeeding in North York when I accepted the nomination, but I believed it was a battle that should be fought, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier should have at his side from Ontario men who felt and believed as he did, whether it meant defeat or success. I decided to stand by him and to fight for him, and I am glad I did so. And may I add this further fact, that if there was any doubt at all regarding the position I was in when I fought in North York in 1917 it would have been removed—

Mr. SPOTTON: Such a hero should get an iron cross.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hear the insulting remark of the hon. member. It is no surprise coming from him.

Mr. SPOTTON: Just a remark.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say that in 1917, when I ran in North York, I was told by more than one of those in the confidence of the Union government, that there was no use contesting that riding seeing that there were sufficient votes allotted to North York, out of the ballots of the soldiers overseas, to make absolutely sure of the defeat of any candidate who might oppose the Union government. I was told moreover, by one of the leading members of the Liberal press, that members of the press of Ontario, at a meeting of a large number of representatives from both parties, had made up their minds that no one who opposed the Union government would receive support from the press should he ever seek to get back into public life. Those were two grounds urged upon me in 1917 by some of my Liberal friends as reasons why I should not run in North York constituency as a supporter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier if I had any regard for my future in the political life of the country. I give the statement concerning the press as made to me by one prominently connected with one of the largest papers in Canada. I give it in the words in which he gave it to me at the time. I know nothing of the facts myself. Parliament is also a place in which regardless of consequences, battles have to be fought which involve principles fundamental in the protection of individual rights and liberties, and a battle fought for the preservation of what one regards as right is infinitely better even if lost than a battle won in which no possible sacrifice is involved on the part of him who enters it. That was my first experience in North York. I was defeated there in 1917 and I am proud of that defeat.

An hon. MEMBER: We were too.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. gentleman says, "We were too." Well, I would much rather owe my position as head of my party to-day to the fact that I stood by my leader, even though it meant defeat; fighting for principles for which he stood, principles which have been vindicated a thousand times since, than to a victory or many victories gained in any other way.

In 1919, at the Liberal convention of that year, I was chosen to be the leader of my party. I had not at the time a seat in the House of Commons but there was a vacancy which had been occasioned by the death of the sitting member in Prince county, Prince Edward Island. The Liberals of that constituency invited me to run in the constituency of Prince, and by that means I was enabled to come back into the House of Commons to fulfil in parliament the duties of leader of my party and leader of the opposition in this House of Commons. I cannot help but contrast in my own mind the attitude taken by the Conservative party of that day with respect to that seat, with the attitude which hon. gentlemen opposite are taking to-day with respect to the seat I now hold in Prince Albert. When I

accepted the constituency of Prince, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, then Prime Minister, and his colleagues, together with the Conservative members of the constituency of Prince, agreed that there should be no contest, but that I should be allowed to reenter the House of Commons without opposition. I came in unopposed, and I am pleased to have this opportunity again to acknowledge in this House of Commons that act on the part of the then Prime Minister of Canada, and those who were then associated with him.

Prince constituency was considered at the time a very safe seat for a Liberal candidate. Being the leader of my party it was of some importance to the party that I should have a safe seat in order that I might be able to devote the time which a leader is supposed to devote to the country at large. When the general elections of 1921 came on, Liberals, not only of Prince but of other parts of Canada made repeated overtures to me to run again in Prince. I was told that there would be no doubt in the world about my re-election there, and it was urged I would be able to give my whole time without concern to speaking in other parts of the country. Did I accept that offer? I chose instead to run again in North York where I had been defeated in 1917, amongst other reasons to see whether or not the people of that constituency believed that I was right in the stand I took in 1917. I ran in North York and I carried the constituency by a very considerable majority, 1,055 in fact. That was not choosing the easy path to the House of Commons. It is true that in 1925 I was defeated in North York by the means I have shown to the committee to-day, and by other means of which the hon. member for North York to-day, and by other means of which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Lennox) no doubt could tell. I was defeated in 1925; but how much time may I ask had I to devote to the constituency of North York? I was during the entire campaign in the constituency but a part of a week. A leader has to choose between what is his duty to his party as a whole and his duty to his constituency, also between his duty to his constituency and what may be his own personal interests. Whenever the interests of my party have conflicted with anything else, I have stood or at least sought to stand by the interests of my party; whenever my personal interests appeared to run counter in any way to those of the constituency which I represented, I have sub-ordinated them or sought to subordinate them to the interests of the constituency. May I say that, in that particular election, had I been able, like my opponent, to spend my entire time in the constituency I think I would have given him a run which would have surprised him.

Mr. LENNOX: Why did not you stay there?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The reason I did not stay there was the one I have just given. I owed a duty to my party to speak in all parts of this country, and that duty had to be carried out whether or not it involved my personal defeat. May I tell the hon. member and hon. gentlemen opposite that in any future election with which I may have to do, I intend, whatever it may involve, to put the interests of my party as a whole before any personal interests.

Mr. LENNOX: Then you do not care about the country?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Someone says, "you do not care about the country?" My party is fighting for the best interests of this country, and when I speak of my party I speak particularly of the policies which it has supported and is supporting and which I believe are for the best interests of Canada. The people of Canada are coming to see pretty clearly that Liberal policies are in the best interests of this country.

Having been defeated in North York, in 1925, several hon. members in this house without any solicitation offered me their seats. Mr. Charles McDonald, who had been elected that year in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, was foremost among the number. He was insistent that the constituency he represented would welcome the Liberal leader and would be prepared to allow him a considerable amount of freedom at times of election to visit other parts of the country as well as to reside in Ottawa while carrying out his duties as leader of his party, and as was the case at the time, leader of the government. He said the electors of Prince Albert would understand the situation and would be quite prepared to make allowances for the more or less continuous absence from the constituency which might be involved. I accepted the kindly offer of my friends in Prince Albert and I was elected in the constituency. Here again may I refer to something which seems to be characteristic of a change that has taken place. Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. McDonald had won his election after a considerable fight, that the constituency had

been carried by the Liberals in the federal elections, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. McDonald was giving up his seat to his leader in order that he might take his place in the House of Commons, the Conservative opposition of the day and its supporters were not prepared to see that an election was avoided. In that particular contest a Conservative candidate was put in the field to oppose me. I was opposed, but the decency, the good sense and the chivalry of the electors of Prince Albert was shown by the fact that they gave me a majority of 5,621. That is how that majority came to be the size it was. I was supported in the constituency by men and women of all parties. May I contrast the attitude mentioned with what took place when Sir Robert Borden, at the time leader of the opposition, was defeated in a constituency in which he ran. Sir Robert Borden was chosen leader of his party, I think it was in 1901. Could my right hon. friend give me the exact information?

Mr. BENNETT: My memory is that it was around about 1901.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Sir Robert was defeated in Halifax in 1904. It is interesting to observe that practically all the leaders of political parties in Canada—my right hon. friend says that he was defeated, I think twice, but he was not then the leader —have been defeated at one time or another. This is almost inevitable, unless fortunately they are in very safe seats, due to the fact that they have had to give their time to the country as a whole rather than to their personal interests in their own constituencies. That is what happened to Sir Robert Borden in 1904. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Kidd) offered Sir Robert his constituency. Carleton was regarded as a safe seat for a Conservative leader, but did Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his supporters arrange to have a candidate oppose him? Not a bit of it; Sir Robert was allowed to be returned by acclamation. This is what any one at all fair-minded would have expected would be done. Later on Sir Robert Borden returned to the constituency of Halifax and was reelected there.

I need not go further with regard to my own record in this matter of elections, save to mention that in 1930, I was again returned to this house as member for Prince Albert by the handsome majority of 1,192. I would not have said what I have except for the fact that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) has seen fit to insinuate that no constituency was prepared to retain me for very long as its member. Before touching upon what the minister had to say with regard to the constituency itself, may I just add that, especially where one is in the position of leader of his party, I believe those he represents are quite sensible enough to entertain the view that the place at which they need representation is in the House of Commons at Ottawa and not necessarily in the constituency itself. It is a very fine tradition in the old country that a man may be free to reside in one part of the country and represent a constituency in another. I hope that that tradition will never fade from our parliamentary life because it offers the only means whereby many men who ought to be in public life can be brought into public life. If the tradition ceased to exist anything of the kind might no longer be possible.

It is true I have been unable to spend much time in the constituency I have the honour to represent in this parliament. This unfortunately has been equally true of the other constituencies I have represented. Although I have not been privileged to spend the time I would have liked to spend in Prince Albert, I do not think I have been neglectful in any particular of the interests of that constituency. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will find out that the good people of Prince Albert understand the situation pretty well, and will not be found lacking in appreciation of what I have endeavoured to do on their behalf.

Here is what the Minister of Agriculture said on Tuesday last with regard to the Prince Albert constituency. I will quote the passage in full, because I think it ought to be carefully preserved:

> The right hon. leader of the opposition made one statement referring to the will of the people to which I take exception, and if the committee will bear with me for a few minutes I think I can show that he is not correct in his statement. The last redistribution made it impossible for the people in the federal constituency of Prince Albert to express their will. I have before me the results of the last federal elections and they show that poll after poll in the northern part, and especially in the city of Prince Albert and the districts in the neighbourhood of Prince Albert, returned majority after majority against the right hon. gentleman. This is what happened in the Anglo-Saxon and French speaking part of the constituency and the only thing that enabled him to carry the election were the votes of a large block of people of German descent who had been left in the southern part of the seat in the last redistribution. I am not making any inference that these people should not be given every opportunity to exercise their franchise. They are of German descent. I had the privilege and pleasure of working throughout that whole district for years as a school inspector. Under the redis-

tribution which was in force during the last elections a large block of these people in the southern end of the Prince Albert constituency and another similar block to the north of Saskatoon, totalling in all about forty-five thousand progressive Mennonite farmers by being thus divided were practically denied the opportunity of nominating one of their own people so that this very worthy part of the Canadian population would be unable to express its opinion in this house. I know many of these people personally and they take second place to none, but this is what happened because of the work of scientific and highly specialized political racketeers. I do not think it was the work of the leaders of the Liberal party as we like to think of Liberalism. I believe it would have been a distinct gain if we could have as a member one of these people of German extraction who had made such a success. But that was made impossible because of the block left in Prince Albert constituency, evidently just to affect a vote of the people in the northern part of the constituency. By doing that, both these peoples have been practically disfranchised. The right hon. the leader of the opposition and his followers have therefore made it impossible for these people to express their will.

First of all let me say a word about people being disfranchised. What the Minister of Agriculture evidently had in mind was the Wartime Elections Act under which all the Mennonites were disfranchised, and under which, in some of the western communities, nearly everyone who happened to be of foreign origin was disfranchised. He just unconsciously let slip what was in the subconscious area of his mind—the thought of disfranchisement of Mennonites and others. There was no disfranchisement in 1930; everyone had a vote; everyone was entitled to vote as he thought best. What the minister could have meant by speaking of disfranchisement, unless unconsciously this thought crept into his mind, I am unable to understand, but what is interesting in connection with the minister's statement is this. He says that they were disfranchised, as he calls it, because the boundaries of the constituency had been so arranged as to bring these Mennonites and others into contact with the Anglo-Saxon people of Prince Albert; that the part of Prince Albert which votes Conservative was placed alongside this part of the constituency which votes Liberal. He says that this was "the work of scientific and highly specialized political racketeers." That, I shall show, was pretty hard on his own party, and on its past and present leaders.

I have taken pains to look at the redistribution of 1924 as it affected Prince Albert constituency. The Minister of Agriculture has sought to have it appear that this bringing together of these two elements and what he calls disfranchising them, in that way, was the work of political racketeers, and he has tried to apply to the Liberal party in 1924 that offensive designation. May I tell him that the constituency line of Prince Albert which determined that all these people shall be in the one riding, the Mennonites and the Anglo-Saxons, was the line laid down by Sir Robert Borden in the redistribution of 1914, a line moreover to which the present Prime Minister agreed, and for which he is part responsible. The southern boundary of the constituency of Prince Albert was left by the Liberal party in 1924 exactly where Sir Robert Borden and the present Prime Minister placed it in 1914.

Mr. TURNBULL: Is it not a fact that the statement which my hon. friend has just made applies only to the eastern part of the present constituency of Prince Albert and does not apply to that part west of the third principal meridian?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking of the part referred to by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. TURNBULL: The Minister of Agriculture referred to the whole constituency.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking of the constituency of Prince Albert as it is now, and I say that the southern line was fixed by the government of Sir Robert Borden. It was agreed to by Liberals and Conservatives alike and the present Prime Minister was himself on the committee that determined it. I say that it was a right and proper line in 1914; I say that it was a right and proper line in 1924 and I say that it is the right and proper line for 1933.

I want to take direct issue with the view that the aim of a redistribution should be to segregate the different elements of our population. I believe in all our efforts with respect to the public life of our country and the making of a country, a nation, we ought to regard the citizens of Canada as Canadians, and Canadians only, irrespective of what their origin may be. The more we can get the different groups and classes which compose the nation to intermingle and understand each other, the more united and happy our country as a whole will be. I take direct issue with the Minister of Agriculture when he says that simply because some people happen to be born of a different origin from his own, that an effort should be made in redistributing constituencies to have them placed in another district, so that they will in no way come into contact with those who happen to be English

speaking; I do not think such a view is manly or British, or has anything to be said in support of it.

Let me say, with regard to the Mennonites to whom the minister refers in the way he has, that there is no finer community of people to be found anywhere. As to their having the right to choose whomever they may wish as their representative, may I say that when in 1908 I was first nominated as a candidate for parliament, in the constituency of North Waterloo, the man who nominated me was Mr. Leander Bowman and the man who seconded my nomination paper was Mr. Henry Hostetler, each of whom belong to that community which my hon. friend said should be entitled to name a representative of their own for parliament. These gentlemen were outstanding citizens of North Waterloo, the constituency represented in this parliament at the present time by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Euler). Is there any finer class of citizens to be found anywhere in Canada than is to be found in North Waterloo? Many of the Mennonites in the part I am speaking of in Prince Albert constituency come from the county of Waterloo itself. May I add this further fact, that when I was opposed in the by-election in Prince Albert in 1926, whoever was responsible for the choice of the Conservative candidate in that constituency chose Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker, to oppose me. It would seem he was of foreign origin. This gentleman, or at all events, his father whom I knew years ago, strangely enough came from the same county of Waterloo as I do myself. It ill becomes any minister of the crown to seek at this or any time to stir up racial strife and differences in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: The right hon. gentleman has done a great deal of it in his life.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is all right for the Tories opposite to do it, but the minute a member of the opposition takes exception to their action, it is wrong so to do.

Mr. STANLEY: That is pretty small for the leader of the Liberal party.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I just draw attention to the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for interruptions and if they make interruptions, they must expect to get the replies they deserve.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): May I appeal to hon. members in committee to allow this debate to be carried on without such frequent interruptions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

May I now say a word in reference to the new boundaries of Prince Albert as set forth in the schedules that are before us. The government have brought down a redistribution map and they have presented to us the boundaries of Prince Albert among those of other constituencies. Let me first of all draw attention to the fact, as I did the other day, that the average unit of representation for constituencies has been fixed at 44,186. Let me draw attention to this further fact. It has been admitted on all sides, that where there are cities there should be a larger unit of representation than in the rural districts. Now the constituency of Prince Albert has in it the fourth largest city in the province of Saskatchewan, the city of Prince Albert, which has about ten thousand population. The present constituency of Prince Albert has a population of 50,898. The map which hon. gentlemen have presented and which they ask us to accept reduces the total number of electors in the constituency of Prince Albert to 38,469. Though the unit in a rural district is 44,186, Prince Albert is reduced to 38,469 under the measure which is now before the house.

We are told that the problem which the committee was confronted with was to reduce the size of the constituency. How have they gone about reducing the size of the constituency? What they have done is first of all to add to the constituency on its eastern side a considerable part of the constituency of Melfort, the present seat of the Minister of Agriculture. I ask this house and the country, is there evidence of fair play with respect to a constituency that is to be reduced in size, when it is found necessary to begin by adding to it a considerable portion of another constituency? I have looked at the part that has been added to see if I could discover the reason why an addition should be made, and I think I have found it clearly enough in the fact that in the last general election the part which is added gave a considerable Conservative majority. It has been found desirable in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite to add to this already very large constituency of Prince Albert a part of a Conservative majority from another constituency.

What else have they done? They have taken away from Prince Albert a great part of the southern portion of the constituency. When one examines the constituency as a whole one finds exactly what was in the mind of the Minister of Agriculture when he said the other day that Prince Albert in all its

northern part had voted against me. He stated that on the floor of the house. He has had to do with the drafting of this map. He knows all about it. The part that voted against me he is allowing to remain in, but the part that supported me most strongly in the last election is being taken out. The pre-eminently Liberal portion of the constituency is being taken away, and they have taken away so much that it has been found necessary to add something from another constituency so as to have a constituency which will look reasonably large. But even then the constituency which they have given me at the present time is considerably below the unit. They have reduced the constituency of Prince Albert, notwithstanding the fact that there is a city in it, to 38,469, when the unit of population even in the rural districts is placed at 44,000 odd. They have by this process of gerrymandering changed the Liberal majority of 1,192 which I received in 1930 into a Conservative majority of 967.

May I add this? Take a look at the other constituencies in Saskatchewan. Have any of them been reduced in this fashion? Last Mountain, a purely rural constituency, has according to this map a population of 48,657; Mackenzie, 47,458; Regina, 53,209; Saskatoon, 47,362; South Battleford, 47,084; Yorkton, 49,423. Does that look like a desire to be fair as between the different constituencies of Saskatchewan? The new constituency that has been created immediately to the south of Prince Albert has been given a population of 46,285, and it is made up largely or partly out of what has been taken away from Prince Albert. Prince Albert has been reduced to 38,469, eight thousand less than the population of the new constituency that has been created, and which is a purely rural constituency while Prince Albert has a very large and growing city in the very centre of the constituency. If that is not gerrymandering, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is.

The Prime Minister has said: If there is any fault to find, if there is any injustice, we are here to remedy it. Now I have presented a case to him and I am going to leave it with him and the government. They must do whatever they think best.

Mr. BENNETT: I say here and now that the letter written by Mr. Turnbull and Mr. Totzke fixing the boundaries of the constituency will be accepted by the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The letter written by Mr. Turnbull to Mr. Totzke was in reply to a plan that related to the province of Saskatchewan as a whole. It was not a communication that had reference to the constituency of Prince Albert.

Mr. BENNETT: I mean the letter about Prince Albert.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Pardon me, it was a letter that dealt with the general plan of the constituencies. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) is here to speak for himself. He will say that he never proposed or agreed to anything that had not relation to the province as a whole, and the reason the committee did not come to an agreement was that they could not agree on the constituency of Prince Albert among other constituencies.

As the Prime Minister has requested it, Mr. Chairman, I am going to state to my hon. friend opposite what I believe in the circumstances to be a perfectly fair redistribution with respect to the constituency of Prince Albert, and I shall leave myself in the judgment of the house and the country as to whether what I suggest is or is not fair.

I have in my hand the constituency map of Prince Albert as it stands at the present time. I notice that most of the constituencies in Saskatchewan have their boundaries marked out by lines parallel both east and west and north and south.

Mr. BENNETT: The townships.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, the townships are all framed on the square. What has happened in regard to these northern constituencies in previous redistributions and in the present redistribution has been to narrow the territory between the boundaries east and west. That is to say, the constituency is made narrower, and narrower for this reason, that the population continues to run up to the north. What is happening in the redistribution map in Saskatchewan is much like what one sees on the banks of the St. Lawrence in Quebec, where as the population has increased one will find a large farm which has come to be subdivided among the members of a family, in a manner which will give to all a certain frontage along the river. These northern constituencies run to an indefinite part of the country, a part not inhabited at all, and as the population continues to increase towards the north they have been made narrower. I say that that same process should be followed with respect to Prince Albert at the present time. It is being followed with regard to constituencies lying to either side of it.

The boundary on the east side is along range 24 west of the second meridian. The lower

part of the constituency of Prince Albert as it exists at the present time is on a range line between ranges 25 and 26. My suggestion to hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is only a suggestion of what I think is fair, is that the line which starts between ranges 25 and 26 at the southern part of the boundary be carried direct north, and that that portion of the constituency which lies to the east of that line be made a part of the adjoining constituency. I should be sorry to lose any part of the present constituency, but if the constituency is to be reduced in size this would appear to be the fairest way to all concerned to go about it.

I did not know when I looked at the map what would be the result of that arrangement politically. I may give to the house what I think is a correct statement, and that is that the total number that would be affected is something around four thousand. I think about four thousand would be taken out of the constituency as it exists at the present time.

Mr. BENNETT: What would the population remain?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The population would remain about 46,000 as I gather it. At the present time it is 50,800, and if 4,000 were taken out 46,000 odd would be left. In my view 46,000 for Prince Albert constituency is a small enough unit. It is smaller than that of the constituency of Mackenzie, smaller than Last Mountain, smaller than Regina, smaller than Saskatoon. It would be the same as the new constituency of Hague. As a matter of fact, owing to the fact that there is a city in it, it should be one of the larger constituencies of the province. I have since looked to see, so far as I could figure from the results at the polls, what the effect would be.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the population of Prince Albert now?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Nearly 10,000.

Mr. TURNBULL: It is 9,905.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, about 10,000. As I figure it out as a result of the transfer I have suggested there would be a loss of Liberal votes. In round figures there would be a net Liberal loss of about 100 votes. It would take off, as I have figured it out—and I am subject to correction although I believe my figures are correct—it would take 4,420 from the present constituency which would mean a loss according to the figures of the last election of 678 Conservative votes and 761 Liberal votes, or in other words a net Liberal loss of 83. I know the government have to consider other constituencies, and that the addition of 83 Liberal votes to the Melfort division might occasion some concern. But I submit that that could be offset by a rearrangement of the line, elsewhere.

Mr. BENNETT: Leaving out the question of votes—because those of us in the west know that only small importance attaches to that from one time to another—what is the effect upon the population of the nearby ridings? I am asking that question for information.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The effect on the population?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, by the addition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Melfort, as I see it here, is 36,237. It is a very small unit under the proposed map.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member is referring to Melfort?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, it is an adjoining riding. If 4,000 were added to it it would bring Melfort nearly to 40,000, leaving Prince Albert considerably lower than it is at present.

Mr. TURNBULL: It is impossible to transfer those two ranges without retransferring to Melfort that portion on the east side of Prince Albert which has come from Melfort to Prince Albert, and about which the right hon. gentleman now complains. So in addition to transferring 4,400 of the Prince Albert vote there would be a transfer back to Melfort of 4,835. That along with the 39,000, at which Melfort will stand under the proposed redistribution, would bring the population of Melfort up to 48,853, with no city in it. In that way that constituency would be made much larger than Prince Albert which has a city in it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank my hon. friend for adding that which I had left out of my calculation. I was speaking of the constituencies as they are at the present time, and not what they would be under the new arrangement. I have another suggestion to make along the same line. I have not discussed it with the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) but I do not see, if it is necessary further to reduce Prince Albert, while I should be sorry indeed to lose any of those who reside in the western townships, why a line might not be taken on the west side of the constituency, in a

somewhat similar way. The line there also stretches far to the north. I do object, however, to cutting out of the southern portion of Prince Albert constituency, a part which is quite thickly populated and which should be retained.

Mr. BENNETT: I must say at once that I am most anxious as far as possible to meet the views of the right hon. gentleman. As my questions have indicated, the difficulty is that we would be leaving a rural constituency of 48,000 people without a town in it. It would be hardly fair to impose upon a government the necessity of accommodating an opponent to that extent. If there is any way out of it I should like to hear it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with the right hon. gentleman that I should not ask the government to do anything for me which would embarrass the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. BENNETT: No, that is not the point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do say, however, that if my right hon. friend will confer with hon. members in charge of the maps he will find it might be possible to take from the constituency of Melfort some part of what is now being given to it, which part could be added to one or other of the adjoining constituencies in a manner which would do no injustice to anyone. I do not know anything about the political complexion of these areas, but I do think something of that kind could be done. At all events I am quite content to leave the matter, so far as Prince Albert is concerned, with the Prime Minister and his colleagues.

I have only one other word to say, and that is with respect to North Battleford. I understand it is the intention to change the name of north Battleford constituency to that of Redberry. The city of North Battleford, the one which gives its name to the constituency. will probably disappear from Redberry, and the city which is now called North Battleford will go into what will afterwards be known as the Battlefords. I do submit that there is something in retaining names having an historical significance. North Battleford and South Battleford are names which have figured in the history of our country and it would, I submit, be a pity to have them disappear from the maps. Redberry may have some associations—I know it has with one very distinguished gentleman—but the name at present means but little to the people of Canada as a whole. The name of North Battleford does mean something. The constituencies of North Battleford and South Battleford are separated by the Saskatchewan river. Further than that the constituency of North Battleford serves commercially that part of the country lying to the north of the river which will be included in the new constituency of Redberry. The business and community interests of the latter are bound up with North Battleford.

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that Battleford was at one time what might be termed the capital of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. VALLANCE: The old town.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, the old town of Battleford. Along the line of what the right hon. gentleman has said concerning the undesirability of perpetuating differences, I might say the idea is to follow the provincial lead and call them one community, namely the Battlefords, rather than accentuate the differences which have grown up between north and south.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are joined together, provincially.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We do not follow the provinces.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think elsewhere in the province provincial boundaries are not closely followed. I do think there would be a distinct advantage in retaining the name which has been associated with that particular part of the province. That which will be the new constituency of Redberry is in considerable part the old constituency of North Battleford. I believe if the government could see its way clear to retain the old name of North Battleford, rather than calling it Redberry, and would bring the town of North Battleford into that constituency, making whatever other adjustments they may find necessary and may wish to make with respect to the boundaries, they would at this stage settle any difference there may remain between us as regards that constituency.

I wish to say further that in view of the remarks of my right hon. friend in the course of the last half hour, if the government is prepared to reconsider and to meet us in the few particulars I have mentioned there would be no desire on our part further to discuss the situation in Saskatchewan. I do not for one moment admit that we are or would be satisfied with the redistribution in the province as a whole, because we are not. But we

cannot expect to be satisfied. We realize hon. gentlemen opposite are in power, that they must and will have the last word, and also that they must take the responsibility for their say. I think the members on the Liberal side both in committee and in the house have made the strongest plea they can and have fought to the limit of their endurance in seeking to protect what they believe to be the interests of their own and other constituencies and of the electorate in the different parts of the province, and I do not want to lend encouragement to any further discussion if we can get this Saskatchewan situation settled by an amicable arrangement. I have made suggestions which I believe will at this stage lead to a settlement in that province, and at this point I am prepared to leave the matter in the hands of the government.

Mr. BENNETT: The right hon. gentleman will observe that the difficulty lies in the general disposition of the population; in shifting the boundaries of one constituency all are affected. I do not see how we can change the Battlefords if we are to maintain the relative population in the adjoining constituencies. I desire to assure the right hon. gentleman at once that I shall wait for a transcription of his remarks and endeavour to adjust the Prince Albert situation in some way.

Mr. TOTZKE: Perhaps as a member of the committee I might suggest a way by which that difficulty may be overcome. There is a certain portion of the proposed constituency of Redberry lying south of the Saskatchewan river. The population in that particular area is contiguous to the old town of Battleford, and this district contains a population of something like 4,000, if not more. This could be added to the constituency now called Battleford, and the transfer of the city to the constituency now called Redberry would not make so much difference with regard to the population.

Mr. LENNOX: I am very glad indeed to have the opportunity of saying another word or two with regard to my own riding. The other day in referring to the townships of Markham and Vaughan the right hon. gentleman said:

> They were added, and when the general election came I carried the old constituency of North York but was defeated by the additional majority in the added townships.

That statement is not correct; the right hon. gentleman knows that he did not carry old North York, and he must have known it when he made that statement. I was dealing with what he made reference to himself, the addition of the two rural townships of Markham and Vaughan, and while I was a little mistaken in the figures my right hon. friend was very badly beaten. Let us see what he says to-day; I took down his words. He said, "I repeat what I said before with respect to North York," and then he said that the reason for his defeat was the additional votes from Toronto. That was the reason he gave to-day; that was how he excused himself for being defeated in North York.

I would ask you to bear with me for a moment, Mr. Chairman, while I give the figures with respect to the Toronto vote in 1925 and 1930. In 1925, when my right hon. friend—not too friendly—was the representative of that riding, it was perfectly legitimate under the act to poll any person who had been living in the riding for two months prior to the date of the issuing of the writ; there was nothing wrong about it. Any man who came up there had the same right to vote under the law as it was then constituted as any person had who lived in the riding permanently. In 1928 or 1929 that vote was entirely eliminated, and so far as I was concerned I was confined, as was my opponent, to the resident vote. Now let me point out where the Toronto vote came in. We had Sutton, which includes Jackson's Point, which of course is the largest summer resort we have in North York; we have North Gwillimbury, which also borders on the lake and runs to Jackson's Point, and on the other side we have Georgina township. Those are the only three municipalities in my riding that come within miles of lake Simcoe.

Now let us see how fair my right hon. friend was, or perhaps I should say how mistaken he was. When we had this Toronto vote, Sutton gave my right hon. friend 179 votes and myself 300 votes; North Gwillimbury, which takes in Orchard Beach and other places, gave the right hon. gentleman 454 and myself 475, and Georgina gave my right hon. friend 411 and myself 367. So these three municipalities bordering on the lake gave the right hon. gentleman 1,044 votes and myself 1,146; my majority, which he says to-day resulted from the presence of the Toronto vote, was 102. Let us see what happened after the Toronto vote was cut off, because not a single soul from Toronto had the right to vote or did vote in 1930. In that year these three municipalities gave me a majority of 232 votes though not a single person from Toronto was permitted to vote. My right hon. friend stated that he was told by some person that he had

voted in both places. All I can say is that it must have been a friend of his who did so, because no one else would tell him. So we have the admission on the part of the right hon. gentleman that apparently his own friends voted in both places, because I am sure no friends of mine would vote twice and certainly if they did they would not tell him.

Now let me refer for a moment or two to what the right hon. gentleman said with regard to the sacrifices he made by going into constituencies that were not safe seats so far as he was concerned, and I dare say that would apply to a great many constituencies. I want to show his chivalry to the men and women who got out and worked night and day for him in North York. He ran first in the constituency of North Waterloo against Mr. Weichel, I believe, and was elected by a majority of 263 in the riding in which he was born. In 1917 he was defeated, in the same riding which knew him so well, by 315, and after his defeat he left the riding and never came back. In 1917 he was defeated by Liberals, because the leading Liberals were Unionists in the riding of North York.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is not correct.

Mr. LENNOX: Wait a moment; I would not get into trouble again if I were you. One of the outstanding Liberals who appeared upon the platform and worked tooth and nail against the right hon. gentleman was no less than the Liberal candidate in the provincial election in 1923, Mr. Pearson. And in Newmarket, which is preponderatingly Liberal, or was, there was a very large majority for Mr. Armstrong, if I remember rightly. That of course was in an election during the war. Then my right hon. friend went down to Prince Edward Island where he got an acclamation. Then he summons up courage and comes back to North York, and I may tell the committee that apart from the election during reciprocity, when Mr. Armstrong was elected by 59, prior to this, there never was, to my recollection a Tory elected in that riding. Sir William Mulock represented it for years, and by very large majorities; and Sir Allen Aylesworth represented it by very large majorities. So that the only time in my recollection when it was represented by a Tory, was at the reciprocity election of 1911, when practically the whole country went against my hon. friends, and during the war.

Then the right hon. gentleman was elected in 1921 by a majority of 1,055. He says that I was mistaken in my figures. Well, I was; I did not know that I had beaten him so badly in the newly added portion of the territory. He was beaten by 408 in a riding that had never in its existence given a Conservative majority where there were two running. With 1,055 to his credit, a gerrymander took place—I should not say that; I should say a redistribution. In the election of 1921 he had 1,055, and he gave the house the impression that he was so very generouus in helping a Conservative candidate that he was willing to sacrifice himself, which he ultimately did in the election.

Let me say to the right hon. gentleman here to-day that in the election of 1921, taking in the new additions, the Liberal majority in Markham, Vaughan and the other municipalities that were added was 2,800; they got a majority of 2,800 over and above the number that voted for the Conservative candidate. And these are the municipalities which had snowed under the Conservative candidate in the immediately preceding election. My right hon. friend had the temerity the other day to get up and say that he added these places because he wanted to please the Conservative party.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I gave the house the figures, which are a matter of record.

Mr. LENNOX: The right hon. gentleman did not give them for 1921.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; I stated what the results of the 1921 election were in the total vote polled against the Liberal candidate.

Mr. LENNOX: At all events the right hon. gentleman was elected in 1921 by 1,055 in old North York, and in that same election, taking West York and South York, or East York as it was called, taking the two constituencies—because Vaughan is west and Markham is east of Yonge street—I may tell the right hon. gentleman, who never shirked anything, that there was a Liberal majority against the Conservative candidate in these sections that were added to North York of 2,800.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. member is now talking about the combined majorities against the Conservative candidate. I gave the combined majorities against the Liberal candidate, and I think the house can determine which of us is right.

Mr. LENNOX: With respect to Vaughan and Markham, there is not a Conservative candidate who ever got a majority in the

former township except Tom Wallace, who lived in Vaughan; and he obtained a Conservative majority against Mr. Dewart, who was a Liberal, a Toronto lawyer, and who ran at the time the market gardeners were supporting the Conservative party.

Now let me refer for a moment or two to something else. I might observe here that even during the Union election in 1917, when Mr. Wallace was a Conservative candidate and ran against a lawyer in Toronto, Mr. Denton, a nephew of the judge, Mr. Denton defeated the Union candidate by a majority of 40 or 50 in the township of Vaughan—I have not the figures by me. But even at that time that township went Liberal.

My right hon. friend has rebuked the government and more especially the Prime Minister and the committee for their lack of chivalry towards him with respect to his position in Prince Albert. He says that Markham and these other places that were added were Conservative. Well, let me say this to him: We are taking Markham out and putting it into another riding so that he should not object to that. I say to this distinguished gentleman who is leader of the opposition: "Come on back to North York. You are boasting that we are going to be beaten in the next election. Well, I invite you to come back to North York. I have no intention of running again, but I will if you come. If you want to keep me in public life and you want to go out of it, you come back."

Let me say a word or two with respect to the chivalry or lack of chivalry on the part of the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) and members of the committee. It is said that they should not have interfered with the right hon. gentleman's riding. What chivalry did the right hon. gentleman display when he deserted Waterloo, when he deserted North York after they had defeated him? What chivalry did he show to the men and women who had gone out day and night working to defeat me? I am told that he never even wrote a letter thanking the Liberals for their support.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know who said to my hon. friend anything of the sort, but it is quite untrue. I am quite prepared to have my friends speak for themselves in that matter.

Mr. LENNOX: They spoke for themselves in 1926 and they never asked you to come back again. The fact is that upon every occasion, except one, the right hon. gentleman has never gone back to a riding in which he was defeated. Chivalry, courage, yes! My riding was preponderatingly Liberal. But what happened after the redistribution? I had intended to retire from public life at the end of 1923; I intended to go back to my legal practice. What happened in 1924 when they all thought and I myself thought that I was not going to run again? After the redistribution of 1924 the Liberal papers taunted and goaded me and did everything they possibly could. They boasted that by reason of the redistribution they had a majority of 1,500. They were blowing around that I would not dare to enter the constituency to oppose my right hon. friend. I had no intention of opposing him but they drove me to it. I never went to the convention of over 1,200 people where I was nominated. They telephoned to me in Toronto and asked me to come up during the afternoon and I did so hours after my nomination had taken place. The night before at the Albany Club I met a deputation of 80 or 100 who asked me to run. I told them that I would not. The next day when I went to the convention and met the executive downstairs I still said that I would not run. I felt that I had done my duty, having had seven elections up to that time. I had three elections in two years and a half and two protests, both of which I won. What happened? Brave as I think I am, when I got up on the platform—

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX: There is another brave man over there.

An hon. MEMBER: What a man!

Mr. LENNOX: When I got upon the platform for the purpose of telling them I would not accept the nomination, in a moment of weakness I wilted and weakened and, finally accepted it. Believe me, when I accepted it I thought that the right hon. leader of the opposition was more popular than it afterwards turned out he was. He has drawn the attention of the committee to the fact that my majority was 76; he is wrong there, without the new addition, it was 89. That is just an error in addition but I made one myself the other day. I do not hold that against the right hon. gentleman. I ran down and got the figures after dinner as I did not expect to speak. I had not the slightest conception of the apparent unpopularity of the right hon. gentleman in Markham and Vaughan.

In the next election the right hon. gentleman had the opportunity to come back. He would not have been opposing any local man because they were looking around for a candidate. They brought in one of my warmest personal friends, Mr. Harry Sifton. He was brought in from Toronto and was a

stranger to the people of North York, but he got a majority of 247 in Markham. He was totally unknown personally to the people. The liberal majority in the provincial house in 1926 was 1,184 in Markham alone and the liberal candidate was a farmer living in Scarborough while the premier lived in York, which adjoins Markham. In 1929 the Hon. Mr. Henry ran again and he was opposed by Mr. Saunders, a young lawyer who lived in Stouffville. Mr. Henry was a farmer and he was opposed by a lawyer in a constituency which was preponderatingly rural. There is only one village in Markham but the people gave this young lawyer who had only been practising a few years and who did not live in the riding a majority of 892 against the premier.

According to the figures of previous elections, I thought that the majority of the right hon. gentleman in the township of Markham would be 400 or 500, but much to my surprise this was reduced to 71. The right hon. gentleman said that he would have defeated the present member for North York if it had not been for the city vote. They had added no less than 13,000 people to my riding. I was an entire stranger to Markham which is south of my riding. I was an entire stranger in every municipality that had been added. Being somewhat of a practical politician I decided what I would do. I said to myself: You had better get down into Markham and Vaughan. I did not put in as many days in old North York as did my right hon. friend. He spoke in all the large centres; he had nine cabinet ministers speak for him in 1925 and all of them with the exception of one were defeated by coming into my riding. There was George Graham, Mr. Massey, Mr. Marler—the whole crowd of them. It served them right, they should not have come in; but they did. My right hon. friend stated that it was the new parts that had defeated him. That, of course, is incorrect, and I am sure my right hon. friend, if he were to try to explain the matter to-day, after what the Toronto Globe has said, would be only too glad to admit I am correct. But I had no idea that the townships of Vaughan and Markham, traditionally Grit, and the other municipalities such as Richmond Hill and Markham village which never gave a Conservative majority, would all, except Markham, which gave a majority of 87 against me, give me large majorities. So I begin to think perhaps that when the election of 1926 came along, my right hon. friend sought a constituency as far north from me as he possibly could get.

He speaks of Prince Albert and I am going to say just a word or two about that. My right hon. friend ran in a by-election in Prince Albert in 1926 and in that election he was opposed, not by a Conservative or anyone running as a Conservative, but by an Independent soldier candidate. In that election he got a majority of 5,621, and strange as it may appear the more the people of that constituency saw my right hon. friend and the better they knew him, the smaller majority he got. When he ran in North York in 1921 he got a majority of 1,055 which was changed at a succeeding election into an adverse vote of 494, making a change in 1925 of between 1,500 and 1,600. In 1926, in Prince Albert, when he was opposed, I am told, by a Conservative candidate, he got a majority of 4,095. In 1930 he might have come back to North York, knowing there was at that time no Toronto vote which he said had defeated him in 1925, but having had a majority of over 5,000 in Prince Albert he remained as a candidate there and his majority was reduced by over 4.000. I do not see why there should be any difficulty about the Prince Albert riding. I would leave it as it is. If it reduced the Liberal majority from 5,600 to about 1,000, one can realize what the result would be in the next election, but I have nothing to do with the committee and for that reason I am not responsible for what is being done.

I am not going to take up any more of the time of the committee except to say that the additions made no difference to my riding and to renew my cordial invitation to the right hon. gentleman, now that Markham is out which he said was put in to help defeat him, to come back to North York at the next election and see how popular he is in that constituency.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Just a word in reply to a couple of remarks made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Lennox). First of all, I noticed the other evening in discussing this bill he said that he wanted to have the riding of North York with the same boundaries as the provincial ones. I just want to say that the plan that was handed to the redistribution committee of the proposed future North York was handed to that committee before the provincial boundaries were fixed, so that the provincial boundaries are following the plan of redistribution that is shown by this map. I know something about my hon. friend's

courage and I do not think it is necessary for him to protest it as much as he did this afternoon. But what struck me as being rather remarkable is this: if he is as good a man as he was in 1924 and in the various contests to which he referred—and I think, from his remarks, he is willing to admit he is—I am just wondering why he thought it should be necessary to get in the next election an advantage of about 1,100 more than he had during those previous campaigns.

Mr. LENNOX: So far as I am concerned, if I were running again, the boundaries would make no difference to me; I would take a chance on any man who ran against me. I am not worrying about that. I do not propose to be a candidate at the next election and maybe the other candidate who will represent the Conservative party will not be as well known.

Mr. ELLIOTT: He may need the assistance.

Mr. LENNOX: Perhaps he may. What my hon. friend wanted was for me to consent to the old boundaries as they were; that is what he suggested to me, but I do not think he was serious in doing so. My hon. friend says that I am getting an advantage of 1,100. I am sure he will agree with me when I say that when I start within the boundaries of the old constituency I am from 800 to 1,000 in the red. Therefore if they gave me an advantage of 1,100, which they have not done, altogether the constituency would represent an advantage of only 200 or 300 Conservative votes. I have been fighting for ten years against an adverse majority of from 800 to 1,000 and now perhaps some little concession should be given to me. I notice that the ex-Minister of Justice got all that was coming to him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am proud of the fact.

Mr. TOTZKE: If we were all such wonderful men as the hon. member for North York, there need not be any difficulty about redistribution. So much has been said in this discussion with regard to my action and the action of the committee in connection with the redistribution of the constituency of Prince Albert that, while I have already expressed as well as I could what really has happened, still I think I must go over the matter once again. It has been charged that at one time I suggested a line running southeast and west to the south of the town of Duck Lake. I admit that that line was suggested, was talked of, but at the time that line was spoken of, I was trying to get from the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) an idea of just what he would do in connection with the constituency of Prince Albert. Prior to that I had been told that the southern boundary of Prince Albert would not be changed. I had been informed, not by the hon. member for Regina but by other hon. members from my province, that they were making the map and that there would be no alterations of any kind. Is it any wonder that there was not much opportunity for the hon. member for Regina and me to come to any agreement? But I want to say further that any suggestions which I made in connection with the constituency of Prince Albert were made as part of the general plan for the whole province. The hon. member for Regina said to-day that I had never agreed to the boundaries of any constituency as proposed by him. I say that that is true; I did not. There were a number of tentative agreements made between the hon. member for Regina and myself, but invariably these agreements struck a snag when we came to other portions of the province, and there was no agreement on any of them.

Also at the time I made the suggestion that the line might possibly go across at a point south of Duck Lake I also asked that the portion that had been taken into Prince Albert from the constituency of Melfort should be removed, but I was told that that could not possibly be done. I said to the hon. member for Regina, "I will look into this." After I had looked into it I went back to him and said, as I am sure he will admit, that that line would not do.

With regard to the proposal that I made at the time, that the territory that had been taken from the constituency of Melfort and put into the constituency of Prince Albert should be returned to Melfort, I want to read just one extract from the letter I received from the hon. member for Regina, dated March 25, very early in the negotiations. At page 3, section 7, he says:

> I am also willing to consider the advisability of leaving the boundary line between Prince Albert and Melfort north of the north branch of the Saskatchewan river as it was.

The hon. member for Regina, and the Prime Minister in his remarks the other day, were very insistent that I had received an offer or a letter saying that the hon. member for Regina agreed with my suggested line. I would like to read to the committee just what that offer was. It is in these words:

> With regard to Prince Albert I will be prepared to make the southern boundary of that approximately on the line suggested by you.

The only thing I want to reiterate in connection with this particular constituency is that the line suggested was part of a general plan. I was still working on a plan upon which I thought we might come to some agreement, and if that line had been proposed by itself certainly there would have been no agreement upon my part.

While I am on the constituency of Prince Albert I want to say just a few words in connection with some remarks that were made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) the other day. I do not intend to open up the controversy again. This is just a matter of figures that he presented and which I want to show to the committee could not possibly be correct. He made the statement that there was a solid German block or a block of Mennonites of German extraction of 45,000 people in the two constituencies of Prince Albert and Saskatoon. The population for the entire district of Prince Albert, according to the census returns, is 50,896, and according to the same returns the population for the city of Prince Albert itself is 9,905. The population as shown for Saskatoon constituency is 60,636, and the population for the city of Saskatoon is shown as 43,291, making the total for the two constituencies of Prince Albert and Saskatoon of 111,532 and for the two cities of Saskatoon and Prince Albert, 53,196. Subtracting the population of the cities from the total population of the two constituencies leaves a total of 58,336, and the Minister of Agriculture says that of this 58,336, 45,000 are German Mennonites or people of German extraction. That would leave a balance of 13,336 for all other races—Anglo-Saxon, French-speaking, Ukrainian and any other nationalities who may be living in that constituency. I say, Mr. Chairman, that that computation shows that the statement of the Minister of Agriculture is absolutely absurd. There cannot possibly be 45,000 of that particular class of population.

The Prime Minister the other day in his remarks on the province of Saskatchewan made much of the fact that the population was moving northward and that of necessity changes in the constituencies must be made in that province more nearly equalized to the population. We on this side have from the outset of the negotiations in connection with redistribution in our province taken the stand that all that was necessary, seeing that there was no change in the number of the representatives from our province, was to rearrange the boundaries of the various constituencies in order that the population might be more nearly equalized. That was the idea behind any proposals and behind any map that we submitted.

The hon. member for Regina has made much of the fact that the redistribution of 1924 was a mistake, that in the central part of our province a certain number of constituencies were formed which should not have been formed and which were 18,000 below the unit of population. I want to deal for a few moments with that aspect of the question. The Prime Minister I am sure was quite sincere in his remarks, but I think I can show by the figures I am going to give that he did not have a clear picture of the situation in Saskatchewan.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there any doubt that the population has moved north since the last census?

Mr. TOTZKE: Not at all.

Mr. BENNETT: Then is there any doubt that there must be a rearrangement of the constituencies?

Mr. TOTZKE: Not at all.

Mr. BENNETT: Then it is only a question of how.

Mr. TOTZKE: Exactly. I have said that right along. I have a list of the constituencies as at present constituted in Saskatchewan with the populations as shown by the census of 1921 and the census of 1931. I may be out a little in the unit as shown for the province of Quebec, for I did not pay much attention to the old boundaries which were to be used for the purpose of making the unit, but I do not think I am out very much. The unit according to my computation was 36,317 for 1921 and 44,219 for 1931, or roughly 36,000 in 1921 and 44,000 in 1931. According to the population of Saskatchewan, divided by the number of members to which the province is entitled, the unit was 36,072 in 1921 and 43,861 in 1931, showing that the units are close enough to 36,000 and 44,000 for the same unit to be used in each computation.

The first constituency I have listed is Assiniboia. In 1921 its population was 34,789. In the last ten years its population has increased by 18·2 per cent. So that was not too bad—34,000 and the unit was 36,000. While I am talking about populations and

equality of populations, I may say that personally I do not think it matters very much whether the populations are a few thousands high or a few thousands low. We have nothing in our province to be compared with the disparities in population that exist elsewhere, for example in some portions of eastern Canada. I am told that in Ontario one rural constituency has as high a population as 80,000 and another one as low as 20,000. I will continue with the table:

Census of Saskatchewan 1931-1921

	1931	1921
Population of province..	921,785	757,510
Constituency—		1921
Assiniboia..		34,789
Humboldt..		37,128
Kindersley..		28,997

It will be noted that Humboldt's population in 1921 was 37,128, and the unit was 36,000. Kindersley's population in 1921 was 28,997, or approximately 29,000, a little low.

Constituency—	1921
Last Mountain..	34,054
Long Lake..	32,308
Mackenzie..	34,669
Maple Creek..	38,586
Melfort..	30,716
Melville..	36,842
Moose Jaw..	42,243
North Battleford..	34,451
Prince Albert..	39,126
Qu'Appelle..	33,003
Regina..	40,625
Rosetown..	29,341
Saskatoon..	40,712
South Battleford..	35,070
Swift Current..	40,305
Weyburn..	37,431
Willow Bunch..	39,257
Yorkton..	37,857

It seems to me that while some of these constituencies may have had a slightly lower population at that time, there was not sufficient difference to make any big parade about it. The six seats which the hon. member for Regina claims were by mistake, on account of low population, put into separate constituencies, are the constituencies of Kindersley, Last Mountain, Long Lake, Melville, Rosetown and Yorkton. Let us see what the populations were at that time, so that we may ascertain whether or not there was such a serious mistake made in connection with the redistribution. Kindersley had a population of 28,997, which was a little lower. The population unit was 36,000. Mind you, this is not making any allowance for the generally accepted principle that there should be a higher unit of population for cities than for rural constituencies. If that is taken into consideration the unit of population for rural seats in Saskatchewan would be considerably below 36,000. Kindersley was a little lower, but I find that during the last ten years the increase in population in that constituency has been over twenty-one per cent. It has been over the average increase in population for the province of Saskatchewan. So that it would appear that that arrangement was not too bad.

Mr. BENNETT: The increase in Prince Albert has been thirty per cent.

Mr. TOTZKE: I referred to the average increase for the province. I may tell the right hon. gentleman the increase in Melfort was seventy-one per cent. The population of Last Mountain was 34,054, very little below the unit for the entire province. Allowing for larger representation in the city constituency, I would say that Last Mountain had approximately a proper population. Next comes Long Lake, with a population of 32,308. That is a little low, also, and I think perhaps there is a little excuse for saying that that constituency was too low, because this, of all the constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan, instead of increasing in population, had a small decrease in the last ten years. But there are other circumstances in connection with the creation of the Long Lake seat which must be taken into consideration, when we study that particular part of the matter.

Next we come to Melville. In 1921 Melville had a population of 36,842, which was above the unit—considerably above when you allow for a smaller unit on account of giving a larger unit to cities. Rosetown had a population of 29,341, also below the unit. Yorkton had 37,857, or considerably above the unit, because there was a small city in the constituency. Therefore the population of the constituency at that time is not at all out of the way. We find that in these six seats in the redistribution of 1921 there were two seats below the accepted unit, although not very much below. Therefore I say when hon. members suggest a terrible mistake was made in the redistribution of 1921, their argument is far fetched.

Let us see what has happened to these constituencies in ten years. Let us see what the populations are now. I shall read first the populations for the entire list of constituencies in Saskatchewan, to show hon. gentlemen opposite that at that time there was no radical

need for change in the constituencies in Saskatchewan.

Assiniboia	41,144
Humboldt	44,146
Kindersley	35,290
Last Mountain	36,507
Long Lake	31,266
Mackenzie	44,869
Maple Creek	43,903
Melfort	52,668
Melville	39,338
Moose Jaw	42,334
North Battleford	53,708
Prince Albert	50,896
Qu'Appelle	35,938
Regina	60,858
Rosetown	32,526
Saskatoon	60.636
South Battleford	45,199
Swift Current	41,717
Weyburn	41,684
Willow Bunch	48,466
Yorkton	38,692

Hon. members will recall that the unit is 44,000. I ask if there are any very serious discrepancies in the populations of those constituencies. When we allow for the extra unit of population which, it was agreed in committee, should be given to urban centres, you will find there is not much discrepancy among any of the constituencies in the province. If we allow for extra representation in the cities we could say that possibly the unit for rural constituencies might be put at about 40,000. Under 40,000 we have Kindersley with 35,290; Last Mountain with 36,507; Long Lake with 31,266; Melville with 39,338; Rosetown with 32,526 and Yorkton with 38,692. There were only three constituencies in which there would be any excuse for making a change. Those were the constituencies of Kindersley, Long Lake and Rosetown. These constituencies are in the centre of the province. The suggestion I made was merely to add territory so as to give a little greater population to these constituencies and to take some of the population from those which were too large.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TOTZKE: When the committee rose at six o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I was about to place some figures on record with regard to the population of the various districts in Saskatchewan following the census of 1921 and the census of 1931. So much has been said with regard to the basis of population in connection with the redistribution of seats in that province that I thought it would be well to have these figures on record even though they are not of much interest to members of the house other than those concerned with the province of Saskatchewan. So much has been said also with regard to the larger percentage of increase in the northern part of the province that I should like to place on record the percentage of increase in all the constituencies during the last ten years, as follows:

	Increase per cent
Assiniboia	18.2
Humboldt	18.9
Kindersley	21.7
Last Mountain	7.2
Long Lake (decrease)	3.2
Mackenzie	29.4
Maple Creek	13.7
Melfort	71.4
Melville	6.7
Moose Jaw	.02
North Battleford	55.8
Prince Albert	30.
Qu'Appelle	8.8
Regina	49.8
Rosetown	10.8
Saskatoon	48.9
South Battleford	28.8
Swift Current	3.5
Weyburn	11.3
Willow Bunch	23.4
Yorkton	2.2

On several occasions the Prime Minister has mentioned the fact that the population in the northern part of the province has increased much more rapidly than the population in the central and southern portions. I have always admitted that fact, and in any proposals that were submitted by this side of the house with reference to redistribution that matter was taken into consideration. Now I should like to place on record the population of the different constituencies in accordance with the last proposal submitted by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull); I do not think I need weary the committee by putting on record the other proposals, except the last one submitted from this side. In one or two instances the figures I give may be a little inaccurate, because I think the hon. gentleman did make some slight changes in a few constituencies. I can assure my hon. friend, however, that any inaccuracies will not be intentional on my part. The figures according to the last Conservative proposal are as follows:

Assiniboia	40,946
Humboldt	45,443
Kindersley	39,632

Last Mountain is to be amalgamated with Yorkton, and I have no figures in that connection; formerly the population was 45,518.

Long Lake	42,146
Mackenzie	46,475
Maple Creek	42,428
Melfort	38,928
Moose Jaw	43,668
North Battleford	41,725
Prince Albert	44,658
Qu'Appelle	38,318
Regina	53,209
Rosetown	40,708
Saskatoon	46,535
South Battleford	44,658
Swift Current	46,447
Weyburn	44,710
Willow Bunch	44,558

Prior to this suggested change Yorkton had a population of 49,006, and the new constituency which I have listed under the name of Hague would have a population of 45,102. Perhaps I should say that some of these names have been changed, so hon. members may have a little difficulty in getting a correct picture. For example, Last Mountain and Yorkton combined are to be called Touchwood; Long Lake is Lakeside; North Battleford is Redberry; South Battleford is the Battlefords and Willow Bunch is Wood Mountain.

Mr. TURNBULL: The figures my hon. friend has quoted for the city of Saskatoon would be for the city of Saskatoon with six townships added. For the city of Saskatoon with nine townships added the figure will be 47,362.

Mr. TOTZKE: And that is taking off Hague?

Mr. TURNBULL: Yes, or Rosthern, as it is called now.

Mr. TOTZKE: I do not intend at this time to discuss the northern portion of the province of Saskatchewan, but in connection with the southern portion of that province I should like to direct the attention of the committee to what I think are some glaring instances of unfair redistribution. This is the portion with regard to which the Prime Minister said recently we had come to an agreement. I want to say that never with regard to at least one of these constituencies have I agreed to the proposals of the government. I want to show the alterations that have been made in these constituencies, and I believe I can show that those alterations are unnecessary.

In the southeast corner of the province we have the constituency of Assiniboia. According to the last census, under the present arrangement Assiniboia will have a population of 41,144. If hon. members will look at the map of Saskatchewan they will see that this is a very symmetrical, rectangular constituency; the north, south and west boundaries are almost straight lines. The east boundary has a few jogs in it, but those are correction lines in the townships. Hon. gentlemen opposite now propose that this constituency shall have a population of 40,946, and it seems to me that here they are not adhering to their policy of a proper redistribution of population. What have they done with that portion they are taking away? In the north corner they have taken off four townships and put them in the constituency of Qu'Appelle immediately to the north. Then they have taken a row of townships on the west side, a complete row extending the full length of the constituency, and put them into the constituency of Weyburn, although Weyburn did not particularly need it, because it has a population of 41,684. But what did they do to give it a little more population? In Assiniboia, instead of taking a straight line, they took four townships in the northeast corner and went up six miles, traversing three rows of townships, eighteen miles, and up another row of townships into Qu'Appelle, taking out these townships from the constituency of Qu'Appelle and putting them into Assiniboia. Let us see whether Qu'Appelle was too large in population and had to be reduced. Qu'Appelle, according to the last census, had a population of 35,938. It is a little small, and should be added to rather than taken from. But they took these places away and added more on the western end of Qu'Appelle in order to bring up the population a little, and we find as the final result of their manipulations here that Qu'Appelle has a population of 38,318. That is considerably below the unit, but perhaps the Prime Minister will say it has increased in population more rapidly than the constituency of Assiniboia. Let us see what happened.

Mr. BENNETT: Isn't the position simply this? You say that we should redistribute Saskatchewan in your way and we say we won't; we are not going to. Isn't that the story?

Mr. TOTZKE: No, I cannot agree to that. The redistribution in Saskatchewan, I say, should be done in a fair way, and there was no necessity for all this.

Mr. BENNETT: The answer is, we have done it.

Mr. TOTZKE: But I am trying to show—

Mr. BENNETT: And we are not going to undo it.

Mr. TOTZKE: Well, so far as that is concerned—

Mr. BENNETT: It is perfectly clear, and the leader of the opposition agreed that we had made the position clear. We agreed, as the hon. gentleman has said, on three things. We agreed that there should be a redistribution, and that the population had moved north; therefore the adjustment must take place in that way. We have gone into it and spent months at it and have arrived at a conclusion as to how it should be done. Now, the question is: Although we are the majority, are we to accept the will of the minority? We are not going to do so.

Mr. TOTZKE: I am quite satisfied that the Prime Minister is right when he says they are not going to do it, but I am sure that the right hon. gentleman will not say that that decision should close my mouth.

Mr. BENNETT: No, I did not suggest it.

Mr. TOTZKE: Well, I am stating my position.

Mr. BENNETT: You have talked three times and said the same thing.

Mr. TOTZKE: And I will talk three times more if I have to.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well. I am content to stay here another two weeks or two months to listen to it twenty times if necessary. You need not worry. I do not desire in the slightest to curb the hon. gentleman's loquacity or his explanatory powers. He may continue as long as he likes.

Mr. TOTZKE: The Prime Minister has no right to accuse me of loquacity; I have not done much talking in this house. Others have done more than I have.

Mr. BENNETT: That is true, except as to this.

Mr. TOTZKE: Well, I have a grievance and it is my duty to state the position as I see it. I represent the Saskatchewan members in this matter and it is my duty to point out the mistakes that have been made. The Prime Minister has spoken about a perfect agreement in the constituency south of Qu'Appelle. I say that we have not had a perfect agreement. There is one of the most glaring instances of unfair redistribution in the province. The population of Qu'Appelle was low; it is not up to the unit. I want to give the percentage increase. I have already given it but I want to refresh the memory of hon. gentlemen. The percentage of increase in the constituency of Qu'Appelle was 8.8, which, compared with the increase in the northern constituency of Melfort, is very low. It is much below the average in the province of Saskatchewan. But that is not the particular complaint I have with respect to this constituency. I have always said that there was not so much complaint about discrepancies in population, but in this particular instance they have changed the straight line on the south side of Qu'Appelle and made a regular staircase of it. Starting with the eastern part, they go over a distance of twenty-four miles, then up six miles and over eighteen miles, then up six miles again, then over thirty miles, and then up to within about ten miles of Qu'Appelle valley. The only apparent reason for this alteration is, in my opinion, to try to secure a safe seat for the member representing Qu'Appelle and to ensure his return to this house. Now, I have no desire to see the hon. member for Qu'Appelle kept out of this house. I like him very much; he is a very nice chap and a good member. But in spite of what they have done for the hon. gentleman I am sure he will be left at home next time.

I say this is one instance where I could not come to an agreement with hon. gentlemen in regard to the southern part of Saskatchewan. The constituency of Weyburn provides another example where the population was practically all right. But what have they done here? They have put another row of townships on the west side and taken off a few townships on the northwest corner. The constituency of Willow Bunch was too high in population and had to be cut down, and I have no particular complaint to make in that regard. Maple Creek had a population of 43,903 and the percentage of growth was below the average of the province; still, they had to make some alterations. In Maple Creek, instead of adding a little to the population, they have made it 42,428. Moose Jaw is another instance where I could not agree. It had a population, according to the last census, of 42,334 and they have brought it to 43,668. They have added five townships and taken off a row of townships on the west side. Nine townships have been taken off from the west side. Moose Jaw constituency has the third largest city in the province of Saskatchewan, a city with a population of 21,000. Therefore, under the principle adopted generally by the redistribution committee, it has a little larger population

than some of the rural areas close to it. Moose Jaw now has a population, under the last proposal, of 43,668, and Willow Bunch has a population of 44,558. The next constituency, west of Moose Jaw, is Swift Current, which has a town of 5,000 people. Under this redistribution it is given a population of 46,447 as compared with Moose Jaw, 43,668.

Is it any wonder I said I could not agree to the redistribution in the southern part of Saskatchewan? There is no question in my mind that these manipulations were carried out not with a view to equalizing population but with a view to making or trying to make safer the seats of hon. members occupying them behind the government. If that is the intention why do not hon. gentlemen say so? Why should they try to justify manipulations of this sort on any other ground? Moreover, there is in Qu'Appelle a glaring instance that has developed lately, and that is, taking a certain number of sections of land out of Qu'Appelle and throwing them into Melville —just little sections, six I believe, with a population of perhaps 150 or 200. I believe the vote the last time was 11 to 77 or 79. It happened to be a Liberal vote because the Liberals had a pretty good majority. The excuse given for doing this is that it is more convenient for the people living in this poll to vote at Le Bret across the Qu'Appelle valley in the constituency of Melville. That may be so but I can give hundreds of instances where it would be more convenient for the people in one constituency to vote in a town in another constituency. If anyone will look at the map they will see how ridiculous it is. They start across the line of railways, then they go up across the line, come back again, up again and then back. There is no excuse for manipulation of that kind. It was bad enough before when its narrowest point was about ten miles wide. I know it will be said that that was done in 1924, but even so there is no particular justification for it. I am informed by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell), who was on the redistribution committee at that time, that he consulted with the then leader of the Conservative party from Saskatchewan, in another house, and this was one of the changes he asked for. This change was given to him. They have now made a jig-saw puzzle out of it. I wish I had cut it out because it is almost equal to some of those shown last evening. I think I have shown that there was no justification for the changes made in the constituencies south of the South Saskatchewan river and the Qu'Appelle valley.

[Mr. Totzke.]

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am in order but with great deference to yourself, I think I must say a few words. We like you in our province and we appreciate what you have done, but since you are interested in this matter and have taken an active part in discussing certain matters now before the committee, I think it would be only proper that you leave the chair and let some other hon. gentleman preside in your place.

Mr. JOHN VALLANCE (South Battleford): Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is futile for me to add any further protests to those already made by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) in view of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) said a few moments ago. He said: This is our plan and we are going to put it through. As has been suggested, I suppose that statement is based upon the fact that he has the majority.

I have represented the constituency of South Battleford in the province of Saskatchewan since the 1925 elections. For the information of the committee, I may say that this seat was created by the redistribution bill of 1924. It is proposed to eliminate this constituency by the redistribution bill now before us. If that is done, I suppose there will be one thing to my credit—I will have been the only member who has ever represented South Battleford in the federal house. Of course, that will be contingent upon the Prime Minister carrying out the threat he made a few moments ago.

I should like to direct attention to some of the glaring instances which have been referred to already during this debate. The constituency of South Battleford has a population of 45,119, and according to the figures given by the hon. member for Humboldt, there are probably only eight or nine constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan with a smaller population. I suppose there is some reason for the elimination of South Battleford, but I would like to know what it is. I can conjecture as to why the present government is so keen to eliminate this seat. I join with the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) in protesting against the amalgamation of the two Battlefords. In my opinion it was wholly unnecessary to abandon any of the existing constituencies in Saskatchewan and create new ones. It has been argued all through this debate that the population in the north was growing faster than the population in the centre and south of the province. With that statement I am in entire

agreement. It will be found that the constituencies in the extreme north of the province average some 50,000 in population. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Humboldt and by the Prime Minister himself, these constituencies have increased their populations to a greater extent than any others. In view of the argument adduced that the population in the north is growing at a faster rate and is likely to continue to grow at a faster rate, I think four constituencies could have been created instead of the present three. This could have been done without disturbing the province as a whole to any great extent. I think if you were to take a group of individuals who were uninterested in redistribution and ask them what constituencies should be eliminated, they would answer: those with the smallest populations.

In spite of what the Prime Minister has said that this bill is going to go through, I rise to object to the joining of the two Battlefords. They do not belong to each other. Those who know the geography of the province of Saskatchewan know that the northern Saskatchewan river has been the natural boundary between these two constituencies ever since they were created. In the southern part of the province the Qu'Appelle valley is recognized as a natural boundary. This valley can be crossed at practically every hundred yards but when you get away from the city of Battleford; the North Saskatchewan river can be crossed only by ferry. There are very few bridges and the two sides of the river do not lend themselves to amalgamation.

I am more opposed now than I was at the beginning of this discussion to the present system of redistribution in the various provinces. I am in absolute agreement with my leader. I think the province of Saskatchewan is an example of the abuses which can be resorted to under the present system. In spite of all that has been said, I contend that abuses have resulted.

Much as been said about the type of population in the different constituencies. If you look at the northern portion of the proposed constituency of Kindersley you will see that the five rows of townships which were previously at the south end of South Battleford are settled by Russians, Germans and other people from continental Europe. This type of population predominates over those from the motherland and the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec. It will be noted that in the last election in this constituency there was an overwhelming majority in favour of the Liberal candidate. In fact, the Conservative candidate made the statement that if the five rows of townships were eliminated, a Tory could win in what would now be South Battleford. Therefore, when the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) tries to tell me that it was only a matter of redistributing the population, that does not go down very well. Right in this city immediately after the last election during the special session of parliament, a western member, when he congratulated me on winning the election, said: "You have won this one, but you will not win the next; we will get you in the redistribution." I hate to think I have been such a menace to the government, they are so desirous of eliminating me from this house.

The only consolation that I have is that I am just about twenty-four miles from the western boundary of Saskatchewan and it is impossible to redistribute Saskatchewan in such a way as to put me out of the province. I now find myself in the position, if this bill goes through, of being in what will be Kindersley constituency. According to the 1931 census the population of Kindersley was only 35,290. You will find some of them as low as:

Constituency—	Population
Rosetown	32,526
Yorkton	38,692
Moose Jaw	42,000

You can go through the whole of the constituencies in Saskatchewan and you will find probably four that at the present time have a larger population than that of South Battleford.

I notice that this afternoon while my right hon. leader was talking, the Prime Minister drew attention to the fact that he himself had at one time been defeated when he ran in 1896 for the constituency of Alberta. That took in the whole of what is now known as the province of Alberta and my right hon. leader pointed out to him that of course Calgary was in that constituency at the time. That is true. I do not remember Calgary in 1896, but I remember Calgary ten years later and even then it was only a cow town or a rather small city. He was defeated at that time probably because Calgary was a cow town. I would tell him to-night that if Calgary were again a cow town he would again be defeated there; his chances would not be one bit better than those of my right hon. leader were when he ran in North York.

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) the unit of population for the constituencies in Saskatchewan were set at 43,861, and I would like the hon.

member for Regina, or the government or any member of it to tell me why they should eliminate South Battleford with a population of practically 46,000 when the unit is only 43,861. If this bill goes through I shall be so far moved into the centre of Kindersley that it will be impossible for me to suggest to the hon. member for Regina that he might take out a little portion at one point and put me back into South Battleford; he could not do it. I appreciate the difficulty in which he is now and the only suggestion I have to make to him is the one made before by the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) and myself, namely, to return to the boundaries as they exist to-day and then by a mere redistribution of population of a few hundred here and a few hundred there we can retain every constituency that now exists and work no hardship even on the Conservative party.

This is truly a political gerrymander and until somebody proves to me it is other than I say it is, I still maintain and believe that this was done with no other intention than to make safe as many seats as possible for the Conservatives and to jeopardize every Liberal constituency they could. I absolutely agree with the hon. member for Humboldt that when the ballots are counted in the next election, they will not get eight Conservative members from my province; in fact I predict they will not get eight west of the great lakes.

Mr. ROBERT McKENZIE (Assiniboia): I have listened with considerable interest to the debate on the redistribution bill and as yet have taken no part in it, but I feel it is my duty to express my opinion regarding one or two matters. I have no grievance so far as my particular constituency is concerned, but before I sit down I want to make a suggestion with regard to the redistribution in Saskatchewan generally. Anyone looking at the map of that province will immediately realize how difficult it is to make an equal redistribution with regard to population. We have in that province twenty-one members, the same as we had formerly, but in studying the map one cannot help being struck by the fact that there are some natural boundaries which cannot or should not be overlooked in redistribution. We have such natural boundaries as the Saskatchewan river, which is navigable only at certain points by ferries and which should so far as possible be considered a natural boundary. Then we have the Qu'Appelle valley, which has always been and should be considered another natural boundary. In addition to that we have Long Lake, which divides the present constituency of Long Lake from that of Last Mountain, a lake about sixty or seventy miles in length and some three or four miles in width; that should be a natural boundary. In the redistribution map now before us I notice that the proposed constituency of Long Lake goes right around the borders on both sides of the lake. That seems to be a ridiculous proposition. That was the former situation, but it was changed ten years ago and in all fairness I think the proposed redistribution should be changed back again, so that the eastern boundary of Long Lake constituency will border on the lake called Long Lake.

I believe a sincere effort has been made to reach a satisfactory conclusion with regard to the redistribution in Saskatchewan. As I said before, I have no personal complaint because the hon. member for Qu'Appelle and I some time ago agreed with regard to the boundaries between our two constituencies, his riding lying immediately to the north of Assiniboia which I represent. In addition to that, the hon. member for Humboldt prepared a map, which was also agreeable to me, and his map added some population to my constituency to the west instead of to the north. Personally, it makes very little difference to me whether an addition is made one way or the other; I am satisfied with everything that will be a fair and equitable distribution of the whole province. I feel rather keenly the position in which some of my colleagues in Saskatchewan are placed in the redistribution which is now under discussion. I do not see that there is any necessity for eliminating one seat. That has meant now that the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Butcher) and the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) are in the one seat; one or other of them will be eliminated. Then we have the situation in Battleford which has been explained by the two members for that double constituency. Had it not been for the fact that some of my friends have been rather discriminated against in this redistribution, I should not have taken any part in this discussion. When it comes to making additions to any of the constituencies or changing the boundaries it must be remembered that in the western provinces the constituencies, especially in the rural districts, comprise very large areas, and we do not like the idea of having new territory added because we find it difficult now to keep in touch with our people and get acquainted with them even in several years when there is such a large territory to cover. For that reason we are averse to having additional territory added.

In the redistribution following the census of 1921 the unit of population was a little over

36,000, and in looking over the bulletin of the seventh census of Canada in 1931 we find that although 36,000 was the unit of population there were nine constituencies which had a population below 36,000. One was some 8,000 below the unit of 36,000, having a population of about 28,000. At the present time the unit of population in our province is approximately 44,000, and we have only one constituency with a population less than 22,500. Compare that with some of the seats in Ontario in regard to which we had a full discussion a few days ago. One seat in Ontario, practically a rural seat, with not more than one small-sized city, has a population of over 80,000, and another seat has a population below 20,000. Surely if 18,000 or 20,000 is sufficient for a constituency in Ontario there is not very much objection to one constituency in Saskatchewan having a population of between 31,000 and 32,000.

I realize the truth of what the Prime Minister said yesterday, that we cannot put through a redistribution measure that will conform exactly to the unit of population. He also said that it was not his desire unnecessarily to disturb existing boundaries. Therefore I suggest to the government along the lines of the suggestions that were made this afternoon and this evening, that they should leave the constituencies in the province of Saskatchewan practically as they are now. I do not think there is very much need of adjusting their boundaries. If we readjust the boundaries of constituencies it means that all our polls will have to be renumbered, entailing a great deal of inconvenience, and therefore so far as practicable I would suggest that the present constituencies be left as they are.

I want to give a few figures in regard to our province. There are nine constituencies at the present time with populations between 38,000 and 45,000, namely, Assiniboia, Maple Creek, Melville, Moose Jaw, Swift Current, Weyburn, Yorkton, Humboldt, and Mackenzie.

Then we have five constituencies with a population under 38,000, namely, Kindersley, Last Mountain, Long Lake, Qu'Appelle and Rosetown.

We have seven constituencies with a population of over 45,000—Melfort, North Battleford, Prince Albert, Regina, Saskatoon, South Battleford and Willow Bunch. It will be noticed that four of these seven with a population over 45,000 are urban seats or at least have a small city such as North Battleford and Prince Albert. The two larger constituencies, with a population of over 60,000, include the cities of Regina and Saskatoon, the two largest cities in our province.

I ask the government to consider whether it would not be practicable to leave the Saskatchewan constituencies as they are. Why disturb them when we have a more equitable distribution at the present time than the province of Ontario has even after these proposed readjustments? That is the only proposal I have to make, and I hope that the government will consider it.

All the constituencies in Saskatchewan except that of Long Lake have increased in population since 1921. I have given figures showing the population in 1921. The only constituency that appears to have lost population since that date and that might require some readjustment is Long Lake, but the difficulty there is the lake, which by all means should be left as the eastern boundary of that constituency. As I said before, a constituency with a population of 31,266 should not be considered too small when there are several constituencies in the other provinces with a population of 20,000 and less. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask the government seriously to consider whether it would not be advisable to leave our constituencies as they are.

Mr. THOMAS F. DONNELLY (Willow Bunch): I did not intend to take any part in this discussion until I got hold of this bill which we are supposed to put through for the redistribution, and when I looked through it I found that the constituency of Willow Bunch, which I have represented in this house for the last eight years, has entirely disappeared, gone by the board. The constituency of Willow Bunch is of great historical interest, and naturally since I have had the honour of representing it for the past eight years and was the first member for that constituency I hate to see it pass away. I do not know why it was changed at all. But I find that the clump of willows has grown into a wood, and the bunch has grown into a mountain, and now the constituency is called Wood Mountain.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Woodpecker.

Mr. DONNELLY: I am no longer the member for Willow Bunch if this bill goes through and I am the representative of that constituency in the next parliament. I am no longer a willow or a bunch; I am a wood mountain. I ask hon. members of the redistribution committee, why did they change the name? They know very well that the name Willow Bunch is of historical significance. For many years it was known as an old Royal

Northwest Mounted Police headquarters. Hon. gentlemen also know that for one winter a band of Indians who had rebelled in the United States and escaped into the northwest wintered at Willow Bunch, and it became famous on that account. To my mind the only reason for changing the name and for making these other changes in the names of constituencies is that the government want to get rid of the returning officers. By changing the name they get rid of the returning officer. If they want to discharge the returning officer why do they not come out like men and discharge him? Why adopt this underhand way to get rid of him? Why don't they play the game? I am not asking for any quarter. I ask for none and I give none, but I say that if they want to play the game like real sports, real men, they will discharge the returning officers if they want to get rid of them, instead of adopting this underhand method of doing it.

As far as the redistribution affects my constituency, I am not concerned at all. First they took off one corner, and they found that that would not work; then they cut off another corner, and that would not work. I told them that the only thing to do with all that southern part of Saskatchewan was to give it to Montana until after the next election. That is the only way you will ever stop Liberalism from representing the southern part of Saskatchewan. Do not make any mistake about it, the southern part of Saskatchewan after the next election will be represented solidly by Liberals. The only way you can stop it is to give it to Montana; then there would be American representatives in the Canadian House of Commons. However, so far as the general redistribution of the province is concerned, to my way of thinking in view of the movement of population some rearrangements of boundaries have to be made in the different constituencies. We will admit that. Some districts have grown faster in population than others. Certain readjustments or rearrangements of boundaries are necessary.

There is also something else necessary. In the readjustment of these constituencies natural boundaries such as rivers and lakes should be considered. One thing further should in my opinion be given consideration: If we want to play the game, with twenty-one members from Saskatchewan at present in the House of Commons I say there is no necessity to redistribute a man out of public life. Why put two members now in the house in the same constituency? It is not necessary. It is done for one purpose only, namely to get rid of one of those members.

The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) spoke about the redistribution which took place in 1924. He referred to those seats lying north of the Qu'Appelle valley and north of the south branch of the Saskatchewan river, and tried to show that they were low in population. As a matter of fact, after the last redistribution they were not very low in population; their population was equal to that of other constituencies. For example, the population in the constituency of Melville was 36,000, and for all practical purposes 36,000 was the unit of population. The constituency of Last Mountain had a population of 34,000, Long Lake had 32,000 and Yorkton had 37,000. The other two, Kindersley and Rosetown, were low. But the three lying in the eastern part of the province, namely the constituencies of Melville, Yorkton and Last Mountain, nearly reached the unit. Despite that fact, however, that was the point where it was decided that three constituencies had to be made into two, or that one had to be cut out. In other words, one of those constituencies in the eastern part of the province had to be done away with. They were not the three lowest in population; the three lowest were on the western side of the province. It was decided that Melville, Last Mountain and Yorkton must be united into two. Why not unite the other three?

Mr. TURNBULL: Four had to be united into three, not three into two. Long Lake was mentioned with the others.

Mr. DONNELLY: Why not take the three lowest ones? Why not take Kindersley, Rosetown and Long Lake, the three lowest in population. Why take two constituencies with high populations, when they had the matter under consideration? The fact of the matter is that they had made up their minds that the former Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Butcher) or the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. McPhee) must go. First a map was produced indicating that the former Minister of Agriculture must go. Then following some discussion and furore in the committee it was decided that he could remain, and either the hon. member for Yorkton or the hon. member for Last Mountain must go. The decision was made that they were to be put into one constituency. The same is true with regard to Kindersley. The hon. member for South Battleford (Mr. Vallance) and the hon. mem-

ber for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) were put into one constituency, thereby eliminating the constituency of South Battleford. It is because of such actions as these that we speak of gerrymandering.

If the government wanted to play fair they could readjust the seats and leave the members now in the House of Commons in their places, so that those members might have at least a fighting chance for their political life. So far as I am concerned, outside of the change of name I have nothing to complain about in connection with my constituency. Whoever gets the Liberal nomination there at the next election will be elected; I am convinced of that.

Mr. E. J. YOUNG (Weyburn): Mr. Chairman, I shall not occupy many minutes of the committee's time. I wish, however, to say a few words in regard to the situation as it concerns the Battleford constituencies. Hon. members of the committee will recall that the old town of Battleford was built many years ago on the south bank of the Saskatchewan river. That was before the days of railway building. The country around the town developed and was tributory to it. The town was the commercial centre. There was no settlement north of the river until the coming of the railway. When the Canadian Northern railway went through it opened up the north country, and as a result the town of North Battleford was established on the north bank of the river. That town became the commercial centre of the new territory opened up north of the river. At the last redistribution two constituencies were set up, South Battleford on the south bank of the river and North Battleford on the north bank, the river forming the natural boundary. That condition has been satisfactory. The proposal now is to take from North Battleford constituency a certain number of townships and add them to the South Battleford constituency. I cannot think that that was done with the object of gerrymandering a seat, because I have counted the votes at the last election, and I find that the Conservative majority in the piece of territory being taken from North Battleford and being put into South Battleford was only 153. I do not believe that 153 votes are going to determine how that seat will go in the next election. I venture to assert that whoever is elected in the the new Battlefords seat which is to be made, whether he be Conservative, Liberal, or C.C.F., will have a majority of more than 153 votes. He will have several times that many. I say therefore that the Conservative majority of 153 votes cannot be the determining factor. Why, then, do the government want to take territory from the North Battleford seat and place it in the seat across the river? The answer is obvious. Roughly speaking the population of North Battleford is 53,000, while the unit of population for the province is only 44,000. That is to say the population in the North Battleford seat as at present constituted is 9,000 too large. The proposal is to take some territory from that seat, and for equalization purposes to put in the seat across the river. In that piece of territory is the city of North Battleford. However the important consideration is this: Will the people in that territory be better represented in this parliament by one member sitting for all the territory north of the river, and representing 53,000 people, or by a member representing 43,000 north of the river and another member on the south side of the river representing 10,000 people north of the river and several times as many south of it? I think that is the important consideration, and I do not believe there is much doubt in the mind of any fair minded person as to which course those people would prefer, or as to which scheme would give them the best representation. If you take that territory from North Battleford, with its commercial centre, the city of North Battleford; if you lift it out of that constituency and put it into another you are dividing the interests of North Battleford and taking away a piece of territory in which they have a common interest. You are adding that territory to a constituency which in the past, rightly or wrongly, has conceived itself to have interests not identical with those of the North Battleford seat. If you add that territory to South Battleford here is the condition that will arise: The people north of the river will say, "Let us run a man from the north of the river; let us get our own man in." The people south of the river will say, "Those fellows north of the river are trying to elect a local man. Let us see that they do not do so. We will run a man from the south of the river." Since the portion of the constituency south of the river is several times larger than the other portion, the southern portion will prevail, and the people of that portion which is taken from North Battleford, the portion lying north of the river, will always feel that they are not properly represented, and that their representative has a greater interest in furthering the cause of the portion of the district

south of the river than in furthering the cause of the portion to the north. They will always feel that they have a grievance, and they will not be satisfied to remain in that situation; they will always want to get back to their old seat.

I believe that should be the paramount consideration in this matter. I think that is more important than considering whether 153 votes should go to one side or the other, and I think it is even more important than considering whether the population in each constituency is exactly the same. It is important that the population of each constituency should be as nearly equal as possible, but it is more important that those who have a community of interest should be placed in one seat, with those who have another community of interest placed in a different constituency. That is more important than the mere counting of heads. I submit that consideration to my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Turnbull) and the government generally, because I believe that if they consider the matter in that light they will admit that there is some justification in the claim of the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) that this territory should be restored to him.

Mr. HARRY BUTCHER (Last Mountain): It will take me but a very few minutes to explain the situation in the constituency I have the honour to represent, Mr. Chairman. I cannot complain that several townships, with a majority of Conservatives, have been added to my constituency with the view of lessening the chances of the Liberal candidate in the future. I cannot complain that several townships preponderantly Liberal have been removed therefrom. I cannot complain that a large number of Liberals have been added to the constituency in order to limit the prospects of the Liberal candidate in an adjacent riding. I can only complain that sentence of death has been passed upon the constituency which I have the honour to represent. The execution is to take place at the next general election. The body is to be divided into three parts. One part is to be buried in the constituency of Melville, another in Yorkton and the third in Long Lake.

You have been advised already, Mr. Chairman, that the representation in the province of Saskatchewan will be the same after the next election as it has been during the last two parliaments. In the past we have had twenty-one members, and after this bill is adopted we will still be entitled to twenty-one members. We agree with hon. gentleman

[Mr. Young.]

opposite that some sort of adjustment is necessary, because the population is not equalized as between the various constituencies. We were under the impression, however, that these adjustments might be accomplished by making alterations in boundaries, rather than by the elimination of some constituencies and the creation of others. Some of us supposed that because we were to have the same number of members it would not be necessary to make any change at all in the map, that we might continue with the constituencies we had in the past. We were informed, however, that there were objections to that course of procedure. One objection was that some of the constituencies were too low in population while others were too high.

I found myself very much in accord with some of the principles enunciated by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Stewart) during the course of his remarks a few days ago. He said that a redistribution should be based upon the population as disclosed by the census; that the unit in urban constituencies should be greater than in rural constituencies, and that no greater disturbance should be made with regard to existing constituencies than was absolutely necessary. Bearing in mind these principles I took the trouble to analyze the results of the last redistribution as well as the results of the present measure. I find that after 1924 we had seven constituencies with populations of less than 41,000, while under the present measure we will have six. After 1924 we had seven constituencies with populations between 41,000 and 45,000; after this measure passes we will have eight. After 1924 we had seven constituencies with populations of more than 45,000; we are still to have seven. With regard to the central constituencies referred to by the hon. member for Regina, those of Long Lake, Melville, Last Mountain, Rosetown and Kindersley, there is no doubt that the population was very low indeed, but I am distinctly of the opinion that the map first presented by the hon. member for Humboldt rectified those irregularities. I found that the unit of population in Saskatchewan was 43,861 and that Regina was left with 56,186, Saskatoon with 52,823 and Kindersley with 39,775, while the eighteen other constituencies ranged between 40,601 and 44,494. It did seem to me that it was unnecessary to eliminate any constituency or create any new ones; for that reason I greatly deplore the passing of the constituency of Last Mountain, and I believe my feeling in that regard will be shared by my constituents.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Melville): Everything seemed to be running along so smoothly this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, after my right hon. leader had spoken, that I thought I was going to get out of talking again in connection with this redistribution bill. This is the fourth day we have been engaged on the matter this week, and during that time I spoke for twenty minutes on Monday, in a very moderate way—at least for me—and everyone wondered just why I was pedalling so lightly. There were reasons for that, which I indicated at the time. I felt quite appreciative of what had been done with respect to my own riding, but I indicated that I could not remain in that condition of quiescence forever while my fellow members were suffering as I had suffered, and some of them perhaps to an even greater extent. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is one of the most cruelly used members in this house under this present redistribution bill.

Before I go further, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I may assume that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) is leading the house at present, and I should like to know if I understood the Prime Minister correctly in the remarks he made just before he left. In response to something said by the hon. member for Humboldt I understood the Prime Minister to say that the bill had been prepared and it was going through in its present form. I thought the Prime Minister meant that the constituencies we had disposed of would be put through, and that the right hon. gentleman did not want us harking back to Qu'Appelle and those other constituencies that have been practically dealt with, but that our attention should be devoted to the problems raised by the right hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon, that is, the questions of Prince Albert and North Battleford. I also understood the Prime Minister to indicate that the government was still open to conviction in regard to those two constituencies. I wonder if that is the position.

Mr. RHODES: I think the words of the Prime Minister must speak for themselves, but my recollection of them is not that of the hon. member for Melville. I did not understand him to say that the bill had to go through as it stood; what I did understand him to say was that if it were a question as to the opposition having their bill or the government having its bill it would be the government's bill

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, of course we were told that several times yesterday; we were given to understand that where there was a conflict between us that would be the situation. I will come to that later, but it will alter the tenor of my remarks very much whether I am beating the air or speaking for the purpose of trying to induce the government to yield to fair representation as they have done in regard to other bills. I do not see why this bill should be any different from any other. The government have acted wisely in not resorting to closure. I do not feel like complaining about the Prime Minister's absence, because he has been here almost constantly, and he cannot do that without some hardship and inconvenience. I therefore appreciate his presence when he is here. Unfortunately however, unless we know that we are talking to some purpose, we are merely beating the air, and if we do beat the air we will use a different kind of air than if we knew we were going to get somewhere as the result of our invocation.

I am not going to take the Prime Minister's statement that the matter is closed; I do not see how he could make such a statement after my right hon. leader's presentation. My right hon. leader presented the case unanswerably on behalf of Prince Albert and Battleford, and if the government wants to fight it could not choose any better ground for the purpose from our standpoint than the claim of Prince Albert and Battleford. "We don't want to fight, but by jingo if we do," and so on. We would rather not if it could be avoided.

I have a crow or two to pick before discussing the matter of redistribution, and I was almost going to include, for comment here, the remarks of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull). I will not do so however. That hon. gentleman intimated that I was only pretending when I presented a map to the late Senator Willoughby. Well, we will wait and see what the Tories will do when we are similarly situated. If it ever happens that we have no members in a province—and it might happen, because it has—and the Tories have the redistributing of constituencies, we shall see what advances they will make to give us representation on the committee, and we can then compare it with what we did. But in justice to everyone in this parliament I think I should refer to the statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin), who I am sorry is not present. When I was discussing this same matter of referring the map of 1924 to the late Senator Willoughby I wondered whether my statement was accepted as accurate. I said I hoped it was, but that if there had been a tribunal to refer the matter

to I could have wired those gentlemen in the west who knew something about it, such as Fred Johnston and John Millar; and the hon. member for Lincoln interjected. "And Senator Willoughy?" That appears in Hansard; that was what he said—well, I should not say that was what he said, because the hon. gentleman's remark was one of these unintelligible mutterings that I could not catch sufficiently well. My answer was:

I will not wait to ask my hon. friend to repeat what he said.

One would almost think I did know what he said, but I did not. I was anxious to get on with my speech and though many people might interpret the answer I gave the hon. gentleman to mean that I had heard what he said, as a matter of fact I had not. If however what he said was that I should wire to Senator Willoughby—and it is reported in Hansard—then there is one thing that the hon. member for Lincoln has indicated, and that is the kind of two-legged cattle they raise in Lincoln county. And if he did wire in the spirit in which he made that remark, he would get no response. So much for that gentleman. I think it is most unfortunate that not only the hon. member for Lincoln but many other gentlemen with whom I have had communication have discredited the late Senator Willoughby in order to discredit my evidence. That is going pretty far in politics, further than I care to go, and I do not believe that there is one man who will approve of that sort of thing apart from the man who made the remark—well, yes, there are two or three others because they have engaged in the same sort of thing.

Now I will come to the remarks of the Prime Minister yesterday. He made certain supposedly axiomatic statements, which have already been referred to by my right hon. leader, and indicated that under such circumstances there was only one thing and that was for the government's view to prevail. Let me quote what he said:

Undoubtedly where two courses were open our friends chose the course that was more helpful to them. . . . Is it not fair to say that hon. gentlemen opposite must recognize that fact, and to recognize the further fact that when a choice has to be made in one or two given ways you must expect that choice to be made in the way that will be most advantageous to the party in power?

Carry that to its logical conclusion and the government can decide everything that way. The leader of the government does not say whether the dispute is about a major or a minor fact or matter; if there is a difference, whether great or small—because he makes no distinction—then obviously it must be determined in favour of the party in power. That is gerrymandering, no matter how the Prime Minister glosses it over with nice phrases. It was a statement of policy on the part of the government; they were out to gerrymander. You can clothe it in nice language if you want to, but that is what it meant. And that is what they are doing, or trying to do. Later on the Prime Minister made a great deal about the fact that everyone on this side admitted that the boundaries of the northern constituencies should be readjusted—that Prince Albert was admitted to have a wrong boundary. Well, the very fact that we are engaged in redistribution is an admission of a certain growth beyond the old boundaries. The old boundaries are not essential nor inherently wrong, they are not wrong because of anyone's fault, but simply because the country has outgrown them. The leader of the government either intentionally or unintentionally tried to leave the impression that we had put our foot in it because we had admitted that the boundaries needed changing. Did you ever hear of such claptrap? That is what I call bunk, and it is my business to debunk the bunker, if I can.

I do not think there is anything else worth while bothering about in this statement of the Prime Minister's; he is just preaching what he practises, the doctrine of gerrymandering in its most glaring form. The pills are sugar coated so that they may go down slick and easy without causing the patient to make a wry face over them.

Now may I devote a moment's attention to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir), who was very ably dealt with by my leader. It will not take very long for me to dispose of him. It is an open secret that the Minister of Agriculture does not like my right hon. leader up there. Like Charlie McIntosh of Kinistino fame he wants to be cock of the north in that northland. Charlie is not looked upon as cock of the north now but possibly the Minister of Agriculture will indulge that dream a little while longer without molestation. I would not have referred to the minister's remarks only he made such an insidious suggestion. I do not know whether he intended it in that way but he spoke about the Germans as though they were something undesirable. He said that my right hon. leader got his majority with the German vote.

Mr. TURNBULL: There was not a single word said by the minister which could be considered objectionable to Germans or anyone else.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am saying that all qualified people should be given every opportunity to exercise their franchise. Have they not been promised all the rights of citizenship? Why then talk about them being Germans? The minister tried to make out that because they are Germans they should have separate representation. Could anything more unkind be said? He was going to segregate them, going to put them in a sort of isolation camp.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Like the Indians.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They will have them on reserves next. That shows how little he knows about the non-English settlers in the west. They want to be Canadians in the truest and broadest sense of the word; they do not want special representation or special segregation or special blather such as that handed out by the minister. This is especially true after what took place during the by-election when the minister's secretary was running against my right hon. friend. The minister spoke about the French, the Ukrainians and the Scandinavians; how their votes in the north seemed to be nullified by those of the Germans in the south. Are they going to give special representation to them all? Is that the reason for these little pocket boroughs? If the Germans are to have separate and independent representation, these others are entitled to the same thing. See what such nonsense leads to? Yet this is the sort of stuff indulged in by the Minister of Agriculture. He is a gentleman of parts, he is an educationist, he has lived in the scholastic world nearly all his life and he knows what is what. He is acquainted with the amenities of life; he is a university graduate. Yet, here he is. He must surely be hard put to it when he has to indulge in that kind of talk. If he is trying to cultivate the Mennonites with that kind of talk he does not know them at all. He speaks about the others living peacefully together, but do not the Mennonites live peacefully together? Is there a more peaceful and God fearing people in the world? They are the resisting ones who do not want to fight and some people think that is carrying peace to the extreme. Yet he is going to segregate them for representation purposes.

There was a little different tune played in the by-election of 1926. We all recall when our right hon. leader was defeated in North York. He was without a seat and, worse than that, we were without our regular house leader. The members of the Liberal party felt like a football team without a captain. It is true he was here for consultation purposes but he was not in the house. And we wanted him in the house. Eventually an opportunity was given by the good people of Prince Albert through the medium of Charlie McDonald, then the member for Prince Albert. He said that he would vacate his seat, and the present leader of the opposition ran in that constituency. There was great mortification on the part of the Tories down here. The papers and the air were blue with explanations about the big majority of 5,300 for Mackenzie King. How was that explained away? It was said that this majority came from the non-English, the Eskimos, the bohunks, the Austrians, and all the other things they were said to be. That went all over the country and I think that balderdash added about 1,000 to the majority. That stuff was printed in the eastern press, it was copied by the western press and proved to be just meat and votes for the Liberal side. That was possibly one of the reasons why the majority was possibly about a thousand more than normal. But it was still a great majority. The following is from the Toronto Daily Star:

> Prince Albert, where the Prime Minister was elected, is made to figure in opposition prints as a place where "the voters' list reads like the pay-roll of the tower of Babel"; a constituency "which contains about the smallest percentage of native-born or British-born electors of any riding in the whole Dominion of Canada."

They then proceed to show that that was a fictitious fable or, in other words, a lie and give figures in proof. The Toronto Saturday Night, true to its upbringing, had this to say:

> Captain Burgess had a splendid record as an aviator in the great war which did not count for much with an electorate largely alien in origin.

As long as it is not Sunday night that says that, I suppose we should not worry.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Charlesworth's paper.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The Border Cities Star were good enough to say this:

> This thrust at the west is a typically Toronto Tory utterance.

The Toronto Telegram, being true to its type, had this to say:

> The voters' list at Prince Albert reads like the pay-roll of the tower of Babel.

They then went on to say that the constituency of Prince Albert contains about the smallest percentage of native-born or British-born electors of any riding in the whole Dominion of Canada. There are more such utterances but I do not think I will tire the

committee by repeating them. The whole Tory press of the country was lousy with that stuff, so is it any wonder the majority was so large? The majority was jacked up by means of that kind, so naturally it dropped somewhat quickly.

I regret the necessity of making these remarks with regard to the Minister of Agriculture. I have not had occasion to refer to him critically for some time. I recall very vividly his first speech. I have forgotten and forgiven what he said regarding myself because I am quite sure it hurt him far more than it did me. But it gave hon. friends opposite some heart for about ten minutes. He referred at that time to my right hon. leader as being an "outcast". We will just let that go, seeing where it came from, and the apparent urgency to say something. There are very few people who have been in public life as long as my right hon. leader who have not had to find another seat at one time or another. As Sir John Macdonald used to say: It is the best apple tree that has the most sticks and stones under it. The man who is doing things has a lot of fellows at his heels during election time who would like to get rid of him. Very often they are able to get rid of him. The leader of this government was defeated in Calgary by Joe Shaw, but he was not then the leader of his party. Joe Shaw was one of the C.C.F'ers or whatever they were called at that time. There is no disgrace in that, so why make such an ado about the defeat of my right hon. leader under the circumstances recited this afternoon?

With regard to the bill as it affects Prince Albert—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am glad I am giving hon. gentlemen a little entertainment. They have been keeping very quiet and not saying very much because they knew I was giving them the facts. As regards Prince Albert, that constituency, as suggested by my right hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) this afternoon, is established on Sir Robert Borden's base line across the province from the Manitoba to the Alberta boundary, laid down in 1914 and confirmed by the Liberal government's redistribution committee in 1924, ten years afterwards, practically without any deviation. I think there is one place where it is five or six miles wider; I am not sure, but outside that, over the whole width of the province, 400 miles, it runs exactly along the line established by Sir Robert Borden and confirmed by Richard Bedford Bennett as a member of the redistribution committee of that day. Therefore we had these two great men, both prime ministers of this country, establishing that line on which we stand to-day. What better foundation could we have? What better base line from which to operate a campaign of education, if you like to call it such, towards this government, inducement, invocation, pleading for the cause of right, for justice to be accorded not only to the constituency of Prince Albert but to my right hon. leader?

I want the committee to understand that so far as I am concerned I am in this fight until justice is given. I do not know how long that will be and I am hopeful that we did not get the real meaning of the Prime Minister this afternoon; that the meaning of his words was not what the tone of them implied and that he is still open to conviction. I have far more faith in the Prime Minister's sense of justice than some people believe I have. If it were not for the hampering influences that are around him, he would have this afternoon yielded a point and a good big one. But of course the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) would have to be turned down and the whole map partly spoiled. I may say in the last analysis, as has been said two or three times to-night, it will not make very much difference in the first election how you jiggle up these seats, not a Tory will get a look-in anyhow at the next election. By chance we may have a number of other parties like the Equity Leagues and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and others of like nature; if they rush in and compete at all points, a number of Conservatives may get elected. That happened at the last election, and while not a single one of those special new groups were elected in Saskatchewan in 1930, two or three additional Tories were slipped in. That is liable to happen again, and that is why I have considered, since the C.C.F. have cropped up, that they or rather their leaders are the left wingers and allies of the Conservative party.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, they are their allies too; without them the Tories would not get forty seats in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Men have been killed before this for saying less than that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The Conservative party has been pretty nearly down to that before.

The constituency map of Prince Albert was first added to by two ranges on the east side

thereof. The government admitted, everybody admitted that the three northern constituencies should be made smaller. The government, as its first step, proceeds to make Prince Albert smaller by adding to it. By making it wider, they were given an excuse to pull the southern boundary up northwards as was indicated by my right hon. leader this afternoon. But how did they go about correcting the others? Let us examine that first, that is, Melfort and Battleford. How did they go about correcting the size of those two? Not by raising the southern boundary line the way they did so generously with Prince Albert, but they reduced Melfort and Battleford by running up a companion seat alongside, making it long and narrow; they ran up alongside Melfort the constituency of Mackenzie, a great big frontier country and gave it a greater population—I am subject to correction now—than the university city of Saskatoon. I think I am right; if it is not greater, it is in the same even thousands, 46,000; it is so close that it is not worth while making a distinction between them and one is a frontier country covering hundreds of miles of frontier while the other is the university seat of Saskatchewan. That is "rep by pop" with a vengeance! Nevertheless it served the purpose in reducing Melfort by taking a corridor along the east side, running it away up to the north pole and then taking another part off the west side of two ranges of Melfort and adding it to Prince Albert. First they took a good, substantial piece off the east side. In Battleford they did much the same thing; they took a great big chunk off it and ran it somewhere into the aurora borealis; I do not know whether it went the full distance or not. But the fact remains that what were formerly three large seats running into the hinterland are now five seats running into the hinterland. If that is the case—and it is—why did they adopt a different method with regard to Prince Albert? They broadened it in order to make an excuse for shortening it and then they say that they are not gerrymandering. They are about the crudest and coarsest bunch of gerrymanders that I ever ran across. They do not know how to do this without giving themselves away, exposing themselves to the gaze of everybody as they have done this afternoon; there has been nothing so rank as the exposure made this afternoon when it was discovered that the Liberal base was right on top of that established in 1914 by Sir Robert Borden right across the province, and that affects Battleford exactly the same way. Listen to my hon. friends opposite now! They are not cackling much. Pullets usually do a lot of cackling over their first egg. But there is no first egg over there; they are not laying at all; they are just quiet.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) knows quite well that my right hon. leader has a good case in regard to Prince Albert. If my right hon. leader suggested that a population of 45,000 would be quite reasonable for Prince Albert seeing that it contained a thriving city and we did not complain much about Melfort having only 36,000, and maybe less if the figures were checked up, surely we cannot be accused of being very exacting about some of these things. For instance, take Qu'Appelle. My good friend from that constituency knows what the situation is in regard to it. I have not said a word about it and I do not intend to say much; it is quite good enough for me. The 500 or so votes he has slipped over we can more than make up for by holding up the map.

But as regards Prince Albert, this is one of the most shameful, disgraceful treatments I have ever heard of by one leader towards another of equal status. I wonder for which of these deeds my right hon. friend is going to enter court? Is it an earldom or a dukedom or a marquisate or some of the other high positions of state that are at the disposal of His Majesty that my right hon. friend is to get for ruthlessly putting his heel on his political adversary? Is it for that that he is going to be so honoured in London? I trow not. Then what is it for? If he is to be an earl, why cannot he act like an earl? Why can he not treat his adversary like a man? We will want to know these things. I am not making these statements because my right hon. friend is out of the chamber at present. Let my hon. friends not think that. If he were in his seat, I would say quite a little bit more, as I have on other occasions. I do not get any answer about all these dukedoms and earldoms and what not. If that is the way they act now before they get them, what will they do afterwards? What will that sound like throughout this country, with people niggering along with the heels out of their stockings and the elbows out of their underwear, and then all this regalia and fine feathers. Somebody said behind me that he thought it would be Lord Gerrymander. I do not know how that would sound, but I think it would be quite appropriate if he insists on this bill going through.

We have always felt that we were on safe ground when we followed in the footsteps of Sir Robert Borden in redistribution matters. When Sir Robert put through the redistribution bill of 1914 the people of the west never knew it was going through; we never knew such a thing existed. Compare that with conditions of to-day. Look at this bill and the admissions it makes on the part of the government, the admission that they have their backs to the wall and that their only hope of rescuing enough of themselves for seed purposes is to get seats by stealth. I could go a whole lot further. I do not want to, but if the mild and gentle touch of last Monday will not have any effect we shall have to try the mailed fist; that is all. I had to stand the reproaches of some of my best friends on this side of the house because I was too gentle with the government last Monday and too complimentary to the Prime Minister. I do not mean that complaint to be made to-night. What is the use of casting one's pearls all over creation if they are going to be thrown back in one's face?

Prince Albert is a characteristically Liberal constituency, but what is not generally understood is that in Prince Albert there is a nucleus of the old Kildonan settlers who came out with Lord Selkirk away back in 1810 and 1812. We have all read that tragic story. I forget who was the captain of the vessel. It was not the captain of the Bright Fan. He got through better than the Bright Fan. He came through to Hudson bay, and the intention was to winter at Port Nelson. He was in a hurry to get back for fear of an early winter and he landed the settlers at Fort Churchill. The settlers had scurvy, and the guard that was there would not let them into the regular camp and they had to dig holes in the ground and live in those dugouts all one winter until spring, and over half of them died. Then in the spring they left and finally got to lake Winnipeg and on to the Red river, and to Kildonan, very much emaciated, and over half of them had died; children had been born in the meantime some of whom had also died. There is a wing of these early Kildonan settlers in Prince Albert to-day to whom a large stone monument has been erected. That stands as a nucleus of pioneering spirit in Prince Albert, and not so called bohunks and Eskimos and other picturesque figures that were represented as largely peopling that northern land. No wonder the Minister of Agriculture wants to hand out a little palaver to set himself right with the citizens of that north country. This is a bold and barefaced piece of fancy gerrymandering, without mercy and without shame on the part of the perpetrators. Look at them having to take all that. Would not that kill you? There is not much to them if they would take it without cause. They are either guilty or no good or both.

A word about North Battleford. I happen to know something about that town, and I know something about the old town too. My team drew supplies in 1885 from Qu'Appelle to Prince Albert and later on to Battleford during the rebellion. The old capital was on the south side of the river on a beautiful flat, and that is where the seat of government was for a few years before it was moved to Regina in 1883. Both are historic places, as indicated by the hon. member for Weyburn. When the first railway came it did not go through old Battleford, and there was great rivalry between North and South Battleford, and it was thought advisable to keep the two towns in separate constituencies for peace purposes. Later on they were joined provincially. I do not know why; I do not think it made any improvement. I want to point out that the assumption of the leader of the government is quite wrong when he says that provincial boundaries in Saskatchewan are tried to be followed in federal redistributions. We never thought of provincial boundaries of constituencies being followed when establishing federal ridings in western Canada. Neither provincial nor municipal boundaries were ever thought of for one minute in connection with the establishment of federal boundaries. Ever since there was a federal South Battleford and North Battleford they have been distinct and separate, and the right hon. the Prime Minister was himself on the redistribution committee that recommended that that should be so. North Battleford as an entity is the work of his own hand, and so is the Prince Albert southern boundary. The boundary lines of those two constituencies are the work of his own hand, and now he wants to deny his own child, his own progeny, his own product. I do not know where he is going to get a foster parent for it, but I think some of us will have to take up the cudgels for the child.

Mr. F. W. TURNBULL (Regina): Mr. Chairman, if there was any part of the redistribution map of Saswatchewan that could be said to be rank or anything gross or anything that was wrong it would be the east and west boundary through the constituencies of Last Mountain, Melville and Yorkton, which was granted to the hon. member who has just sat down as a result of the sympathy plea he put up through the committee and through all the press of Canada. In the face of the change that was

made to suit him personally in answer to that plea of sympathy, he has the ingratitude to stand here in the house and declare this to be a redistribution without mercy and without shame. If there was any possibility of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the house talking themselves out of anything they now have it is the kind of talk that we have had in the house this afternoon and evening, so far as I am concerned. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister held out the olive branch to the other side of the house this afternoon when he proposed a compromise for the constituency of Prince Albert that in all fairness and in all justice should have been accepted. It was a compromise that their own member on the committee declared was a fair compromise but it was repudiated upon his return to his own party, and the proposition was refused.

Mr. TOTZKE: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TURNBULL: I did not interrupt my hon. friend.

Mr. TOTZKE: It is a matter of setting the hon. member right. I do not know what the compromise was.

Mr. TURNBULL: At one time in the discussion, as the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) knows, a line was drawn across the map in my office, which line is still there and speaks for itself. That line represented a tentative agreement with regard to Prince Albert. My hon. friend says that it was at that time arranged that some 4,800 of a population added to the east side of Prince Albert should be removed, as well as the acceptance of that boundary. The line which was drawn on the map went right across the territory which he said was to be removed.

Mr. TOTZKE: Does my hon. friend say I drew the line?

Mr. TURNBULL: It was either put there by you in my presence or by me in your presence.

Mr. TOTZKE: I did not draw it, and I never made that agreement at any time.

Mr. TURNBULL: That offer was then made in writing, and my hon. friend will not deny that he received a letter with the offer in it.

Mr. TOTZKE: I read it to-day in committee.

Mr. TURNBULL: My hon. friend says that was part of a proposed general settlement. True, that is on his part. On my part it was an offer made without conditions, without concessions, standing by itself which could have been accepted by the Liberal side of the house and left the rest of the case for Saskatchewan wide open. In fact in the same letter I asked my hon. friend to join with me in defining the differences which would now remain between us with respect to the province, so as to narrow the field of discussion and hasten prorogation. My hon. friend refused to do it. He said, "You will either settle the whole of the map, or we will settle none of it."

Mr. TOTZKE: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member does not wish to be unfair. It is true I did not reply by letter, but he will admit that we discussed the matter afterwards.

Mr. TURNBULL: My hon. friend replied by telephone and refused it. There is no dispute between us on that point. Why interrupt?

Mr. TOTZKE: I refused the Prince Albert one.

Mr. TURNBULL: He replied about Prince Albert. There is no doubt about that point; he refused it.

Mr. TOTZKE: Absolutely.

Mr. TURNBULL: Absolutely, and at stages of the discussion he said I will either have to agree with him on the whole map or we would leave the whole matter open for discussion.

Mr. TOTZKE: That is not true.

Mr. TURNBULL: He said it again in the house to-night.

Mr. TOTZKE: I did not say—

Mr. TURNBULL: I have only forty minutes to speak. I did not interrupt my hon. friend, and I hope he will not interrupt me. Whether he said it or not, that has been the attitude of my hon. friend for two months—that and nothing else. I was presented with a map in the earlier stages of negotiations. I was told if I would accept their map they would concede some changes in the boundary line here and there. That was the attitude from the beginning. This afternoon, in spite of the refusal, my right hon. leader offered to restore the line which had been discussed by the hon. member for Humboldt and myself, if that would settle the trouble in Prince-Albert. I hope my hon. friends opposite are not going to talk themselves out of that concession, before they are through. It has been stated that the southern boundary line of the constituency of Prince Albert is the same southern boundary line that was established twenty

years ago by Sir Robert Borden. It is the first time in my life I have ever heard that a boundary established twenty years ago was like the law of the Medes and Persians and could not be changed when population changed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is not the point.

Mr. TURNBULL: There was not any point. The constituency of Prince Albert as established in 1924 was very far from the constituency of Prince Albert as it existed in 1914.

Mr. BENNETT: Hear, hear.

Mr. TURNBULL: The constituency of Prince Albert as it existed in 1914 went from the third meridian to the eastern boundary of Saskatchewan. It included all the territory now in the constituency of Melfort. The southern boundary line of the constituency was not the line established by Sir Robert Borden, so far as the west side of the constituency was concerned. The north Saskatchewan river was the southern boundary. The boundary north of township forty-one was the boundary from the east boundary of the province of Saskatchewan to range 7 west of the third meridian, and from there the boundary was the north Saskatchewan river to the western boundary of the province of Saskatchewan. Prince Albert constituency was delimited in 1924, as hon. members will find by reading the schedule in the act passed in that year, being chapter 63 of the statutes. They will find that practically a new constituency was established. The whole constituency of Melfort was cut out of Prince Albert, and there were taken into Prince Albert seven ranges from the constituency of North Battleford. Of course there were changes in population there, and when an hon. member in this house states that there was no change in the constituency of Prince Albert in 1924—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No one has said that.

Mr. TURNBULL: Anyone who says that is departing from the fact. Here is why hon. members opposite wish to leave the whole map open—we had an exhibition to-night when the hon. member for Humboldt criticized the plan south of the south Saskatchewan and Qu'Appelle rivers. Member after member sitting behind him repudiated his stand. Member after member got up and stated that he was satisfied with his constituency south of the river, and pleased with the fairness with which he had been treated. Not one member from that part of the country said there was anything wrong with the redistribution south of the river, and they repudiated completely the stand taken by the hon. member for Humboldt. He gets up and complains about the boundary line between Qu'Appelle and Assiniboia which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. McKenzie) states was arranged satisfactorily between him and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley). The hon. member for Humboldt has said that we were guilty of a deliberate attempt to gerrymander, to which the hon. member for Assiniboia was a party. He has said that there has been a deliberate attempt to give the hon. member for Qu'Appelle 500 Tory votes—

Mr. TOTZKE: Does that make it any better?

Mr. TURNBULL: The hon. member for Assiniboia states that he is satisfied.

Mr. TOTZKE: That does not make it any better.

Mr. TURNBULL: He complains about the size of the constituency of Swift Current. It is within a population of 701 of the very size he made it on his own map. There is all this fuss in a constituency of 46,000 people because there is a difference of 700 in the population. That is one of the great things wrong with this map, so far as the southern part of Saskatchewan is concerned. I had drawn a map to remove some of the population by extending Kindersley south of the south Saskatchewan river, and the hon. member for Humboldt went to room 429, protesting loud and long because I had disregarded the natural boundaries by going across the south Saskatchewan river.

Mr. TOTZKE: Did you make the change at my request?

An hon. MEMBER: Sit down.

Mr. VALLANCE: He does not have to sit down.

Mr. TURNBULL: In the same committee room the hon. member for South Battleford (Mr. Vallance) stood and told everyone in it that if the constituency of Melville was readjusted he would withdraw his opposition.

Mr. VALLANCE: I beg your pardon; I rise to a question of privilege.

Mr. TURNBULL: I leave it to the press or to any member of the committee. That is a sample of his good faith.

Mr. VALLANCE: I rise to a question of privilege, and it is this: The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) has accused me of making a statement I did not make. If he will allow me to state what I did say—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. VALLANCE: I will not sit down.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You are very polite over there.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman, what I did say in the committee was that if the seat of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) was reinstated, so far as South Battleford was concerned I would withdraw my objection. That is what I said, and I stood by it—until the bill came into the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. TURNBULL: I do not need to establish my case any better than it has been established right now by the hon. member for South Battleford (Mr. Vallance). What took place to-night is a test of the good faith of the hon. member to whom I am referring. It is a plan which was arranged from the start, namely that they would try to make political capital out of redistribution through accusations of gerrymandering. They knew the minute the map was presented they never intended to take it.

Mr. VALLANCE: Why did you abolish the South Battleford seat, with a population of 45,000?

Mr. TURNBULL: The hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young) told why it was abolished. The hon. member for South Battleford did not observe the truce with regard to his own seat. He has said that in regard to his own seat there has been gerrymandering, but the hon. member for Weyburn agreed with me that it was not for that purpose at all.

Mr. VALLANCE: He was dealing with the Battlefords.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Anderson, Toronto-High Park): I must ask hon. members to observe the ordinary rules of debate.

Mr. TURNBULL: My hon. friend from Willow Bunch (Mr. Donnelly) has only one complaint to make with regard to his riding, and that is that the historic name of Willow Bunch has been taken away and the much older and more historic name of Wood Mountain substituted therefor.

Mr. DONNELLY: It is not as old.

Mr. TURNBULL: Wood Mountain was a mounted police post for many years. Many people who travel through that part of the country have never heard of the Willow Bunch trail, but they have heard of the old Wood Mountain trail right down to the Hudson Bay post.

Mr. DONNELLY: If you are just as wrong in everything as you are in that you are away off.

Mr. TURNBULL: Several suggestions have been made during the course of the afternoon with regard to this matter of redistribution. One was that we should leave it alone, that we should accept what the Liberal party did in 1924. Any person caught with stolen goods can make that suggestion and say, "Leave it with us; do not take it away. We got it in 1924, so let us continue to have it." That is the proposition, in spite of the fact that it is admitted on all sides that there must be a redistribution in Saskatchewan because of the fact that the population in the north has increased by from 30 per cent to 71 per cent, while the population in the centre of the province has decreased.

Another suggestion that has cropped up from time to time during the negotiations, and in the course of the debate in this house since it began, is that we should let the Liberals do it, that we should take their map. They will alter a line here and there for us, but they are to do the work of redistribution. Hon. gentlemen forget that while they have been in office in Saskatchewan for twenty-five years, and were in power in this house the last time redistribution had to be dealt with, they are not always in power.

An hon. MEMBER: Wait till we get back.

Mr. TURNBULL: The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson) once told me that I spoke in this house too much for a young member. I would suggest to him that he speaks in this house too much for an old member.

Mr. SANDERSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I never said a word, and I want my hon. friend to take that back.

Mr. TURNBULL: If that is the case I apologize to my hon. friend, but I was of the opinion that he made a remark.

Mr. SANDERSON: I did not.

Mr. TURNBULL: Another proposition was that the judges should be allowed to carry out the work of redistribution. If the day ever comes when the members of this House of Commons are incapable, either through a lack of intelligence or because of a desire not to use that intelligence, of conducting their own business in their own way, then I will say it is time to let the judges do it. When hon. gentlemen opposite get into opposition they become very non-partisan; they do not want the house to do anything. Everything must be referred to an independent commission; everything must be referred to a commission

of judges; everything must be done in this way or that way, just so long as the government does not do it. Why did they not suggest some of these things when they were in office? Why do they not suggest that we all go home and let the judges do everything, because after all redistribution is only a matter of legislation, the same as anything else.

The fourth suggestion is that we should have proportional representation. This hoary old theory is trotted out again. We had it in the famous chart of 1919. When my right hon. friend says anything about this government not keeping its election promises let him never forget the chart and compass of 1919. At least we can say that we have tried to keep our promises, while my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition says he never intended to keep that promise, that he only made it as a sort of chart which he might or might not follow, according to his own sweet will. But he says, "Oh, we could not put proportional representation through because we had a hostile Senate." Hon. gentlemen opposite never tried the Senate; they never put it through this House of Commons. It was introduced here and withdrawn, and that is all the right hon. gentleman did. A hostile Senate did not prevent the right hon. leader of the opposition, then leader of the government, from sending the amendment to the criminal code with regard to section 98 to the Senate five times during the course of his period in office. I cannot say why he did that; he would get up and say it was not true, but the fact remains that the suggestion that he could not put through proportional representation because of a hostile Senate fades into insignificance when we consider what happened to the amendment to section 98 of the criminal code.

With regard to what took place in the constituency of Last Mountain, no person regrets more than I do that the result may be to eliminate the hon. member representing that constituency (Mr. Butcher). I made an attempt to prevent that elimination from taking place, but I could not do so because of the campaign put up in the press by the friends of the hon. member for Last Mountain, as he well knows. I am sure my hon. friend does not attach any blame to me with regard to what has happened. In a moment of weakness, probably, I did something which the speech of the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) would indicate that I should not have done; nevertheless it was done, and I hope the wheel of time will bring the hon. member for Last Mountain back to the House of Commons, because he is a member who is respected very highly on this side of the house.

I do not intend to traverse at length all those things which have been repeated over and over again this afternoon, nor do I intend to do what the hon. member for Melville deliberately tried to do to-night. The hon. gentleman stood up in this house and said that his friends had criticized him because he had not tried to provoke us sufficiently, and he was trying to make up for that oversight to-night. Because he could not sufficiently provoke us to-night he said we were no good or something else, simply because we respected that which he did not respect himself. When he speaks of the right hon. leader of the opposition moving from place to place I agree that he speaks from the bottom of his heart, because he has had bitter experience.

Some complaint has been made about the constituency of Moose Jaw being too small and the constituency of Swift Current being too large. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm), speaking in the house the other night, said some regard should be had to the number of votes polled in these various constituencies. I do not say that is the only factor to be considered, but I do say it is one of many factors that might be taken into account. The figures show that if the percentage of votes cast in 1930 was applied to the new territories of Swift Current and Moose Jaw there would be 22,667 votes in Moose Jaw and 19,729 votes in Swift Current. So while Swift Current is larger than Moose Jaw in point of population, Moose Jaw would have over 3,000 more voters on the list than Swift Current would have. There are many matters that must be taken into consideration as well as population; there are natural boundaries to be considered, and so on, and all these considerations must be applied in each case.

With regard to the constituency of North Battleford my hon. friend from Melville got into trouble again by saying we were sending five seats to the north pole or the aurora borealis or some similar place. His own friends on the opposite side want to do that; it is their proposition to send five seats to the north. It is true that at the present time we are sending four seats north, but not five.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If you count them up you will find that there are five.

Mr. TURNBULL: I should like the hon. gentleman to tell me what they are.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: North Battleford, South Battleford, Prince Albert and Mackenzie.

Mr. TURNBULL: My hon. friend is wrong; the proposition from his own side is that South Battleford should be sent to the north. On our map South Battleford has its northern boundary at township 53.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It goes up far enough, anyway.

Mr. TURNBULL: I do not propose to answer further arguments with regard to North Battleford. They have been repeated and they have been answered; doubtless they will be repeated again, but during the course of the whole afternoon not a single new argument with regard to North Battleford or South Battleford was brought forward. There has been repetition, it is true, but that does not add any particular strength to the argument, so I do not propose to pay very much attention to it. There has been nothing new brought forward with regard to the constituency of Prince Albert, except some statements which I have shown were not particularly well founded on fact. It is admitted that the boundaries of Prince Albert must be changed; both parties have changed them. It is admitted that something should be taken out of the southern part of Prince Albert, because both maps take something out of that southern part. It has been proposed to take two ranges off the east side of Prince Albert and put them in Melfort, leaving the south boundary where it was before. That was the proposition of the leader of the opposition. I attended him in his own room on Tuesday morning and we discussed that very proposition, and I pointed out to him that to do as he suggested would make the population of Melfort over 48,000 and leave the population of Prince Albert, with a city, around 45,000 or 46,000. As far as I knew, the suggestion dropped at that particular point. I thought the leader of the opposition was satisfied at that time that that proposition was not a feasible one. So far as Prince Albert is concerned, the population of that constituency is 50,896. The population of the constituency has increased thirty per cent in the last ten years. It includes a large territory to the north which is likely to develop into a mineral area between now and the next redistribution. There have moved into the area a considerable number of people, between 1,500 and 2,000, since the last census, and when we start with a population to-day of 39,000, allowing for people who have moved in since the last census, and allowing for the trend of population, I think we are pretty well following the precedent established in 1924 with respect to these northern seats. I think we are following that precedent when we start them slightly below the regular unit of population.

My hon. friend from Melville attempted tonight, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, to put into that gentleman's mouth words which he never uttered.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What were the words?

Mr. TURNBULL: There is not one word, there is not one sentence, there is not one paragraph, there is not one idea in what was said by the hon. member for Melfort which was as interpreted by the hon. member for Melville.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I quoted him.

Mr. TURNBULL: Yes, with the hon. gentleman's unkind interpretations, inferences and insinuations.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I quoted him.

Mr. TURNBULL: There is not one single word in what the hon. member for Melfort said that will bear the colour which my hon. friend opposite tried to put upon his remarks. There was not one single disrespectful remark made by the Minister of Agriculture with respect to any resident of Prince Albert, nor was there a single disrespectful remark made with respect to any resident of the old Saskatoon county, the new county of Rosthern. My hon. friend opposite is playing the same game that he has played all over Saskatchewan for the last twenty years.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Bah!

Mr. TURNBULL: There has not been an election since 1917 when my hon. friend and his friends have not preached racial prejudice all through the province—not even in 1930.

Mr. DONNELLY: Who started the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. TURNBULL: The hon. gentleman's friends in the United States.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Who started it first?

Mr. DONNELLY: Will the hon. gentleman deny that they were out parading in Regina on the day of his election?

Mr. TURNBULL: I don't know what you said.

Mr. DONNELLY: Can you deny that they were out parading in Regina on the day of your election, saying that they elected you?

Mr. TURNBULL: If they did I didn't see them.

Mr. DONNELLY: Deny it if you can; be honest about it.

Mr. TURNBULL: The less my hon. friend from Willow Bunch says about the Ku Klux Klan the better. In Saskatchewan they have cleaned up a number of things that might be quite interesting to the hon. gentleman, and they will clean up my hon. friend, the member for Willow Bunch, at the next election. Let me say that among the ranks of the Ku Klux Klan, so far as I know, there are many Liberals, respectable citizens in Saskatchewan, who are carrying on their business in a very respectable way, and the hon. member has no more right to cast slurs upon these people, who as I say number among their ranks some of the best citizens of the country, than I have to cast slurs on any other order either in Saskatchewan or in any other province.

Mr. DONNELLY: Why was it made a political organization?

Mr. TURNBULL: It is not a political organization.

Mr. DONNELLY: They use it as such.

Mr. TURNBULL: The constituency of Prince Albert, Mr. Chairman, has to be reduced; it is agreed that this is so. Now, let us see how far we can get on common ground. It is agreed that it must be reduced. Both maps produced show that it should be reduced, and it is agreed that the reduction must take place in the south; both maps indicate the necessity for a reduction in the south. The question then is only as to where the line should be drawn, and taking into consideration the trend of population I drew it where I thought right and proper. My hon. friend from Humboldt thought that a different line would be fair. I agreed to accede to his wishes and after I did so he threw the offer back in my face. I do not want to adopt the same language used by my hon. friend from Melville, about casting pearls before swine, but that is what happened.

Mr. TOTZKE: I have denied many times the statement the hon. member is making when he says that I agreed to it. I said it was only a suggested line which I would look into, and I telephoned him and told him that I could not accept it.

[Mr. Turnbull.]

Mr. TURNBULL: My hon. friend is quite right in a way. He said it was a fair line—

Mr. TOTZKE: I did not.

Mr. TURNBULL: —but he would not agree to it unless we agreed to the rest of the province.

Mr. TOTZKE: I said, "What about this line? Would you agree to that?"

Mr. TURNBULL: If my hon. friend did not think it was a fair line why did he ask me to agree to it?

Mr. TOTZKE: I did not ask you to agree to it.

Mr. TURNBULL: As a matter of fact, although the discussion has wandered all over the map of Saskatchewan to-night, picking up every little thing that could be picked up anywhere, the member of the committee who refused to be of any assistance in fixing up any of the details of the map unless the main propositions were agreed to—and I do not blame him, because it was the power behind him that compelled him to do it—now comes into the house and criticizes these little details in a map regarding which his own friends declare that it makes no difference anyhow because we could not elect a Conservative member in the whole province under that map. We have spent four days studying a map which, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, will make no difference because we cannot elect anyone under it. That is the exhibition which we have in the House of Commons in the closing days of the session. That is what hon. gentlemen mean when they say, "If you don't give us what we want we will hold the house in session and fight to the bitter end." That is the proposition that is put up to us; that is exactly where hon. gentlemen opposite stand.

There are only two points of major importance in dispute; one is Battleford and the other Prince Albert. That is all. The others, it is all agreed, are minor.

Mr. TOTZKE: I have more complaints to make.

Mr. TURNBULL: Both parties admit that in these two there must be changes, and both parties admit pretty well where the changes should take place. But my hon. friends say, "If you don't make the change where we want it we will keep the house in session." And then they tell us that they are not trying to govern the country by

minority; they tell us that they are reasonable and are adopting the proper course that representatives of the people should follow.

So far as I am concerned, the fact that not a single member south of the South Saskatchewan river has criticized his own seat or his own boundaries or any other boundaries is an indication that the redistribution south of the South Saskatchewan river is a reasonably fair one. It is true that there are constituencies that are smaller than the unit, and the time will come when the boundaries of these constituencies will have to extend northward across the course of these rivers. I do not think that the time is ripe for that at this redistribution, and my hon. friends agree with me because they have not proposed a single extension of one of these constituencies. If you divided the population south of these rivers into eight you could not get 44,186 in each constituency and allow for excess population in Regina. When I reduced the population in my own seat, when I reduced my majority by 300, by taking that population off, I wonder whether I was creating a deliberate Tory gerrymander in my own favour. I sought no advantage from the redistribution. The map which I made is to my own disadvantage but I think it is in the interests of the people of that part of the country just as is the map of the northern part. It is my own settled opinion that it represents justice to the people who will elect the members to the next parliament. No real criticism of it exists to-day beyond the fact that it is said that it will hurt the chances of some Liberal members of being reelected.

In one of the speeches made since this debate commenced, the right hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that redistribution should not be in the interests of a particular member or a particular constituency but in the larger interests of the people of Canada. Yet the whole fuss has been over the question of how this new constituency of Prince Albert will affect him personally. I would say that there are enough intelligent people left in Prince Albert constituency under the map as drawn to be able correctly to weigh the policies of th right hon. the leader of the opposition. If the boundaries now set are allowed to stand there will be between 38,000 and 39,000 people in this constituency. They are among the most intelligent people that there are in Canada, they are the descendants of the old Lord Selkirk settlers about which the hon. member for Melville (Mr. Motherwell) was moaning a few moments ago. If these men are not of sufficient intelligence to form a jury to weigh my right hon. friend and find him either righteous or wanting, I do not know where you will find them in the Dominion of Canada.

My right hon. friend complains that he does not want to be elected by 39,000 people; he wants a larger constituency of 51,000—this where there was an increase of thirty per cent while in other parts of the country constituencies containing a smaller population are considered as much too large. If the line suggested by my right hon. leader (Mr. Bennett) this afternoon is accepted, there will be an additional 6,600 of population. This would bring the total up to 45,000, or more than the average for the province itself. In addition to those which I have included, he would then have in his constituency a number of old-time settlers who have settled around Duck Lake and Carlton. These are French Canadians who settled there in the early days and their descendants are still in this district. It would not detract any from the intelligence of the constituency which will pass upon my right hon. friend's policy if it were allowed to remain as proposed, but perhaps he is afraid of one of the most intelligent electorates in Canada.

As I said in the beginning, the reason why I decided to unite four of these constituencies into three was because of the deficiency in population in the central areas of the province. I shall put certain figures on Hansard to indicate the condition which existed. It was suggested that because Yorkton was one of the largest constituencies there was no reason for its subdivision, but if hon. members will look at the rate of increase in population they will see the reason why this was done. The population of Yorkton in 1921 was 37,857; in 1931 it had increased to 38,692; under the new map it will have 48,473. There has been an increase in ten years of 835 and the average percentage of increase is 2.2. The population of Melville in 1921 was 36,842; in 1931, 39,338; under the new map, 47,499. There has been an increase in ten years of 2,496, or an average increase of 6.7. In 1921 Last Mountain had a population of 34,054; in 1931 this had increased to 36,507 while under the proposed map it will contain 45,518. In ten years there has been an increase of 2,453 or 7.2 per cent. In 1921 Long Lake had a population of 32,308; in 1931, 31,266 and under the new map it will have 42,146. In ten years there was a decrease of 132 and as the percentage was so small I did not attempt to work it out. In 1921 Rosetown had a population of 29,341; in 1931,

32,526 and under the new map it will have 40,708. There has been an increase of 3,185 or 10.8 per cent. In 1921 Kindersley had a population of 28,997; in 1931, 35,290, while under the new map it will have 39,632. There has been an increase of 6,993 or 24.7 per cent.

While the eastern constituencies had the largest populations they showed the smallest percentage of increases. The western constituencies had the smaller populations but they show a larger percentage of increase. In addition to that, the ratio of voters to populations is greater in the western constituences than in the east and that is why I seleced these four eastern seats for amalgamation.

I think I have covered all the arguments which have been made to-day and which had not been covered previously by myself. As I said before, I have no intention of repeating what I said the other day or in attempting to follow my hon. friends in what they have said. I merely point out that out of the members on the opposite side of the house who rose to-night to discuss the Saskatchewan map, five had no complaint as far as the boundaries of their own constituencies were concerned. All of them complained of the boundaries of Prince Albert but they have presented no argument which has changed the situation in the slightest. As far as I am concerned, I see no reason to be impressed by their arguments.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to add anything to what I said this afternoon, but as the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) who has just taken his seat made reference to some of my remarks, possibly I should say a word in reply.

The first point touched upon by the hon. member was the reference I made this afternoon to the advisability of having redistribution made by a commission of judges rather than following the method which has been adopted at this and the last two redistributions. I think I was careful to say that my suggestion did not apply to this redistribution. I recognize quite well that at this stage no one is thinking of changing the method of the present redistribution, but I realize also that ten years hence the House of Commons of Canada will be faced with a problem similar to that with which we are now dealing. I was careful to say that I thought every hon. member owed it to his country when he saw a position which he believed would better its future to state it. None of us can say what opportunities there may be for those who are now in the house to state a position ten years hence. Of one thing we can be perfectly sure: a very limited number of those who are here to-day will be here to speak ten years hence of what has taken place at this time. It was because of that and because of what must have impressed itself upon everyone who has been present during the past two weeks that I thought it advisable to say that when the House of Commons was again confronted with the question of redistribution of the constituencies of Canada, it would in my opinion be wise for it to adopt the plan of referring the whole matter to a commission composed of judges who would have the opportunity of viewing the situation impartially, not from the point of view of the self-interest of any individual member but rather from the point of view of the wider interests of the people of Canada as a whole. That is the position which I took this afternoon and which I take again to-night. Anyone reading the Hansard report even of to-night's debate must realize to how small an extent the redistribution being effected at the moment is based upon the foundational principle of the division of the various constituencies according to the general interest of the country as a whole regardless of how those general interests may be influenced or affected by the special interests of individuals who are sitting in the House of Commons at this particular time. I make that statement without reflection upon anyone. I was careful to say that the same thing might have applied to previous redistributions.

May I say that at the time Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in the house, when it was suggested that a commission of judges might be appointed for the purpose of making a redistribution, Sir Wilfrid himself opposed the idea. He said very much as the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) has said to-night, that he thought a committee of the members of the House of Commons would be not only as able but as honourable in dealing with the whole situation as would any commission of judges. I must add that the commission that was proposed at the time Sir Wilfrid made his remarks was one composed of judges appointed only by the government of the day. What I proposed was a commission that would have represented on it in equal numbers judges nominated by both sides of parliament, a body of six judges who should be chosen from among judges of the different provinces and who would be able to view the electoral map as a whole in the light of their previous experience as members of parliament, had they served as such, and in the light of all the information that could be brought before them by the chief electoral officer, members of House

of Commons, and others who might wish to appear. I believe that method would avoid what I think has been in some degree an unseemly discussion on a matter which is not one simply of legislation but one essentially judicial, where parliament acts in the capacity of a high court seeking to do justice and justice only to all concerned. The hon. member for Regina, who has just spoken, said that after all redistribution was only a matter of legislation. I do not agree with him in that at all. Redistribution is a matter of legislation, but it is also one essentially of justice in the redistributing of the constituencies of Canada in accordance with principles which will be observed above all else as fair and just. I believe those principles will probably be observed most fully if the matter is carried out in the manner which I have indicated.

I have no more to say on that topic, but I come to the next one to which my hon. friend referred. It was that proportional representation was a fairer method of providing for representation in the House of Commons than the one which we have at the present time of determining that representation by single member constituencies, constituencies arrived at in the present fashion. I was careful there again to say that I was speaking not of the present but of the future, in the light of our experience at this time. This is the moment for one to speak of these things, when they are present to the minds of all who are here. The Prime Minister has spoken of the obvious unfairness—he did not use those words; what he said was that it ought to give us all occasion to pause—but I take it that I am not misrepresenting him by saying the obvious unfairness of representation where a situation existed where all the members returned from one province were of one political party alone. His reference was to Quebec after 1921 when the entire membership from that province in the House of Commons was Liberal. He might have spoken of the absence of any Conservative representation in six provinces out of nine after the elections of 1921. The Prime Minister says that that ought to give one occasion to pause for reflection. I shall go a step further and say that a system which results in the body of opinion of a political party of an entire province having no representation in the House of Commons has, I believe, something lacking, something inherently wrong about it. It is not a truly representative system. I wish to go just one step further and point out to hon. members what the complexion of the House of Commons at the present time is as compared with what it would be were it truly representative of the electorate of Canada as evidenced by the votes which were cast in the general election of 1930. I am doing this, not for the purpose of stirring up controversy at the moment, but for the purpose of supporting by reference to actual facts as known to all, the argument which I have put forward that proportional representation is a much fairer way of determining the representation in the House of Commons, in order that it may represent minority as well as majority opinion and represent more truly the will of the electorate at large, than the system which we now have. The figures that I am going to quote are official ones given by the chief electoral officer. They are the same figures that will be found in his report, with this exception, that his report, in referring to total ballots cast, includes, I understand, all ballots, those that were discarded as well as those that were counted. The figures that I give are from an official statement given to the press by the chief electoral officer at the time of the last general election, and it includes the ballots which were counted but not those which were discarded. The numbers of the latter are so insignificant that they do not affect the argument.

The total membership of the House of Commons is 245. I am speaking now of the situation as it was when parliament came into being after the last general election. The total number of Conservative members is 137. That leaves a balance of 108 members including all who are other than declared Conservatives in the House of Commons. The vote cast on July 28, 1930, for the Conservatives was considerably less than that cast for members who constitute the Liberal party, the present Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and the Independents, all of whom are on this side of the house. I want to make that point clear, that though hon. gentlemen opposite to-day have the larger representation in the house, namely, 137 members, yet the 108 members who are sitting on this side represent of the actual ballots cast a larger number of votes than those cast for the hon. gentlemen opposite. I say to the Prime Minister that that gives pause for reflection. It is an indication that there is about the system under which our parliamentary institutions at the moment are operating, with respect to representation in the House of Commons, something which is not wholly sound, or just or fair.

The total vote cast on July 28, 1930, was 3,898,995. Of that total the Conservative

party received 1,909,955 votes. The vote represented by those who are now sitting on this side of the house was 1,989,040 votes. May I say that in that total I have not included what would have gone to the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) had there been elections in their constituencies. They were both returned by acclamation and I have left out the votes that would otherwise have gone to them. I think I am safe in saying the vote which would have gone to either of them would have increased the total vote that is opposed to the government.

May I now give the significance of these figures? A total of 1,909,955 Conservative votes returned 137 members. In other words, 13,941 votes were cast per member. On this basis, 1,989,040 votes, which represent the total number of votes that were cast for those opposing the government, would have returned 142 members opposed to the government. There would have been a larger representation in this house of those opposed to the Conservative party than there are members of that party in this House of Commons at the present time.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Would my right hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I do not wish to interrupt him. Has he any licence to say that those who sit as members of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the Progressive party, would have voted for the Liberal party had my right hon. friend been leading the government of the day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; I have been very careful to avoid saying anything of the kind, and my words appear in Hansard. I have spoken of those who are sitting on the other side as representing Conservatives returned to office, and those who are sitting on this side, but I have not said a word about—

Mr. MACDOUGALL: If my hon. friend will be indulgent enough to allow a word, I think he has talked of those who sit on the other side of the house as being favourable to the Liberal party and opposed to the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; I say that they are not supporters of the government.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: They are not supporters of the right hon. gentleman's party either.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not say that they were.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Why add them to your vote?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me make this perfectly clear. I know that some of them are distinctly opposed to our party. One has since the election become a member of the tariff board. I am not for a moment saying that they are supporting my party. They are not supporters of the government and, according to very sound doctrine, those who are not for us are against us. But let us come to the votes cast for the Liberal party and in this instance I shall leave out votes cast for Liberal-Progressives which will include some who sit on this side and who have supported the Liberal party on every vote. If you take the total votes which were polled for straight Liberals, not including Liberal-Progressives, or members of the C.C.F. or any independents or any Labour members, you have a total Liberal vote of 1,714,860, which would have returned on the ratio of 13,941 votes per member, 123 Liberals to this house, whereas at the present time there are 88 Liberal members. May I repeat, I am raising this question at the moment because it has been raised in the course of this debate and has been referred to again this evening by the hon. member for Regina. That is the reason I bring it up at the moment. It cannot affect the present redistribution, but, it is a matter which ought to cause all those interested in democratic government and the fair representation of opinion regardless of the particular shade of political belief to which that opinion may belong, to consider very carefully whether it is not desirable to have a fairer method of representation of the will of people at large in the House of Commons which has to do with the making of the country's laws.

There is only one other matter, Mr. Chairman, to which I wish to refer at the moment, and that is with regard to what the hon. member for Regina has said respecting the constituency of Prince Albert. My hon. friend referred to his kindness in coming to my office the day before yesterday, I think it was, to have a word with me concerning the map of Saskatchewan, or perhaps I should say more particularly the constituency of Prince Albert. I told my hon. friend at that time that I would not wish to say anything to him which I would not say on the floor of the House of Commons, and that what I was saying to him then was what I would say when I came to speak in the house. He will bear me out that those were my words and that what I said in the house this afternoon

was wholly in accord with what I said to him. That is where our conversation began and ended so far as I understood him. There were no undertakings or commitments in any particular, but I stated to the hon. member for Regina that I had understood the Prime Minister to say from his seat in the house that the government were prepared to do what was fair and just with respect to Prince Albert and would welcome suggestions and that I therefore would be glad to present the point of view which I thought was fair and just, but that I would certainly so far as Prince Albert was concerned leave the matter in the hands of the government. I think my hon. friend will bear me out in that. If that is true I must take exception to his saying that most of the discussion about Prince Albert has been simply as to how the matter is going to affect myself.

Mr. TURNBULL: Will my right hon. friend pardon me? He misunderstood my reference. When I made that remark it was not with reference to the conversation between my right hon. friend and myself in his room, but with reference to the debate my right hon. friend carried on in the house to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It referred to what was said in the house to-day? That is quite right. I am of course in the judgment of the house as to the significance of my remarks this afternoon. I was speaking this afternoon, as I said the other day, both as the member for Prince Albert and also as the leader of the opposition in the House of Commons, but I wish the government in its decision on this matter to consider the position of the constituency of Prince Albert, and to consider that alone. I do not ask any consideration as the leader of the opposition. It is for the government itself to say whether or not they think that position merits any consideration. But I do want to make a very strong plea for justice to the people of the constituency of Prince Albert. In that connection I have only to repeat that I cannot consider as just a means of altering the boundaries of a constituency which has to be reduced in size whereby you add to the constituency to begin with, a double row of townships on one side comprising something like four thousand additional persons. I cannot see the justice of that method of proceeding, especially when I have pointed out, as I have this afternoon, that constituencies in the northern part of Saskatchewan have been more and more narrowed with each redistribution. That is the exception that I take very strongly, in the first place, to the redistribution that is proposed in the government map. It adds to the eastern side of the constituency of Prince Albert a section from the adjoining constituency, a section which brings into the constituency of Prince Albert an additional number of some four thousand persons, a part moreover which is largely Tory. The constituency has already 50,000, and the government claim that that is too large and that its duty is to reduce it. Well, to reduce it by beginning to add to it does not seem to me a fair way of proceeding. It is against that in the first place that I wish to protest.

Another objection I wish to make is this. The unit of representation of Prince Albert as it stands in the proposed redistribution is away below what is the unit of representation of rural constituencies generally in the province of Saskatchewan as they appear on the map. It is down to 38,469 in Prince Albert whereas the unit in a rural constituency is 44,186.

Mr. STEVENS: Not rural constituency but the average for all.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the right hon. gentleman has confused two things.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING. The unit that is recognized, and my right hon. friend knows that where there are cities in a constituency we have pretty well agreed that the unit of representation should be above that in purely rural seats.

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And I have pointed out that the city of Prince Albert is in the constituency of Prince Albert, and that the constituency as it appears on the electoral map should therefore have above the average unit of 44,186. It ought to have at least in addition another couple of thousand. That at all events is my view of what is fair and just in the matter.

I would say further that the redistribution should seek to be impartial as between the political parties. If that may be considered a factor—I do not say it will necessarily be considered as such—but if it were to be considered as such the aim I think should be, where there has to be the taking away of any part of a constituency, that it should be taken away in a manner which will reduce in equal numbers or approximately equal numbers the representation of both political parties.

Those are the points that strike me as being fair. I am stating what I believe to be what the people of the constituency of Prince

Albert will regard as fair in the light of the position as it is. I do not wish hon. members on this side to keep up the discussion in order to attempt to force the hand of the government in any way as to what it is going to do in Prince Albert. I have stated the case so far as Prince Albert is concerned, and I propose to leave it at that and to abide, as of necessity I shall have to abide and the constituency will have to abide, by the decision of the government in the matter. But I will expect the government to do what they believe to be right, and they must be prepared to have their action judged in the light of the perfect freedom which they have in the matter of reaching a decision. I hope I am making clear the view I take. I am not asking for anything, personally. May I say to the hon. member for Regina that frequently this afternoon and in his remarks this evening he said my reason for stating my position was that I was afraid of something, that I was afraid of this or afraid of that.

Mr. BENNETT: He was adopting the language of some hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have not heard any hon. member from this side saying any hon. gentlemen opposite were afraid.

Mr. BENNETT, Oh, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think so. At any rate, the hon. member is free to choose his own language. I just wish to say to him that I am not in the least afraid of the consequences of a campaign in Prince Albert, nor am I afraid of a general campaign whenever it may come, so far as the fortunes of the party which I have the honour to lead are concerned.

Mr. MANION: The same applies on this side of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have spoken longer than I had intended. We have come practically to the closing hour of the day, but before taking my seat I should like to say just one word further about the Battleford constituencies. I do believe an injustice will be done if they are left in their present form. I mean, the form in which they appear in the redistribution map. Why should we seek the creation of new constituencies under new names, when at the present time we have names which form part of the history of Canada associated with particular areas?

Mr. BENNETT: May I draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to one matter which concerns me, and with which I have much difficulty. To change any one constituency in the area to which attention has been directed will necessitate the redrafting of the entire schedule concerning that area. It is a great difficulty. I know the right hon. gentleman opposite appreciates, as he did this afternoon, that the general quota is substantially the same in the whole area. obviously sometimes you have to add on in order that you may properly arrange the population—and this has nothing to do with politics. That was done in some of the seats to which reference has been made. The difficulty is if you change the Battleford constituencies and Prince Albert the whole matter is open again, and you have to rearrange all the northern part of the map. That was the stand taken by the representative on the committee: "You do this, and if you do not do it in the way in which we want it we will object to the whole." If the right hon. gentleman has any explanation I am most anxious to hear it—and I must say I have spent some time looking at the maps to-night. Just how it will be possible to follow his suggestion without recasting the whole, I cannot see.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to the Prime Minister that while it is perfectly true that in the negotiations, whatever proposals have been put forward from this side have been put forward in reference to a map which represented the constituencies as a whole, so far as the present stage of the discussion is concerned it is not our intention to attempt to continue the discussion on all constituencies. The hon. member for Regina has said some hon. members have not spoken, and he has concluded from that they were—

Mr. TURNBULL: No, no. I said they had all spoken, but had not complained of their own ridings.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It would be a most extraordinary thing if a redistribution were made in which every member would be so badly treated that he would have to complain about his constituency.

Mr. TURNBULL: It does not take much to bring complaints from that side of the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am prepared to admit we are all inclined to search out and it is our duty to search out what appear to us to be insufficiencies or inaccuracies. I wish to say at the moment, however, that we do not intend to go over the entire map of Saskatchewan and hold up this House of Commons simply to have our own way with

respect to any map which has been presented. I realize and have said from the start that the government has its majority. Further, the Prime Minister has made it clear that he intends to use that majority to have this redistribution put through. If it will facilitate conclusion of matters to have it known that our chief difference at the moment comes down to the constituency of Battleford, or Redberry as it is now proposed to call it, leaving the question of Prince Albert as I have left it, I would say that that, as matters stand, is the point of greatest importance.

Mr. BENNETT: Does the right hon. gentleman refer to the name or to the arrangement of the area?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I have in mind is that the constituency to be called Redberry should be permitted to retain the name of North Battleford. For the constituency to retain it appropriately the city of North Battleford, to which the whole commercial and industrial area in the north is related, ought, it seems to me, to be in it. And to arrange this is a matter of very slight readjustment, so far as I can see, because there is only the distance of six miles from the boundary of Redberry to North Battleford. Furthermore, the city of North Battleford is not very large. So far as we are concerned, I think we would approve of any adjustment by hon. members opposite which could be recognized as fair, even if it were to involve taking a corresponding population from one constituency and adding them to another.

Mr. BENNETT: Speaking from memory, I must say to the right hon. gentleman that to do what he suggests will necessitate a change in the constituency directly south, namely that of Kindersley. That matter was considered by the committee, and they found it impossible to adjust the population basis if the boundary of the new projected constituency of North Battleford were carried farther south and took in part of Kindersley. That would make an adjustment necessary in that area, and so on throughout, and the whole map north of the Saskatchewan river would have to be recast. The right hon. gentleman must appreciate that that is the real difficulty. I have looked at the map with great care to-night and I really do not see, in view of the arrangements which have been arrived at with regard to the general principles of equality of population, how such a change could be made. I make that statement frankly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have reached the hour for adjournment. I should like to ask the Prime Minister to take another look at the map to-night, to see if it is not possible, without in any way prejudicing the map as a whole, to make the slight readjustments which ought to be made. I have looked at it and I must say I cannot agree when he states that to do this will in any way upset the whole arrangement.

Mr. BENNETT: Did the right hon. gentleman look at the Kindersley situation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And Rosthern?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: And Rosetown?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. I think it is quite possible to take part of the immediate environment as between the two Battlefords themselves and make the necessary adjustment. However I shall leave the matter in the hands of the right hon. gentleman.

Progress reported.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put pursuant to standing order.

Friday, May 26, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SATURDAY SITTING

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved:

That on Saturday the 27th May, instant, the house shall meet at 11 o'clock in the morning. That in addition to the usual intermission at 6 o'clock p.m., there shall also be an intermission from one to three o'clock p.m., and that both the order of business and procedure shall be the same as on Friday.

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house resumed from Thursday, May 25, consideration in committee of Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. Morand in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 carry?

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Encouraged by the remarks of the Prime Minis-

ter a few days ago, in which he intimated first of all that he was not aware of the exact boundaries even of his own constituency in Alberta, and further encouraged by his subsequent remarks towards the close of his address on that occasion, when he said, as reported at page 5347 of Hansard:

> I am not yet advised as to the whole issue in Alberta and not having had an opportunity to discuss it fully with anyone who could inform me, I am not going to do more than say that I believe the former Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart, Edmonton) with his conciliatory spirit, and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy) will have no difficulty in working out that problem.

And again, on the same page:

> To-day the problem of the boundaries of Bow River is one of some difficulty, but I think there should be no really insurmountable obstacle in the way of its solution.

—encouraged, I say, by these remarks of the right hon. gentleman, I intend to devote a few minutes to the consideration of this question. What I propose to discuss is not so much the boundary of Bow River itself as the conditions in connection with the Calgary seats and the effect which that division has had on the rest of these constituencies. Before I come to that part of the discussion this morning, however, I must say that I share the views of many in this house, that redistribution left in the hands of those who are directly interested in its results is perhaps one of the unfortunate features of our so called democracy. After listening for several days, in patience and silence, to the somewhat bitter and acrimonious discussion that has been carried on, I do feel that the public interest would be better served if we could work out some practical method by which redistribution would not be left to us as members of the House of Commons. I do not however see the practical side of the proposal made by the leader of the opposition in that regard.

The leader of the opposition suggested that there should be set up a committee of supreme court judges, three from one side of the house and three from his party, I presume—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not say party; I said opposition.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There was no other possible interpretation of the right hon. gentleman's words.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but I was very careful to make it clear that the government represents one side of the House of Commons while all those who sit opposite represent the other side. I did not try and was careful not to limit the opposition to one party.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But there still remains a practical difficulty, because this corner, or this group on this side of the house, has never yet been in the happy position of being able to appoint judges. Again let me point out to the right hon. gentleman that in the division he makes he implies, what I think he did right to imply, that judges, no matter how high spirited they may be, might under pressure of political influences revert to their former political partisanship.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Quite the opposite was in my mind. I felt they would view matters judicially though with special knowledge.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Such a conclusion is inevitable from his suggestion that three be selected from one side and three from the other; he cannot get away from it.

Mr. STEVENS: You would have a political judiciary.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If on the other hand we could secure something as intelligent, poor as it may be, as we have in our election act, it would not be so bad. The chief electoral officer is appointed for life, and if the chief distributing officer were appointed for life, not subject to the continual whims or influences of political parties, then perhaps we could get somewhere. Let me say this to the right hon. gentleman. I will support any practical proposal that will place redistribution beyond the power or influence of private members, but at the moment I see no practical way by which it can be done. If I thought it could be done I would support it heartily.

I come now to the second constructive proposal of the right hon. gentleman, namely, proportional representation. He says that if returned to power the party to which he belongs and has the honour to lead will once more bring up this question in the House of Commons—I presume with the intention of putting it through the house. I am very glad indeed to hear him say that, but my pleasure in the matter would be much greater if I did not have vividly in my mind a recollection of what has taken place in connection with this very question, during the government of the hon. gentleman. He was careful to say yesterday that his own ministry had introduced a bill into the house. He did not say just why it was not proceeded with but in soft tones he implied that it was because of the position of the Senate. What are the

facts? They are set forth in the journals of the House of Commons, sessional papers 1916 to 1930. In 1917 a motion was made by Mr. Turriff that necessary legislation should be enacted. There was a debate thereon which was adjourned as so often happens with these private members' resolutions. In 1921 a further resolution was introduced that some system of proportional representation should be adopted. An amendment was moved by Mr. Calder that a subcommittee should be appointed to consider the subject, and this was agreed to. The committee was appointed by leave, and there was a motion by Mr. Davidson to reduce the quorum, to report from time to time, to have leave to print and so on. The first report appears on page 391 of the records of that year. In 1922 there was a resolution to adopt the alternative vote method moved by Mr. Good, but the debate was adjourned. In 1923 there was a resolution to adopt the alternative vote method. That also was moved by Mr. Good who was a member of the group in this corner of the house. He came from Brant and I think he sat in the seat now occupied by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner). The motion moved in 1923 was agreed to. In a moment I will check it up and see what happened. It will be noticed that that was a motion to adopt the alternative vote method in constituencies like city constituencies. That was carried by the house at a time when my right hon. friend's party was in power. But no further move was made in that direction. In 1924 there was a resolution to adopt the alternative vote method, also moved by Mr. Good. The debate was interrupted by the six o'clock closing rule for Wednesdays.

Mr. STEVENS: May I interrupt my hon. friend? Has he the record there of what happened to the resolution regarding the alternative vote?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, I have the whole record. In the year 1924 the former Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) introduced Bill No. 128. The purpose of this bill as stated in the explanatory note was to make to the Dominion Elections Act the amendments necessary to provide for the single alternative vote at any election when three or more candidates had been nominated and only one member was to be returned. That bill was given first reading and then allowed to stay on the order paper. In 1925, the hon. gentleman introduced a similar measure, the purpose of which was precisely that of the bill of the year before. All of us who sit in this corner of the house know perfectly well why that bill was introduced, why it was placed upon the order paper, and why it was given only first reading. The only reason was to prevent further embarrassing discussions of the subject from this corner of the house. It was nothing more or less than that. I have a too vivid recollection of what happened. Why was not the bill given second reading so that there could be an intelligent debate? Why was it not sent to a committee, if necessary? The right hon. gentleman would have had the support of this group, and it was no mean strength at that time. Why did he not challenge the Senate when with the two groups combined he had such an overwhelming majority as to make it beyond question that the bill would carry. But he went no further in the matter. According to the records of 1923, I find that Mr. Good, seconded by Mr. Brown, then in this corner of the house, moved a resolution This contained many whereases and ended up with the resolve that in the opinion of this house an alternative vote method should be adopted for use in future elections for this house in all single member constituencies where more than two candidates were running for election. After a debate thereon, the motion was agreed to without division. The records of 1923 show that. May I ask my right hon. friend why this legislation was not pressed through in view of the non-contentious character of the decision of the house on that occasion? In the same year another resolution was introduced by Mr. Good, again seconded by Mr. Brown. After many whereases it resolved that in the opinion of this house, for the purpose of demonstrating the working and effects of the system of true proportionate representation, one or more multi-member constituencies should be constituted by the redistribution legislation in which that system should be applied at the next general election. There was a chance to pass that resolution and pass that legislation. It was not a sweeping form of proportionate representation, such as is now proposed, but only a moderate experiment to see if it would work out and if it really was subject to all the frailities and flaws to which it is said to be subject. What happened? When the vote was taken, although the right hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Quebec East voted in fav-

our of the motion, among others, there was lined up the following Liberals against:

Mr. Benoit	Mr. Maclean (Halifax),
Mr. Binette	Mr. MacLean (Prince)
Mr. Bouchard	Mr. Malcolm
Mr. Boucher	Mr. Marcil
Hon. Mr. Cannon	Mr. Martell
Mr. Dechene	Mr. Michaud
Mr. Deslisle	Mr. Marler
Mr. Denis (St. Denis)	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Duff	Mr. Power
Mr. Fafard	Mr. Rinfret
Sir Lomer Gouin	Mr. Roberge
Mr. Macdonald (Pictou)	Mr. St-Père
Mr. King (Kootenay)	Mr. Séguin.

There were five or six ministers who voted against that motion and I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he has consulted those ministers and received their consent as well as the consent of these various genial French Canadian members to the legislation which he now proposes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say that the matter has been discussed and agreed to in a Liberal caucus.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am afraid that it was also agreed to by the party upon a former occasion. I am pointing this out in all kindliness because we do not want to be disappointed again. If the right hon. gentleman does come to power again we want to nail him down now to this principle.

Mr. STEVENS: They are just kidding the troops.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. gentleman's party has kidded us plenty.

Mr. STEVENS: I have always voted against it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But on other questions. I am not so sure that the promises of my hon. friend's party have been always implemented. I do not think they are in a position to cast any stones.

There is the record and the right hon. gentleman says that he will introduce a bill. I may say that if I am here at that time I will support it and I am quite sure that if the group in this corner is back again—I do not think there is any question but that it will be back in greater strength—it will give its full support to such a measure.

Mr. STEVENS: Do you think that promise is safe?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The right hon. gentleman can rest assured that whatever government is in power, this group will support any measure for proportionate representation or even the single transferable vote.

As a matter of fact if that is not done we will see that they get the opportunity.

There can be no two views as to the justice and the logic of the position taken in regard to the necessity for this alteration. I say frankly to any hon. gentleman present who is concerned with serving the public interest and getting just representation that there can be no two thoughts on this question. Let me give the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) another illustration. He heard the excellent one given yesterday by the leader of the opposition in connection with the actual results of the last elections. These results are wholly unjust and out of proportion to the actual votes cast.

I come now to the Irish Free State election of 1933. Ireland is a country in which proportional representation has been put into effect and in which it functions admirably. Indeed, so efficiently does it function now that the whole world was astonished at the rapidity with which the results were published after the general election of January, 1933. The complete fairness of this method was indicated in the figures that were published in pamphlet No. 73 of the Proportional Representation Society. The parties are grouped into two lots: the De Valera group and Labour who were cooperating and the opposition group consisting of the Cosgrave group, Centre and Independents. The De Valera and Labour group polled 770,968 votes and won 185 seats, or 9,070 votes per seat. The Cosgrave, Centre and Independent group polled 615,358 votes and won 68 seats, or 9,049 votes per seat, almost an identical number. Approximately 9,000 votes elected a member, exactly corresponding, as I have suggested, to the support that was given. It should be noted, however, as was pointed out by the Ottawa Citizen in an editorial the other day, that in these figures are included the university seats and the seat of the Speaker, the candidates for which were returned by acclamation. If we exclude these, we find that the total vote cast for the De Valera and Labour group was 768,889 and that 82 seats were won, or 9,376 votes per seat. In the other group, 613,666 votes won 64 seats, or 9,528 votes per seat, an almost exact reflection of public opinion.

Let us compare this with the British election in 1931. In Great Britain in that election the National party, formed as it is of many parts, polled 14,519,016 votes and won 491 seats, or 29,000 votes per seat. Labour on the other hand polled 6,649,630 votes, but won only 46 seats, this working out at 144,000 votes per seat, whereas the National party won its election and power on 29,000 votes per seat. No other argument is necessary than to give illustrations of that character. I admit

there are practical difficulties, geographical difficulties, difficulties of area and all that sort of thing, but none of them is insurmountable. In Ireland they have worked out this method for the whole nation on an intelligent basis under which, as I have just indicated, the results are as happy as they have been.

Mr. STEVENS: Is my hon. friend aware that this was tried for a number of years in British Columbia, in Vancouver, New Westminster and other places, and that after an earnest trial it was discarded?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It was also tried in Winnipeg. It operates as a single transferable vote method in Alberta for provincial elections with every satisfaction; so far as I know there is nobody in that province who is not satisfied with the results. Just because the forces of reaction were stronger in British Columbia than were the forces of progress is no reason for suggesting for a moment that the principle is unsound or impracticable.

I now revert to the question of the redistribution in Alberta and again I quote the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett):

> To-day the problem of the boundaries of Bow River is one of some difficulty. but I think there should be no insurmountable obstacle in the way of its solution.

I am prepared to accept the words of the right hon. gentleman when he said that he was not even aware of the exact boundaries of his own constituency. I am prepared to accept his words when he said that he had not yet been fully informed as to the whole issue in Alberta. May I in a few words that will be as noncontentious as possible, indicate to him precisely, as I see it, the situation in my province?

Mr. BENNETT: I have gone over the map since.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am very glad. I had hoped that that had been done and that some reasonable arrangement could have been arrived at, but apparently it is hopeless. Calgary is a city of exactly 83,761 population. In the city of West Calgary my right hon. friend holds his seat. The city of East Calgary did the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Stanley) the honour to elect him. The city of Calgary with a population of 83,761 would, with the addition of a very small proportion of agricultural territory in its neighbourhood, perhaps with the addition of a very little beyond the surburban townships, have resulted in an excellent two-seat city, and on the principle that industrial population should be kept as closely as possible to itself, this would have been an excellent two-seat city. What has happened? For some reason and I am not going to say for what purpose I think it may be—

Mr. BENNETT: There has never been a two-seat constituency in the west.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I mean two constituencies to the city. I am glad the right hon. gentleman has helped me to clear that up. I do not understand why it has been divided virtually into three seats, for that is actually what has happened. It seems so illogical, so unfair to divide a city of that small size into three seats. On the same basis the city of Montreal would have about twenty-five seats, Vancouver between eight and nine, Winnipeg eight and Ottawa around five, with the addition of the country territory around; as has been done in the case of Calgary. Obviously this is unfair; it it not the just system of redistribution of which the right hon. gentleman has spoken.

The old East Calgary constituency embraced part of the city and a part of rural territory, about twenty-four miles wide by about thirty-six miles long running immediately north of the city. For some reason the hon. member for East Calgary desired to get rid of that and he abandoned his old rural East Calgary. He then also desired apparently to get rid of a part of industrial East Calgary, in fact a large portion, amounting, I am informed to 19,000 or 20,000 people out of a population of 83,000. For the new East Calgary is carved a channel down through the centre of the city and it is extended onward along the boundary of the Bow river down to a line south of Okotoks and then west to take in the Turner valley oilfields. This is an amazing constituency, an astonishing one to make. I would like to know why it was necessary to give up old rural East Calgary or industrial East Calgary. Surely these people were faithful to the hon. gentleman in the last election, but now he is willing to cast them to the chilly waters of Bow river and to betake himself to the warmer and ever green pastures of Turner valley. I cannot for the life of me understand why the hon. gentleman did this unless he is afraid he cannot be elected again in the old constituency of East Calgary. That may not be just to him; I do not know. But that is the only reason that comes to my mind as possible at the moment for his extraordinary action.

Now will hon. gentlemen note that having once made such a distribution of the Calgary population and having taken in a large portion of the old constituency of Macleod, the constituency of Macleod was left without sufficient population, and so Macleod is ex-

tended out into the southern portion of Bow River. That is the first dislocation that results from what the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Stanley) has decided upon. Medicine Hat, a constituency that like the southern Saskatchewan seats suffered from drouth for many years, and depopulation consequent thereon, had fallen below the necessary quota. Its actual population was 32,709, and evidently it was desirable to build that up. Now the constituency of Lethbridge had a population of 47,871, or over 3,000 more than was required for the quota even if 44,000 was to be regarded as a fair quota for rural constituencies of the character of Medicine Hat, Macleod and so on, which by the way I would not for a moment attempt to sustain. It is my impression, and I am upheld I think by all fair-minded persons, that city constituencies should always have a larger unit of representation than rural areas which are more difficult to cover, and for various other reasons which were given in the discussion yesterday.

Be that as it may, here was a constituency absolutely adjacent to Medicine Hat from which a surplus population could be drawn without injury either to the people themselves or to the sitting member. It would not have disposed of his seat or affected him in any way whatever. It would have taken in a few townships from the eastern side of Lethbridge and added them to Medicine Hat, and in that way built up its quota to a fair degree anyway. But instead of that the new Lethbridge constituency is left with a population of 46,401. Again I ask the question, why? It has been said, because the people living in the eastern townships of Lethbridge had a greater community of interest with Lethbridge than with Medicine Hat. That argument, if it is valid in that case, must be valid in other cases, some of which I shall cite in a moment or two. But it is not valid. It has never been regarded as valid. Look at the shifting around of population all over this country in this present redistribution. The convenience of the people concerned in a district must sometimes be affected by the actual requirements as a result of over- or under-population.

Medicine Hat, then, had to have population, and so they came to Bow River and took a second bite at the cherry, and they have just about destroyed it at that. The second bite runs up along the Canadian Pacific railway line to just west of the town of Strathmore. The right hon. leader of the government knows as well as I do that the interests of the people of Strathmore and of Gleichen and of those little towns in between are far closer to those of Calgary from which Strathmore is distant twenty-eight or twenty-nine miles, and from which Gleichen is distant forty-eight miles, than they are to those of the city of Medicine Hat, from which they are distant some 132 miles. But for some purpose, population or other, the boundaries are moved up to embrace the towns of Strathmore and Gleichen.

It just happens by a strange turn of the wheel of fortune that I reside in the town of Gleichen, and therefore under this redistribution I will reside in the constituency of Medicine Hat. But, Mr. Chairman, I am not protesting on that basis, and for this reason: When I was elected in 1921 the constituency of Bow River ran far north of Drumheller and embraced my farming place and my home town. After the hon. gentlemen to my right, the Liberal party, redistributed the constituencies in 1924 that constituency was shortened up considerably, by 27 or more miles, and it left me just 27 miles outside the boundary of my own riding. So this is the second time that I have been redistributed out of my constituency. But notice that whilst since 1921 I have resided 27 miles outside of my constituency my good friends in the constituency have been loyal to me and have elected me three times, in 1925, 1926 and in 1930. So I cannot argue that being resident outside the constituency is any great handicap in my case, nor would I so argue. As a matter of fact, I have sufficient confidence in the loyalty and intelligence of the people of that portion of Alberta and of western Canada to know that it does not much matter what is done in regard to that particular seat. The only thing I am pointing out to the right hon. gentleman is that this injustice is being done to the population in Strathmore and Gleichen. It is utterly unjust to Strathmore especially, and to a slightly lesser degree to Gleichen, to be tacked on to the city of Medicine Hat in the Medicine Hat constituency 132 miles away, while they are respectively only 28 and 48 miles away from the city of Calgary.

There may be an explanation for all these things but I cannot for the life of me see what it is. When I learned what was being done I did what was expected of me in the ambit of my duty. I saw our representative on the committee, the member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy), discussed the matter with him and told him that I looked upon this as a quite unfair form of redistribution, and he unavailingly took the matter up with the chairman of the subcommittee, and came

back to me and said, "You had better prepare an alternative map." I went to work and prepared an alternative map, no easy task for one without an adding machine, but we prepared one and I submitted it to the whole caucus of our group on two occasions, and on two occasions they endorsed it as the fairest in every way. It displaces no person from his riding. It displaces materially no boundary line, except for a township or two, shifting them around a little, and it gives a fair unit of representation. Let me point out what it is. Under the proposal that I made both to the subcommittee and to the main committee, Macleod would have 41,855; Lethbridge, 41,011; Bow River, 41,565; Medicine Hat, 40,347; and the two Calgary seats 47,600 or 47,700 apiece, as best determined between the two sitting members for Calgary. It would have left Calgary still a two-constituency city. That is the feature evidently that it was thought desirable not to retain. The map I have submitted is absolutely fair. It disturbs nobody, and it leaves the boundary lines just in the general direction they were in before.

When this matter was discussed it was pointed out that that "impassable river" called the Bow river should be regarded as the boundary line and should be a factor in the redistribution. But, Mr. Chairman, strangely enough the impassable character of rivers has not always been used as a reason for a just redistribution but frequently has been used for an unjust redistribution, as in this particular case. The Vegreville constituency was extended north over an impassable river over which there is only a single bridge in the whole district, and it was extended to embrace a Ukrainian settlement. I have no objection whatever to that. I think that was the intelligent thing to do and I am raising no objection, but I am pointing out that a river was crossed although it was an impassable river. Let us take a look at the Bow river. In this very portion of the river that is under consideration there are no less than three splendid provincial bridges, steel structures, and traffic moves freely to and fro, winter and summer. It is the height of absurdity for any hon. gentleman to contend that the river is any longer an impassable boundary. The community of interest between one side and the other is complete. As a matter of fact, as the right hon. leader of the government knows, the population of that district south of the river, the Arrowwood district, travel across the river either at Cluny, at Gleichen or at Carseland and move on up to Calgary when they take their motor trips to the Calgary stampede or for business reasons or to purchase supplies. The right hon. gentleman knows that as well as the hon. member for East Calgary. Yet this form of redistribution is to be enacted. Let me assure the house and government, and particularly the government, that in my view they would be well advised to reconsider the distribution of these six constituencies; only six are involved. The boundary lines of North Calgary on the north side, Bow river on the north side and Medicine Hat on the north side remain practically unaffected, except for a small jog to take in East Coulie. To that, again, I have no objection. But it does not affect any of the constituencies in the north of the province. Apparently it does not concern them. Those six constituencies might be redistributed on a fair basis; in my view the present basis is quite unfair. It disturbs the lines everywhere, disturbs the population everywhere. The point I wish to make this morning is that Calgary should not be divided into three seats, because such a change would be an injustice to the labour element of the city. It would weaken their position. Secondly Gleichen and Strathmore should not be tacked on to the Medicine Hat riding.

Mr. G. D. STANLEY (East Calgary): I shall not deal with the first part of the address of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) in connection with the general subject of the electoral system. At this time it is an academic question, because we have long since passed the point where we must make any decision on matters of that kind. An interesting point, however, and an interesting piece of information which I think should be extended to the house and which the hon. member avoided very carefully was an analysis of the condition of representation in the legislature of the province of Alberta. As he intimated we have proportional representation in force in two of the cities, and the alternative vote in the provincial constituencies throughout the province. Therefore we should have a fair report from the results of the elections in those places. I regret I am not able to give the exact figures, but I understand there are in the neighbourhood of sixteen members, all told, who are not listed as supporters of the government, and whose aggregate vote exceeds that of all the government members put together. There is a chamber of sixty-one members. The government party in that legislature has a very large majority, but the party in majority holds office on a minority vote—a very considerable minority vote. Some time later we may be able to discuss that situation.

However, coming to the immediate question which concerns us to-day in regard to redistribution in the province of Alberta and particularly that part of it which refers to the constituency of Bow River, first allow me to deal with the map which the hon. member himself prepared. This matter was fully discussed in committee; all representations were made there. The subcommittee met dozens of times and discussed the whole situation. In my view the rehashing of these details before the house serves no useful purpose. May I emphasize the fact that the hon. member who has just spoken stands out as the lone objector from the province of Alberta. There was agreement between the two hon. members representing the Liberal and Conservative parties. There may have been some small objections, but there have been no serious objections raised by representatives from other constituencies in the province. Some other hon. members may have some objections concerning the particular constituencies to which the hon. member has referred, but we have not heard of any serious objection being taken. In a few moments I shall deal with the details of his remarks.

First allow me to take the map which he has presented. It is a model of straight lines; there is no question about that. It is made with the idea of having straight lines, without any consideration for natural boundaries. The hon. member has been the author of these proposed straight line constituencies, and he still insists upon placing those straight lines to suit his own convenience. In our redistribution we took cognizance first of natural boundaries and secondly of community interests. In spite of what the hon. member has said, that section of the province of Alberta located south of the Bow river never has had and has not at the present time any community interest with that portion north of the Bow river, and particularly those people living in the Drumheller valley. To most hon. members these names may be only terms, but to the people living in the province of Alberta they mean more than that.

The constituency of Bow River came into existence in 1924. I am informed it was formed from the leftovers, after all the rest of the province had been redistributed. I have no doubt about that. Certainly it presents a leftover constituency, and as Bow River exists to-day I consider it has the most unfair representation of any portion of the province of Alberta. The hon. member proposes straight lines to continue the condition existing in Bow River to-day. To that the committee cannot agree. Personally I certainly cannot agree to it. I state that the constituency as framed violates every idea of fair representation. Let us turn to the constituency of Macleod, to which the hon. member has referred. That portion of the constituency of Bow River south of the river which now becomes part of the constituency of Macleod naturally belongs to Macleod. It has and always has had a community interest with Macleod that no other constituency can claim. It extends eastward to the Bow river, and in spite of what the hon. member has said, there is an insuperable barrier between the Macleod constituency on the west and the Medicine Hat constituency, as proposed, on the east. It is a natural boundary. Having lived in that portion of the country, having covered almost every yard of that whole country from top to bottom by horse and otherwise, I know the country; and I know this, that the farmers of the early days who came and settled west of the Bow river came over to the Calgary and Edmonton railway and marketed all their grain in the Calgary and Edmonton towns prior to the construction of the present railways. That country now is traversed by two other lines of railway running generally north and south, and it is covered by some of the most excellent highways of any province in the country. So there is a community of interest beyond dispute.

Now the hon. gentleman says that Macleod is over the quota. It is, I admit. Personally it was my desire that a portion of Macleod should still belong to the proposed East Calgary constituency. But it was represented that it would be preferable from the standpoint of the member representing Macleod that that portion which would naturally come in should remain in Macleod. Personally I have no objection whatever to it coming in. Even yet I am quite prepared, if hon. gentlemen, or the hon. gentleman who represented the corner in the subcommittee, would consent I would be quite happy to have it come into East Calgary, because that particular portion was my old home and my constituency in the province of Alberta. But in all fairness I do think yet that it belongs to Macleod constituency. In a moment I shall explain what I mean by that.

Coming to the Lethbridge constituency may I say that in its centre is the town of Lethbridge, and radiating out of Lethbridge are the various railroads, including the Crowsnest pass and the railway to the south. Inseparably connected with the city of Lethbridge are the irrigation districts known as the Lethbridge

northern irrigation district and the Canadian Pacific irrigation district. The straight lines of the hon. gentleman would have cut right through the heart of both those districts and thrown them into districts which are not immediately concerned with the irrigation problem. I consider that is a serious indictment of the suggestion of straight lines. May I further say that the straight line proposed by the hon. gentleman would have cut off the southern portion of the railway running south from Lethbridge and taken away the town of Milk River and the Milk River district which have no connection directly or indirectly with the city of Medicine Hat or the constituency of Medicine Hat, but belong in every sense to the city of Lethbridge. So that in all fairness, while we took off two townships that could be added to the constituency of Medicine Hat, the two townships to which the hon. gentleman refers would cut off Taber and Milk River and all that district.

Then going northward the hon. gentleman referred to the constituency of Vegreville and to our violating the principle of natural boundaries. I may say that I personally hesitated very seriously before I consented to the extension of the Vegreville district northward above the river. The river is a very serious barrier between the southern portion and the northern portion of that constituency. In spite of the discussion we have heard during the last two or three days the committee were unanimous and the subcommittee were unanimous that that was the proper thing to do. The hon. gentleman who represents Vegreville (Mr. Luchkovich) was also consulted in regard to this situation, and after going into the whole matter it was agreed all round that it was a fair thing to cross the river and take in the block of townships north of the river in the Vegreville constituency. The reason for doing that I have no hesitation in saying was that the large Ukrainian-Canadian population might be included in the constituency of Vegreville and have their representation in this house. Further it was also done—and done after consultation and by unanimous consent of the subcommittee—in order that those residents who live immediately east and immediately west of that particular part of which we speak might be included by themselves in the other constituencies immediately north and immediately west of them. These are largely French-Canadian citizens, and we had sent to us through the chairman of the general committee, through the Prime Minister, through the various members of the subcommittee, representations from various French-Canadian societies both in the west and in the east asking that these settlements of French-Canadians might be allowed to remain intact and not be included in the Vegreville constituency. Out of respect for these and by consent of every person concerned they were left as outlined in the map.

Then when we come to the central portion of the province, may I say with regard to the large rivers, that we respected them as natural boundaries and these were retained. The exception which the hon. gentleman pointed out is the one single exception, and that was only done after due consideration and consultation, and upon unanimous agreement.

Coming back to the constituency of Bow River as it exists to-day may I point out that there has not been in the past and is not now any community of interest between residents in the town of Carmangay or the district of Carmangay and the residents in the town or valley of Drumheller, none whatever. Nor is there any community of interest between those living in the rural portions of that part of the province and those living in the rural portions west of Drumheller. But there is a very decided community of interest between those living in the Drumheller valley and engaged in the coal-mining industry and the settlers in the rural parts of the province contiguous to Drumheller. There is also a very distinct community of interest between the farmers living in the rural portions of the proposed part of the Bow River constituency contiguous to the city of Calgary. So that the inclusion of the rural portions of the proposed constituency of Bow River with the other industrial portions is perfectly compatible.

Now the hon. gentleman comes to the city of Calgary. I need hardly point out to members of this house, and the hon. gentleman knows it just as well as any person, that a city in western Canada is not comparable to the city of Toronto or the industrial cities of eastern Canada. Our centres are related to the whole country contiguous to them. "All roads lead to Rome." In the southern portion of our province all roads lead to Calgary just the same as in the northern portion all roads lead to Edmonton. It is only natural that the rural portions be included in the representation of the city of Calgary. That is not a new principle; it is one that has always been recognized. It is a principle that exists at the present time.

There are two Calgary seats, and the hon. gentleman would give one to understand, at least according to the words he uses, that the proposal divides Calgary into three seats, giving the city of Calgary three representatives. That is not the case by any means. Calgary West continues; Calgary East modi-

fied continues; and the industrial extreme east end of the city of Calgary forms part of the Bow River constituency. So that when the hon. gentleman tries to make it appear that Calgary is having three seats he is stating what is not correct.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman states that what I said was not correct. What I have said is that the city of Calgary has been divided into three seats by the addition of large areas of rural territory.

Mr. BENNETT: That is not correct.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It is correct.

Mr. STANLEY: But that was not what the hon. gentleman said. I do not want the house to get a wrong impression, but if my hon. friend now wishes to correct the statement he made, in accordance with what I have said, then we are starting out on the correct basis.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Everyone understood what I said.

Mr. STANLEY: They understand it now since I have made the correction, and I hope they understood it before, when the hon. gentleman made his incorrect observation. May I point out here that Drumheller and Drumheller valley are engaged in the coal mining industry. It is a large and extensive industry, and the industrial population in that valley approximates 10,000 or more. Operators, labouring men and labour organizations in the valley are engaged directly or indirectly in the coal industry. Now, I think that hon. gentlemen in this house will agree with me that labour and operators engaged in that industry are entitled to some exceptional consideration when it comes to the matter of representation. Decidedly that has been so in the province of Alberta with respect to representation in the provincial legislature. Drumheller Valley has it own representative. I do not know what his particular proclivities are, but I understand he was elected largely by the labour vote. At any rate, they certainly have their own constituency and select their own representative, and I understand that he was elected by a very large majority. He is independent too; he is certainly not attached to either of the old line parties. In the city of Calgary the labour and industrial organizations, occupying almost exclusively the extreme east end of Calgary, have their representative in the house.

Some of us have our ideas as to how the matter should be arranged, and some of us oppose in detail just the particular way in which it is done. But I do not think that within the city of Calgary you will find any opposition among reasonable men to the inclusion of a representative for the city of Calgary for the Labour ranks. Certainly I have no objection, and so it is that the city of Calgary for years past has been represented in the legislature of the province of Alberta by one or more Labour members.

I will leave it to hon. gentlemen and to you, Mr. Chairman, whether there is anything unreasonable or unfair that those engaged in industrial occupations, representing the extreme east end of Calgary, and those engaged in industry, in the way I have indicated in connection with Drumheller and Drumheller valley, should be united in order that they may have a representative in this house. For the life of me I cannot see how any man in this house can stand up in his place and take exception to that reasonable proposition, and least of all can this be done by the hon. gentleman who represents himself as champion of labour from one end of the country to the other. If there is one man I can think of, apart from the two hon. gentlemen from Winnipeg and the hon. member for East Hamilton, if there is one member of this house who has a right to see that Labour gets a fair deal in the matter of representation in this house, I should think it would be the hon. gentleman who speaks so much about the co-operation between the U.F.A. and Labour.

Take this constituency as it is. You have that labour and industrial population in Drumheller and Drumheller valley, and there is the industrial and labour population I have spoken of in the extreme east end of Calgary. May I point out that in the extreme end of which I have spoken you have the Canadian Pacific Railway Ogden shops; the Imperial Oil refineries; the stockyards; and you have flour mills and other kindred industries; and in large part these activities are remote from the rest of the city. As a matter of fact, I am informed that a considerable proportion of it was not in the earlier city and more recently it was decided that it should be included in the city in order to obtain some of the facilities which the city has to offer.

There is the proposal, and that proposal, we decided in the committee, should constitute the Bow River constituency. The hon. gentleman spoke of a fair deal for labour. Allow me to put this to him. Here we have a constituency which is engaged, two to one, in all these industries of which I have spoken,

and along with that you have the best organized U.F.A. section in the province of Alberta. I say that without equivocation; there is not a part of Alberta which is better organized, from the U.F.A. standpoint, than the country intervening between the two industrial sections of the proposed Bow River riding. As I said in the committee, if there is anywhere in Canada a proposed seat which will represent the ideals so loudly vaunted by my hon. friends of the C.C.F., it is the constituency of Bow River. If that relationship, that cooperation is real and genuine as my hon. friend would try to make the people believe, then I say that is the constituency which he should accept. I have heard of several ways in which labour in the city of Calgary could be strangled out of representation but I have never heard of a more effectual way than that proposed by the hon. member for Bow River. The city of Calgary can be divided into two constituencies or made into a two-member constituency, where labour would not have a chance in the world. The hon. member represents himself as one of the exponents of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, as one of the great champions of labour, as one who promulgates the spirit of cooperation between the different sections of the country and yet he comes here and when faced with an opportunity of cooperating to the extent of giving them representation in this house, he says it is a gerrymander or something of that kind.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I said no such thing.

Mr. STANLEY: He did not use that word.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Not yet.

Mr. STANLEY: Not yet, but no doubt he will. If there is any thing which the hon. gentleman's imagination can express in words, I have no doubt he will do it. His facility of expression, capacity of imagination and ingenuity of argument are altogether beyond me.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): You are far too modest; you are doing very well.

Mr. STANLEY: The hon. gentleman is alone in his serious objection. He stands up in this committee and represents himself as one of those pleading the cause of those who have been used unjustly. He says he is talking for democracy, not for himself at all. I assume he is a democrat to the hilt, whatever a democrat may be. I was reading the other day where the great Lamb asked Lord John Russell what was a democracy. Lord John Russell defined a democracy as the greatest good for the greatest number. Lamb asked what was that greatest number, and the reply was, number one. Unquestionably the hon. gentleman is a democrat to the hilt and he is looking after number one in connection with this constituency. In this case number one is not looking after the interests of labour for whose cause I have been speaking.

The hon. gentleman seems to be particularly anxious to be saved from the friends of the cause he assumes to speak for throughout this country. I have been at labour conventions and I know all about them. May I just tell the hon. gentleman and this committee that labour is not all on one side by any means; labour is not all included in the little official organizations which assume to control it. Labour is the most free in mind and the most free in expression of any people I know of. When labour calls a convention they have a habit of saying just exactly what they want to say and doing just exactly what they want to do. They have a habit of choosing just exactly the candidate they want to choose. I have no doubt that when the labour men of the Drumheller valley and the industrial section of East Calgary meet together, they will do exactly as they want to do and choose the candidate they want to choose. The hon. gentleman may have some fears in that regard. He would like to have a United Farmers of Alberta convention where the official representatives would select a candidate. I know enough about those conventions to say that if I wanted to be sure of the expression of public opinion, I would take the choice of the labour convention. In the province of Alberta there are four or five thousand members of the United Farmers of Alberta and they presume to represent the 175,000 or 200,000 farmers in the province. When they meet in convention to select a farmers' candidate, it is the members of this four thousand group which select the delegates. When a United Farmers of Alberta convention meets in Bow River it is composed of the members of the organization and they select a candidate according to the desires of those who belong to the group. There are possibilities of some difficulty and I have no doubt in the world that the hon. gentleman is sometimes embarrassed with the possibilities of labour interfering in the selection of the candidate in that particular constituency.

I do not think I need bother particularly with the question of residence, outside of saying that the hon. gentleman is now living

in Gleichen. Since 1924 he has not lived in his own constituency but he moved last fall to the town of Gleichen. I must confess that that moving was very quietly done. That was quite proper and it was done in such a way that not very many of us knew that he had moved. I shall leave that because the hon. member preferred not to press it as a particular excuse.

He referred to the constituency of Medicine Hat and intimated that the population was much below what it should be and that it should be extended. This extension would have to be northward or westward. If it went northward it would mean going over the large Red Deer river. You would then get into a country which is very thinly populated and which would add very little population to the proposed constituency. If you went westward you would have to take in part of the proposed constituency of Macleod. This would mean crossing the Bow river into territory which has absolutely no relationship in a community way to the constituency of Medicine Hat. The hon. gentleman did not tell us that the extension of Medicine Hat westward including the town to which he referred, was on the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway and took in a thickly populated part of the country together with several larger towns and villages. The hon. gentleman says that those towns are not related to Medicine Hat, that they are closer to Calgary. He is perfectly correct in regard to these towns being closer to Calgary, but if he wants to be fair I think he will be the last one to ask that they should be included in the constituencies of Calgary. That would remove Bow River entirely and it would not overcome the difficulty in which Medicine Hat finds itself. We have taken into the proposed constituency of Medicine Hat a sufficient population to run it up to between 38,000 and 39,000. It is still under the quota but in view of its expanse and the area taken in, the subcommittee and the general committee considered that it was a fair redistribution.

I do not know that I should take up any more time of the committee. The Liberal member of the committee, the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart), together with the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Kennedy), discussed these matters in all fairness and before I sit down I should like to say a word of appreciation of the fairminded way in which the consultations were approached, the fairmindedness of both members in connection with all the questions that were discussed. The hon. member for West Edmonton was

agreeable to all the arrangements that were reached, not that he considered that they were the best from his standpoint, but they were acceptable in view of the situation taken as a whole. The hon. member for Peace River was fair enough to say that in general the undertaking in Alberta was just, but that he objected to some details in the outlines in connection with the constituency of Bow River. May I conclude, therefore, by saying that on a mathematical computation, 98 per cent of the boundaries as set out in the constituencies of Alberta was acceptable to the subcommittee and 100 per cent was acceptable to the larger committee.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If this be an illustration of the government's idea of co-operation or of compromise, I submit that it is indeed compromise with a club. The hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Stanley), who has just taken his seat, paid a tribute to the fairness of the subcommittee and, I think, with considerable justice. As a matter of fact I have endeavoured so far to dispossess myself of any particular feeling of possible discouragement or rancour in connection with the matter, and even after the hon. member's speech I do not propose to let myself be led astray into a mere harangue.

That I am, as he suggested at the outset, a lone objector from Alberta, is not correct I explained to the committee, when I opened the question, that our group had discussed this matter on two occasions and that they were unanimously behind me in regard to it. So much for that.

He pointed out that the map I proposed consisted of straight lines and took no recognition of natural boundaries. It no more took straight lines than the old ones did; it no more ignored natural boundaries than the old ones did, and no injustice whatever was done to anyone in connection therewith. I have not had a single complaint except from a tiny corner of the constituency of Macleod immediately where the Bow river enters; they wanted to be included in Bow River. There is not a bridge in that section. That is the only complaint and that is the position with respect to that.

The hon. gentleman furthermore described the community of interest of the northern portion of Bow River with the southern portion of it. His description was so stirring, so plausible, that honestly, I was almost convinced. We were told that Drumheller had no community of interest with the country south of the Bow river. Perhaps it has not, but is community of interest to be a deciding factor? If community of interest is to be

the deciding factor, then the coal mining area of the Crowsnest should be joined up with the city of Lethbridge, both of them being coal mining areas. But they do not want that; there are too many labour men there. Just as the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Stewart) would dislike caring for all the Crowsnest wildcats, so the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Stanley) sloughs off the labour fighters of East Calgary; they are too much for him to handle.

Mr. STANLEY: Then why does the hon. gentleman object?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not. What I am objecting to is the absolutely improper character of the redistribution in Calgary itself principally and in this seeking to tie up Strathmore and Gleichen with Medicine Hat, 130 miles from them. Neither of those matters has been adequately dealt with by the hon. gentleman, nor has he successfully defended his action in connection with it. Why does he not tie up Lethbridge with Crowsnest pass which is only 76 miles away and Lethbridge is also a coal mining city? Why not join up the coal mining area if the hon. gentleman is so concerned about the welfare of communities that have a common interest?

Let us take just one other illustration to show how specious and unreliable is the hon. gentleman's argument. He said that the industrial section of East Calgary has some community of interest with the industrial district of Drumheller. Of course it has. This move, were it possible without injustice to Calgary, would be admirable. I have no objection, wherever it is practicable, to joining up industrial communities, but may I ask the hon. gentleman, if community interest is to be a factor; why, when he had a chance to join, has he severed the Imperial Oil Company and other oil holdings in Turner valley from the refinery section of East Calgary? In this case he has taken the refinery section with the refineries, the workers and everything there and sloughed them off into a coal mining area when they might have been joined up with their own oil area. The hon. gentleman was very careful to avoid any reference to why he had given up his natural territory of rural East Calgary? Why did he abandon that and take to himself a new section around Turner valley? I heard it said that this was because of community of interest of Turner valley to East Calgary. If that is logical and reasonable, why slough off the refinery section of East Calgary? No, his argument does not hold water. The hon. gentleman referred in very similar terms to those used by the Prime Minister the other day to Bow River as being the left-over of all the other constituencies. That may have been the case; of course I do not know what happened in the earlier days of Bow River. It has not been there very long, but if it is only the left-over, may I congratulate the hon. member on having now elevated it to sufficient importance to become what I assert it is, virtually a third Calgary seat.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman must admit that he is incorrect in saying that Calgary is divided into three seats. The country for 100 miles west and for twenty miles north is included in West Calgary, and in East Calgary the country twenty miles south is included, so that Calgary cannot be divided into three seats. The territory that goes into Bow River is part of Calgary; it is not three seats in Calgary.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. gentleman is quite correct as to areas, but here you have a city with the possibility of getting three representatives as a result of a gerrymander which adds three large areas of rural territory to it.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps the hon. member will not mind an interjection, because I am not going to speak on the subject, but he realizes that the country west of Calgary has been most difficult to handle because of an Indian reserve immediately south and on the main line of the Canadian Pacific and since West Calgary became a constituency it is the only one in which that territory can be placed, Banff, Morley and as far west as Lake Louise, at one time as far north as Olds and now as far north as Carstairs. My hon. friend knows the geographical difficulties that cannot be overcome.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I want to be fair and as regards the Prime Minister's seat, I recognize that the action taken in dividing Calgary the way it is, may have actually endangered his seat more than otherwise.

Mr. BENNETT: Absolutely.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Whatever has been done in this matter has not been done to the advantage of the Prime Minister. I concede that at once, but what has been done has been to the direct and distinct advantage of the present sitting member for East Calgary. He has deliberately rejected the labour section, for which he speaks himself or pretends to speak. He is deliberately sacrificing that, giving it up and giving up the

rural area lying north. Why? Because he wanted to hunt some other safer seat. It is the only explanation. He has not denied it. I wish he would tell the house or the committee why he had to travel south, having abandoned all north, and run into the Macleod riding. He is going to say that it is because of the community of interest between the oil fields down there and the city of Calgary, but gracious, he has already thrown off the direct community of interest by rejecting the refinery section of East Calgary. These arguments don't go.

I was going to say that whilst the Prime Minister himself and the member for East Calgary referred to Bow River as being a left-over, it appears to me that they are now concerned with making it a great deal more than a left-over. They are leaving it in the position, as I submitted a moment ago, of being a part of one of the three Calgary seats. I am not worrying very much about the constituency of Macleod, not in the slightest, but when the hon. gentleman argues that the territory east of the present line and running to the Bow river is a natural part of Macleod because of its excellent unequalled highways, he is speaking of something that he evidently does not know anything about. All the roads running east there are dirt roads, and not highways.

Mr. STANLEY: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. STANLEY: I beg my hon. friend's pardon too.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Outside of the one from the city of Calgary there is not a single highway running into the new portion of the Macleod riding. They are all dirt roads. Heaven knows I have travelled over them enough in the last twelve years to know. Whether it is to Lomond, Retlaw, Vulcan or the rest of them, they are dirt roads, and as for ease of transportation, in all that territory transportation would have to be by car unless you are going by rail, and to get the rail you would have to go to Calgary. In one case you can go north of High River and get the Blackie line, but that is the only point of contact. The lines run north and south, and not across east and west as the hon. gentleman would have led the house to believe. If an election is called in winter time, and we have known elections in winter time, these people, unless happily there is a chinook, are going to have a good deal of difficulty in getting about during the election period. Of course, the argument can be used that all parties will be equally handicapped in that respect.

The hon. member for East Calgary said that they could not or did not want to make up the deficiency in Medicine Hat by adding the over-population from Lethbridge, the adjoining constituency, because he said it would split the Lethbridge Northern and the Canadian Pacific irrigation district. All right; I will agree with him that it would have that effect. But let me take him to what he has done himself. He has split the Canadian Pacific irrigation district which is east of Strathmore and turned it into Medicine Hat. The important part of the Canadian Pacific irrigation system, the greatest irrigation system that I know of in western Canada, is now split and a part of it is turned over to west of Strathmore and part to the east of Strathmore. If arguments like that are going to be used, they should be valid throughout. But instead of that the hon. gentleman puts up an argument just to suit a particular purpose and not for general application, and that kind of an argument is not just.

The hon. member for East Calgary also said that Calgary, being a western city, was not comparable with other cities. I ask him to give just one single instance of any other city, with a population of about 83,000, that is so divided as to form, with the addition of contiguous rural territory, three seats. I ask him to give just one other illustration even under the present bill where such a condition prevails.

My hon. friend at the end of his remarks said something that would have been better left out. He said that as for the U.F.A. conventions, when they were nominating candidates, the officials came there and nominated the candidates.

Mr. STANLEY: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What did the hon. gentleman say? I do not want to do him any injustice.

Mr. STANLEY: I said that the delegates of the U.F.A. convention were those who were officially members of the association. Perhaps those were not my exact words, but that was their purport.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Ah yes, and it is democratic because each local, scattered, as the hon. gentleman himself has said, over the most highly organized and one of the most efficient U.F.A. districts in Alberta sends its delegate to the convention on the basis of one delegate to every ten members, or minor portion thereof. Each local is entitled to one delegate, and they vote, nominate and

decide. The officials have nothing to do with it. The president is in the chamber at the moment and can corroborate what I say. The officials take no part in the constituency nomination or in financing the election of the candidate. It is the most completely democratic representative type of political movement that you have in Canada at this moment, and no one knows it better, if he would only do himself and it justice, than the hon. member for East Calgary.

Further on in the course of his speech the hon. member did disclose one of the underlying objectives. First of all I have alluded to his desire to try and make for himself as safe a seat as possible under the circumstances by getting rid of what he knows is going to be an adverse vote for him in the next election in East Calgary, by getting rid of the rural territory north of Calgary.

But there was another and a deeper motive. He hopes, as was intimated, to split the labour and farmer cooperative forces. He hopes that by getting industrial Drumheller and industrial East Calgary together they will be anxious to nominate a straight Labour candidate, and that the Labour men will vote for the Labour candidate and the farmers will vote for a farmer candidate. That is the hon. gentleman's hope. I personally have no fear in the matter because there is no section in all of Canada in which a finer feeling of cooperation between farmer and Labour groups exists with such completeness as in that very district. As far as I am concerned, the hon. gentleman himself said to me, "What are you objecting to? You will be safer there than in any other seat." He does not deny it.

I am not going to enter into the field of political controversy in this matter. If the government is determined to put through what will look to everybody who looks at the map as a distinct gerrymander of the city of Calgary, if the government is prepared to accept responsibility for that, that is their business. If the government is willing to accept responsibility for dissociating the cities of Strathmore and Gleichen from their natural Calgary interests and the district contiguous thereto, that is their responsibility. I have put in my protest, and in as reasonable a fashion as possible, and with that I rest my case.

Mr. F. G. SANDERSON (South Perth): Mr. Chairman, we have heard from almost every province in the dominion except Ontario. I desire to say a word or two about the redistribution in that province, particularly in western Ontario. I fully realize that a redistribution of seats is a large problem for any government, and from the discussions which have taken place from day to day in this chamber, and perhaps will continue longer, it shows that there is still a great division of opinion as to whether the proposals are fair or unfair. Any remarks I have to make will be more in the way of criticism, particularly with regard to western Ontario.

When the government introduced this bill they apparently had in their minds the thought that they would decrease by four or five seats the representation in the rural sections of the province of Ontario, and that they would add three seats to the city of Toronto and the one or two remaining seats to some other point in the province. I want to warn the government, if they have not already been sufficiently warned, that cutting out rural representation and adding more seats to the city of Toronto will not help to quiet the unrest which abounds throughout the country. This is a very dangerous time to go ahead with any such scheme. I am fully conscious of the growth of the population of the city of Toronto. The Prime Minister speaking the other day said that if Montreal had its fair proportion of seats it would have twenty-four.

Mr. BENNETT: No, not its fair proportion,—if it had its proportion on the basis of the unit of population.

Mr. SANDERSON: I said fair proportion, and I know that is what the right hon. gentleman had in his mind.

Mr. BENNETT: No, because we had agreed there should be a higher quota for city than for country constituencies, for that very reason, namely that the old doctrine of representation by population was being departed from.

Mr. SANDERSON: Yes. By following the unit of population Montreal would have twenty-four members. I have often watched hon. members from the city of Toronto, and it always appears to me that the greatest difficulties they have in reaching the House of Commons are those of securing nomination. That is where they have their elections; that is where they have their difficulties; that is where they have their worries. Having received the nomination they are practically elected.

Mr. MORAND: Conservative nomination.

Mr. SANDERSON: Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Tory Toronto.

Mr. SANDERSON: I am speaking particularly about the Conservative members from the city of Toronto. I am glad to say that there is one Liberal member from that city and while I do not wish to make any prophecies as to what will happen in a future election, I would go as far as to say that after the next general election, whenever it comes, there will be four or five Liberal members from that city.

Mr. MORAND: Hope springs eternal.

Mr. SANDERSON: That will be the result, despite the gerrymandering, if you wish so to term it, which is going on in the province of Ontario, and the effort to deplete and take away from the farmers their proper representation, thereby increasing the representation of the city of Toronto from nine members to eleven members. We have heard the statement that members from the province of Ontario are satisfied with the proposals which have been made and which, in the course of a day or two, will be brought down in the redrafted bill. I wish to say however that so far as I am concerned—and I believe I voice the views of many other Liberal members from the province of Ontario—I am not at all satisfied with the arrangements which have been made, despite the fact the statement is made that everything has been agreed upon and that it will go through without protest. It shall not go through without my first registering a criticism and protest against it, no matter whether it has been agreed upon or not.

My criticism applies to western Ontario. The proposal is to go into three historic counties of Ontario, namely, Bruce, Perth and Oxford, and to eliminate one seat from each of those counties. I do not know that I have any objection to the union of counties, where population and areas warrant only one representative. That procedure may be proper, if it were done fairly and with a spirit of justice. I wish to speak concerning that part of the county of Perth which I have the honour of representing, namely South Perth. The proposal is to unit the two constituencies in the county of Perth into one seat. But that is not the proposition which will come before this House of Commons. The proposal which will come before us is to unite North Perth and South Perth, with the exception of two townships. It is suggested that if these historic townships are left in the constituency the population of Perth will be too high. That is the excuse given.

Let me point out what the provincial government has done in their redistribution of the county of Perth. Apparently they thought Perth had not sufficient population. They united South Perth and everything in South Perth with everything in North Perth, and by some process of elimination or of moving through the air or under the ground they have added the town of Palmerston in South Wellington to the county of Perth, increasing the population one way and proposing to decrease it in another. There is only one reason for taking the townships of Hibbert and Fullarton out of South Perth and putting them into South Huron. It was done for political purposes, to weaken the Liberal candidate who will run for the county of Perth in the next federal election. There was only one reason why the provincial government took from another county the town of Palmerston and added it to the county of Perth; it was done to load the dice, to stack the cards.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to refer briefly to the political history of the county of Perth, showing that from 1867 right down to the present day North Perth—not altogether consistently, but almost consistently—has elected a Conservative to the House of Commons; and you will find that South Perth has done exactly the opposite, that since 1867 South Perth has voted Liberal with the exceptions of 1911 and 1917, 1911 being the famous reciprocity election, and 1917 the war time election. I want to read to the house the record of the general elections in North Perth:

Year—	Party	Majority
1867	Liberal	208
1872	Conservative	56
1874	Conservative	163
1878	Conservative	83
1882	Conservative	252
1887	Conservative	200
1891	Liberal	71
1896	Conservative	46
1900	Conservative	280
1904	Conservative	320
1908	Liberal	41
1911	Conservative	407
1917	Conservative	1,868
1921	Liberal	756
1925	Conservative	661
1926	Liberal	640
1930	Conservative	863

I would like now to put on the record the results of general elections in South Perth from 1867 to 1930:

Year—	Party	Majority
1867	Liberal	97
1872	Liberal	427
1874	Liberal	*
1878	Liberal	77

* By acclamation.

Year—	Party	Majority
1882—	Liberal	179
1887—	Liberal	93
1891—	Liberal	177
1896—	Liberal	218
1900—	Liberal	10
1904—	Liberal	144
1908—	Liberal	29
1911—	Conservative	82
1917—	Unionist	57
1921—	Liberal	261
1925—	Liberal	414
1926—	Liberal	515
1930—	Liberal	717

My point is that in uniting South Perth with North Perth the government should have been fair enough to take the chance on the record of the elections even going back to 1867. It is a horse race, it is practically a tie, a neck and neck race, in South Perth and in North Perth. But they are not fair enough to take all that comprises South Perth; they take out two townships with a population of over 3,000 and add them to South Huron. Now what is the reason for that; what is the explanation? Is it not to handicap the Liberal candidate when he runs in the whole county of Perth and give an advantage to the Conservative candidate? That is not fair. It cannot be defended in any way, mathematically or geographically. I would like hon. members to look at the map of the county of Perth. It will be seen that what they propose to do is deliberately to reach over the fence and take two historic townships which have been in South Perth since confederation, for purely political purposes to take them out of Perth county and put them in another county. I want to be perfectly fair and candid about this matter; there is not a Liberal in South Perth who would be opposed to the joining of the whole of South Perth with the whole of North Perth, making one seat for the county and taking their chance, win or lose. But in this way the government and the committee are taking an unjust advantage, doing an injustice to the Liberal party and the Liberal candidate, whoever he may be. There is no justification for it in respect of population, as I propose to show.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, in order that we may deal with the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, about which we have had a good deal of discussion, I propose to move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again in order that the Speaker may take the chair so that we may send a message to their honours for the purpose of enabling the Senate to reconsider the amendment. I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again this day.

Progress reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

NON-CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house disagrees with their amendment to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, for the following reasons: "Because the deletion of subsection 3 of section 3 makes the whole section 3 not sufficiently effective."

That the clerk of the house do carry the said message to the Senate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is my hon. friend going to do about it now?

Mr. DUPRE: The bill comes back to us after having been amended by the Senate. Section 3 is the section that deals with irrebuttable presumption, and it is struck out; therefore the whole section 3 becomes practically inoperative. I have reason to believe that a new amendment will be proposed in the Senate, I hope in the course of the day, which will acceptable to this house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope my hon. friend is correct in his surmise, because if he is not I am afraid the bill will be worn out travelling back and forth so often.

Mr. STEVENS: It is printed on good paper.

Mr. BENNETT: For the information of the right hon. gentleman I may say that the question of the surroundings of children has received careful attention on the part of the Social Service Council, and Mr. Macdonald of Toronto, the chairman, has interested himself greatly in the matter, in consequence of a decision of the court of appeal of Ontario which held that the statute was to be so construed as to make it almost impossible for conviction to be secured. It is proposed to provide as a compromise to the original proposals passed by the house that the magistrate shall exercise discretion in the first instance, and if he decides, upon the findings, that the condition is likely to have an injurious effect on the moral character of the child, then that shall, for the purposes of the trial of the accused, be regarded as an irre-

buttable presumption, and the accused will then be confronted with the necessity of proving by adequate testimony that immoral surroundings do not exist.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am in accord with the Prime Minister with respect to the bill and I hope that the amendment to which he refers will carry.

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house again in committee on Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. Stirling in the chair.

Mr. SANDERSON: When the committee rose at one o'clock I was putting some figures on the record in regard to the population of Perth county. Under the last census the population of the entire county of Perth is about 51,000, and the proposal is to take out the townships of Hibbert and Fullarton from South Perth and add them to South Huron, which would bring the population down to about 47,816. The population of Oxford, if it goes into one seat, will be 47,825. The Prime Minister, in correcting me this morning with reference to what had been said in regard to the claim that Montreal might ask for 24 seats, said that the unit of population was not always a factor in redistribution. With that I agree.

Mr. BENNETT: It was hardly put that way—not always the only factor.

Mr. SANDERSON: I accept the correction. I am going to attempt to show what the position is with regard to the population of some of the other constituencies that are left untouched by this redistribution, and I am speaking only of the province of Ontario. It is proposed now to take the town of Clinton and the township of Goderich from South Huron and put them into North Huron. I mention it now only to show how the figures will work out. If that is done it will make the population 26,095 in what will be the riding of North Huron after the redistribution. In regard to the proposal to take the two townships of Hibbert and Fullarton from South Perth and put them into South Huron, with the town of Clinton and the township of Goderich taken from South Huron and put into North Huron, and two townships from South Perth put into South Huron, it will have the effect of giving South Huron a population of 19,085. That appears to be a low figure, and it is. I would point out however that in the province of Ontario there are some constituencies that are lower than that and they are not being touched by this redistribution. For instance, there is the constituency of Glengarry, with a population of 18,666; there is Haldimand, 21,428; and there is Brant, 21,202. These are all represented in this house at the present time by supporters of the government. And when we come to analyze some of the counties where there is only one member we find that the population far exceeds the population that Perth will have under this plan of redistribution. Perth, with the two townships out, the townships to which I have referred, would be 47,816. We have Lincoln, represented by one member, with a population of 54,199; there is Welland, represented by one member, with a population of 82,731; and there is Nipissing, also represented by one member, with a population of 70,204.

I quite agree with the Prime Minister therefore that the unit of population is not always the only factor in redistribution. I hope I have the right hon. gentleman correct this time. There are many constituencies far below the unit and many far above, and I know it is quite difficult to deal with this redistribution and balance the units of population.

I come back now to my own county of South Perth. In regard to the joining of the two Perths, I say again, as I said before the adjournment at one o'clock, that I have absolutely no fault to find with this proposal. As a matter of fact, I am and always have been in favour of it. The constituency of South Perth is low in population, less than 18,000. Yet under this bill it is proposed to take away almost 3,500 of population. I have always been under the impression that there was only one fair way in which to effect a redistribution in my riding. That was by joining the whole of the Perths together. There is no reason for taking two townships out of South Perth. It is an injustice to the people who live in those townships.

Let me enlarge on that for a moment. This morning the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Stanley) spoke about the community spirit. I quite agree with what he said. These two townships have been in South Perth ever since confederation and it is now proposed to move them to South Huron. I know that in some cases these matters cannot be adjusted but the only equitable and fair way to make an adjustment here is to leave these two townships where they have been since 1867. I know that it will probably be said that on the basis of the 1926 and 1930 elections there was not very much difference between the Liberal vote in South Perth and the Conservative vote in

North Perth. The figures for the 1930 election show that in North Perth the Conservative candidate was elected by a majority of 863 while in South Perth I had a majority of 717. Without taking out these two townships, the Conservative candidate would have an advantage of 146. This goes to prove the statement which I made this morning that since confederation the elections in the two Perths have been more or less of a horse race. But under this bill they do not propose to leave it that way, they propose to take out the townships of Hibbert and Fullarton. In the 1930 election the township of Hibbert gave me a majority of 245 and the township of Fullarton, a majority of 45. This makes a total of 290, which added to 146 will give the Conservative candidate in the next election an advantage of 436. Some hon. members opposite may say that that does not amount to very much. But why disturb South Perth at all? Why not leave it as it is so that there will be an even break between the south and the north, so that the next candidate may have a fair show and a fair run?

I have no desire to delay this committee nor do I want to break any agreement which may have been made. I am perfectly willing at all times to take a sporting chance, but there has been no justification for disturbing townships in South Perth. I have always been under the impression that county boundaries should be adhered to as far as possible in making a redistribution. If that principle were followed we would have a different picture to-day in western Ontario. Bruce county would be one seat and the same with Huron, Oxford, Middlesex and perhaps many other counties in the province. I am of the opinion that one hon. member is quite sufficient to represent a whole county in the House of Commons. I am sorry the Prime Minister has vacated his seat as I had a plea to make. I do not want to be misunderstood in making this protest. There has been an agreement arrived at and it may be said that I was a party to that agreement. But it cannot be an agreement when one has given his consent under pressure. If the agreement is not fair there is no reason why this committee could not adjust it and make it fair. I am asking for no special privileges, I ask simply for fair play. It will not be fair unless the whole county goes into one seat. If the committee in its judgment decides that there shall be no change, let it go at that but I am inclined to think that the good farmers of South Perth and North Perth will resent the fact that the whole county has not been joined together and that townships have been taken away. I think they will come to the same conclusion as I have, that an unfair advantage is being given to my opponent.

If the county of Perth were made into one riding it would make one of the largest rural ridings in the province of Ontario. It would be a rural riding inferior to none in the whole province. There would also be large manufacturing interests in the riding. The city of Stratford is a divisional point of the Canadian National Railways and there are about seven or eight hundred railway employees. The railway vote in Stratford has always been the deciding vote in an election. There will be the towns of St. Mary's, Mitchell and Tavistock, as well as six or seven smaller villages. I ask only for fair play in this matter; I ask that these two townships which have been in the riding since 1867 be not interfered with. If that were conceded there could be no criticism. There cannot be any criticism where justice is rendered, but there can be and will be severe criticism if injustice is done and the whole of South Perth is not included in this amalgamation with North Perth.

I want to say this about my good friend the hon. member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. MacNicol): I have no fault to find with him. He has had a very difficult task to perform in this redistribution in Ontario. He has had many problems that must have been on his mind day and night. He has always been very courteous and fair with me any time we have had any conversation and I appeal to him as one coming from the city of Toronto and as one who, once he gets his nomination, is, as I said this morning, elected. He does not know what an election contest is; he has no handicaps; it is only a question of a majority or of thousands of a majority in the city of Toronto. I ask him to put himself in my position to-day. Will he be a party to handicapping me or any other gentleman who happens to be the Liberal candidate in Perth? Be fair about this. Never mind about these agreements if they are unjust. Now is the time to remedy that; now is the time for this committee to put itself on record and I appeal especially to hon. gentlemen opposite to be fair in regard to joining the two Perths. I say again that I am not pleading for any advantage; I am pleading only for justice, fair play, an even break and a chance for the Liberal party in the next general election in the county of Perth.

Mr. MacNICOL: I want to thank the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson), who has just taken his seat, for the very kind remarks which he has made in reference to the committee and myself. I can also say that all my negotiations and those of the

committee—and I think I can speak for all the committee in this regard—with all the Ontario members have at all times been on the same plane on which the hon. member was so kind as to say I had negotiated with him on behalf of the other members of the committee.

I suppose I ought to be very careful in what I am now going to say because I may be treading on dangerous ground. Private members cannot make any prophecies or references as to what may be done in the future. The situation referred to by the hon. gentleman was, as he knows, not in our original picture. I am not going to refer to any reasons for changing the original picture; I suppose throughout the country many original pictures were changed, but in the final picture a situation resulted that I must confess we tried to avoid from the beginning. I believe all the members of the Ontario committee set out with the object of affording each hon. member an opportunity to return to his riding in so far as the redistribution was concerned. I am happy to say that with the exception of only the hon. member representing South Perth and the hon. member representing North Perth (Mr. Wright), every member from Ontario will have a free contest, one might call it, for election without being in opposition to anyone now in the house. The situation is that in the picture which finally resulted, in one lone riding my two good friends the hon. member for South Perth and the hon. member for North Perth may be nominated in opposition to each other in the next contest. The hon. member for North Perth does not desire this situation any more than does the hon. member for South Perth. We did not have to change the riding of the hon. member for North Perth so far as population went because he had approximately 34,000 and at the commencement we did not propose to alter it. Naturally he has a very strong case on which to oppose this bill, but I hope he does not do so; I hope he will accept it just as it is. In the next contest he appears destined to be up against one of the ablest members opposite, certainly one of the best speakers in the country, a thoroughly experienced organizer and a man with a great prestige in the western part of Ontario. I am sympathetic towards my warm friend the hon. member for North Perth because he will have a contest on his hands.

Mr. POULIOT: Give him a divine mandate.

Mr. MacNICOL: What I started out to say a moment or two ago was this: After the next general election, if all the prophecies my hon. friend, the member for South Perth, has been making about the result of the next election come true, if he is elected he will then be sitting behind the then prime minister. If he is not elected and his prophecy in regard to the success of his party comes true, he will be the defeated candidate in that riding. If I am not treading on ground I should not tread upon, perhaps the then prime minister will appoint him to a safe seat in the Senate if he will accept it.

Mr. SANDERSON: Will my hon. friend permit me? I made no prophecies about the coming election except in regard to Toronto and I said that I thought in that city, after the next election, perhaps three or four Liberals would be returned to this house. I never make prophecies.

Mr. MacNICOL: Not in the speech the hon. member has just made, I quite agree with that, but in many prophecies in former speeches. I want to speak in the same courteous manner as my hon. friend did, because I do not want to raise animosities as they get us nowhere. With the other members of the committee I want to see the whole Ontario schedule go through, but I should like to refer to a few figures in connection with those presented by my hon. friend. The present picture so far as the three ridings that are proposed for the counties of Perth and Huron are concerned, will be as follows:

Constituency—	Population
Perth	47,816
North Huron	26,095
Huron-Perth	22,661

We had to have some ratio of population to go by as a basis for these ridings and on examining the tables we found that in the proposed riding of Perth there is contained in the city of Stratford, the town of Listowel, the town of St. Mary's and the town of Mitchell—I am not sure whether it is a town, but I will give it that distinction anyway—a total of 25,808, or an urban population of over one-half of the new riding with a population of 47,816.

In connection with North Huron with a population of 26,095, there is an urban population of 6,239 and in Huron-Perth, with a population of 22,656, there is an urban population of 3,352. That strikes me as pretty fair ratios of population for those three ridings. One of them, that is Huron-Perth, is almost entirely rural. The riding of North Huron is not as largely rural as Huron-Perth, having twice the latter's urban population, and therefore it should have a larger unit than Huron-Perth. The riding of Perth itself, be-

ing over fifty per cent urban, should have a larger population than either of the other two. The fact that the city of Stratford has a population of 17,742, in the riding of Perth entitles that riding to a considerable larger unit of population for representation in this house.

As far as the townships are concerned the riding of Perth will have eight townships and four urban municipalities; North Huron nine townships and three urban municipalities; Huron-Perth eight townships and one small urban municipality; it therefore is much more rural than either of the other two.

The hon. member for South Perth has referred to Toronto. I shall give a few figures with regard to the city of Toronto, not with a view to criticizing what has been said at all, but simply to show that the city of Toronto has a very substantial unit for each of its members. Under the last redistribution there were twelve members for the county of York and the city of Toronto, which together may be called urban, the unit being 53,970. As a result of the present redistribution each of the 15 members proposed for the county of York including the city of Toronto will have a unit of 57,537, or approximately 4,000 more than after the last redistribution.

Taking it in another way, at the census of 1921 the two counties of Huron and Perth had a population of 97,731, and returned four members, so that the average unit was 24,443 as compared with the unit for the entire province of 35,776, which gives a percentage of 68. As a result of the present redistribution Huron and Perth will have a combined population of 96,572, and will return three members, giving a unit of 32,191 or 72 per cent of the unit of 44,186 for the entire province.

The counties of Bruce and Grey have been mentioned. There again we have reduced the number of ridings from four to three. In the redistribution of 1921 the counties of Bruce and Grey had a combined population of 103,786, and returned four members, giving a unit of 25,946, or 72 per cent of the average of 35,776. Under the present redistribution these two counties will have a combined population of 99,985, and will return three members, giving a unit of 33,328, or 74 per cent of the unite of 44,186 for the entire province.

Under the present redistribution there will only be a few counties left in all Ontario that will have their own boundaries as the boundaries of their new ridings. That gives the house some idea of the changes that have had to be made throughout Canada as a result of the increase in the population of the province of Quebec, which population, as hon. gentlemen know, is divided by sixty-five, representing its representation in this house, in order to give the unit for all Canada. In my opinion that is one of the saving clauses of the British North America Act. If it were not for that clause this house would likely be twice its present size. I believe this country is over-governed to-day. By that I mean that there are altogether too many members of parliament, senators, legislative councillors and members of legislatures. To put it in another way, too many men are engaged in the government of Canada and its provinces. That saving clause in the British North America Act I hope will never be removed.

The counties of Brant, Durham, Elgin, Glengarry, Haldimand, Essex, Wentworth, Welland, Lincoln, Lanark, Middlesex, Norfolk, Northumberland, Leeds, Prescott, Peel, Halton, Renfrew, York and Waterloo are the only counties in this province to-day that it is not proposed to associate under this redistribution with other counties, and I doubt if in the next redistribution there will be more than two or three counties in that category.

Something has been said about the counties having a smaller population as the result of the present redistribution, but under the present redistribution the following rural communities will have a larger unit than the county of Perth, namely, Nipissing, Welland, Wentworth, East York, West York, South York, Waterloo and Kent.

Reverting to what was said about the cities, the city population has very considerably increased since the last redistribution. Brantford has increased in population by approximately one thousand, but its representation has not been increased. Fort William has increased by approximately six thousand, and the increases in other cities have been as follows:

City—	Increase of population
Hamilton East	12,538
Hamilton West	3,051
Kingston	2,076
London	5,183
Ottawa	13,730
Peterborough	1,233
Port Arthur	4,932
Windsor	24,517
Toronto	115,344
York	99,976
Nipissing	15,033

In view of its increased population the city of Toronto will receive two more members under the present redistribution and the county of York one additional member, Toronto's population having increased by 115,000

and York's by approximately 100,000. Those are the only two in the above list of Ontario urban centres that will receive increased representation.

I want to say that the committee did work hard. They tried to give an opportunity to every member from Ontario, and they tried to maintain the county boundaries wherever possible, but that could not be done in every case. Every member of the committee regretted that in the end we had to do what we finally did in connection with Perth, and Huron, but I cannot see that there is anything else to do. If you make the county of Perth a one-member constituency you would then have two adjacent counties, one of which will have a population of 51,392, returning one member, and the other with 45,180, returning two members. That would hardly be fair to either the county of Huron or the county of Perth. So we had to put them together. All we could do was to strengthen North Huron in population, and we did that by adding two municipalities to North Huron, bringing its population up to 26,095, and then we took two townships in Perth South adjacent to Huron and added them to Huron-Perth, making the latter's population 22,656. I agree that that is a small population. Under this redistribution there is one riding left in the province of Ontario which will have a population of only 18,000 odd. I am not going into that question now. Under the previous redistribution there were also a number of ridings with a very small population. Generally speaking, the unit in Ontario has been raised. Although I have not the figures before me there are more ridings as proposed in Ontario to-day close to and over the unit than there were as the result of the last redistribution. I am not criticizing those in charge of the previous redistribution. There is no doubt that hon. members at that time met the same difficulties as those with which we are confronted and no doubt they had to do the best they could. We endeavoured to do our best, and could do only what we did. As a result of the last redistribution ten or twelve members had to contest in five or six seats. The committee which acted at this session I believe may look with a feeling of satisfaction upon the fact that of the eighty-two Ontario seats there is only one in which we had to place two men now in the house. If the whole of Perth county had been put together South Huron would have been left with a population of less than 20,000, and we would not have been acting fairly to the county of Perth. I cannot help thinking that we have done our best.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

None of us claims that the redistribution is perfect. I say to-day as I have stated before that until we have legislation to conform to that of many other countries, and to that of two provinces in Canada, namely Nova Scotia and Ontario, in which legislation has been enacted stating a minimum unit of population per riding, there will always be some anomalies. I believe however that there have been fewer this time than on any previous occasion, and that the redistribution in the province of Ontario will result in fewer heartburnings than any previous redistribution has caused.

May I close by stating that the hon. member for South Perth and the hon. member for North Perth have both been very kind in what they have said about the redistribution since they have known what is proposed. Neither has been harsh in his criticism. Both have acted like real men. I am sure, that they realized the committee had a very difficult task, and that it did the best it could.

Mr. SANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say only a word or two in reply to the hon. member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. MacNicol). He has compared the population in the two Hurons with the population in the two Perths. I do not wish my remarks to be misinterpreted when I point out that the proposal is to take the town of Clinton, which has voted Conservative by a good sized majority, and the township of Goderich, which is largely Conservative, and both of which are now in South Huron, and place them in North Huron constituency. Then, after taking out the town of Clinton and the township of Goderich, in order to adjust the population it is proposed to take these two townships from one riding and put them into South Huron. That constituency is Liberal, and has been Liberal for years. In that instance the committee has used a double edged sword. It is endeavouring to build up a stronger riding for the hon. member representing North Huron (Mr. Spotton). But on the other hand by shifting these two townships into South Huron, the committee has endeavoured to weaken the Liberal candidate in the county of Perth.

I shall offer a solution to the hon. member from Toronto. If he accepts my suggestion in the spirit in which I offer it he can leave North Huron as it is. If this suggestion were adopted rather than the proposed scheme the difference in population would be only a few hundred. The hon. member for North Huron has come through two or three elections successfully, and I feel sure he need

not be afraid of the result. Surely he can come back again. Then the committee could leave South Huron just as it is, there would be no fault to find and the question of population would be adjusted. There would be in each riding of North and South Huron a population of almost 23,000, and the two townships would be left in South Perth as they are at the present time. By accepting my suggestion no one would be adversely affected. Justice would be done not only to the hon. member for North Huron but to the hon. member for South Huron and to myself. Neither would there be any injustice done the hon. member for North Perth. My suggestion is very simple, and would not be very difficult to put into operation. It would adjust this whole grievance.

The hon. member for Toronto Northwest has not given and I suggest he cannot give or will not give the real reason why the townships of Hibbert and Fullarton should be moved from South Perth into South Huron. The only reason is that it would give an advantage to hon. members opposite. Give us an even break on this. Treat us fairly, and you can adjust this matter in five minutes in the way I have pointed out.

Mr. H. B. SHORT (Digby-Annapolis): For several days we have been listening to a discussion among hon. members from Saskatchewan, Quebec and Ontario. I propose now to say a few words about Nova Scotia. As hon. members are aware, on account of the redistribution, Nova Scotia was obliged to lose two members. And to preserve county lines I have been given a constituency with a population of 50,859. Previous to the last census my constituency had a population of 34,650. It is composed of the counties of Digby and Annapolis. When we realized it was necessary to lose two seats in the province of Nova Scotia, one on the island of Cape Breton and the other on the mainland those people familiar with the map of Nova Scotia expected the counties of Colchester and Pictou would have to be joined. Colchester was the smallest county in the province, having a population of only 25,051. We naturally expected, those of us in the western part of the province, that that constituency would be joined with Pictou and Cumberland. There was another way it might have been divided. There is the county of Antigonish-Guysborough, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Duft) and having a population of only 25,560. That adjoins the county of Pictou. There was a suggestion put before the committee that the county of Pictou be divided and half joined with Antigonish-Guysborough, which would bring that constituency up to the unit number, and let the western part of Pictou county take on Colchester. But the committee did not accept this proposal, they preferred to keep the county lines, which I realize are very highly regarded in my province. We have not yet, I think, in any redistribution disturbed county lines except in my county of Digby where they have been disturbed in practically every redistribution. We have in the county of Digby two municipalities, Digby and Clare, which latter is composed of Acadian French, having their own municipal council. In 1911 that municipality was joined with Yarmouth. In the redistribution of 1924 Clare was taken away from Yarmouth and rejoined with Digby-Annapolis. I felt and still feel that I am being legislated out of my seat in the constituency of Digby-Annapolis. I feel that there was another way in which the seats in Nova Scotia could have been redistributed. However, I realize that when these redistributions take place someone has to make sacrifices. My turn has come, and I suppose I shall have to make the best of it. However, I do not like it and I protest against it most vigorously. Personally I feel it very keenly, and more keenly on behalf of my constituents and those who come after me, because it is going to make it utterly impossible for a Conservative to win that seat. Whatever my friends from Ontario and Saskatchewan and Quebec may say about everything in this redistribution having been done for the advantage of the Conservative party, I want to say that as far as Nova Scotia is concerned every advantage has been given to our Liberal friends. As I say, they take the municipality of Clare and join it to Yarmouth which has always given a Liberal majority. In the last three elections I am happy to say I reduced the Liberal majority very materially, and we have almost broken even; however it has been traditionally Liberal since confederation. That district is given to my hon. friend the member for Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston), making his majority the greater. I have had attached to my constituency the county of Kings, which has 24,357 population. It has given a Liberal majority since confederation, with just two exceptions. In the last election the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) had a majority in Kings county of over 900. I feel that I would be lax in my duty to my constituents if I did not make a protest in connection with the redistribution in Nova Scotia.

This constituency in length is 145 miles. It is in one of the most thickly populated districts of Nova Scotia, the Annapolis valley.

It has a coast line of some 200 miles. It has seven incorporated towns. So you can readily see that it is going to be a big job for any one man to take care of a constituency such as that.

Every time a redistribution has taken place in Nova Scotia it has been done in the western part, the eastern part has never been affected. Always everything has been given to the eastern part. The western part of Nova Scotia is entitled to just as much consideration in redistribution as the eastern part. That is another reason why I enter my protest in connection with the way my seat has been dealt with.

I object also to the name. They have named this seat Evangeline. Evangeline was made famous by Longfellow. It is a name that is famous in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Is it made infamous by small fellows?

Mr. POULIOT: You are a long fellow yourself!

Mr. SHORT: It is all right for poetry and tradition but I do not think it is a proper name for a constituency. I am therefore going to suggest to the committee that they change the name to Digby-Annapolis-Kings, so that the identity of the three counties will not be lost. I think that is only right. I am also going to suggest that the constituency of Shelburne-Yarmouth, which is having Clare added to it, should have the name Clare included. Clare, as I said before, is an entirely Acadian French district, they are very proud of their history and traditions, and for that reason I ask the committee that the name Clare be included in the name of the seat.

I do not know that there is any further protest that I need to make; I just want to state in closing that I am very much opposed to the manner in which my seat has been redistributed. I feel that an injustice has been done to that part of the province.

Mr. R. K. SMITH (Cumberland): Mr. Chairman, I feel it necessary to reply briefly to the remarks of the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis. Due to the reduction of two seats in Nova Scotia the redistribution problem there became one of extreme difficulty, surrounded by intricacies. Of necessity some sacrifice had to be made in rearranging county lines to make the necessary reduction. The island of Cape Breton was pretty well agreed to as between the other members of the committee and myself, and I do not feel it necessary to dwell on that phase at this moment. Later I wish to refer to the comparative length of a constituency there, in reply to the remarks made by the hon. member regarding the length of his new riding.

Now, with respect to the mainland of Nova Scotia, Colchester being in the centre of the province was the pivotal point from which we had to approach the solution of the problem. The population of Colchester is roughly, 25,000, and it was felt that we should concentrate our attention on Colchester in a manner that would be satisfactory to the people there, as well as just to the other bordering constituencies, some of which would be affected in whatever rearrangement was made. Three different proposals were considered. It was proposed to divide Colchester county, throwing one half into Pictou and the other half into Cumberland. That would mean the complete elimination of Colchester. It would mean throwing the people of Colchester county, at least part of them, into Pictou, notwithstanding that their general interests were not common; the community interests of each are as far apart as one could possibly imagine. The same applies to the other half which would have been thrown into Cumberland. Consequently the committee opposed it, and the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley) agreed with me that it would not be fair to divide Colchester, eliminating it completely. That proposal was therefore put to one side. The next proposal was put forward by the hon. member for Hants-Kings, namely, that the county of Pictou be practically split in two, and one half of the population and area thrown into Antigonish-Guysborough, which would bring the county of Antigonish-Guysborough up to approximately 45,000, the other half in with Colchester, making the second constituency out of the existing three. That again would mean the complete obliteration—yes, the complete elimination of Pictou county, that fine old Scottish county with their high pride of ancestry and tradition. The population according to the last census, is over 39,000, and the proposal would have meant throwing these people of Pictou into other constituencies with whom they had nothing in common; and whose interests were as far removed as the poles. I did not think it was fair; I did not think it would be just to divide Pictou county throwing one half into the county of Antigonish-Guysborough and the other half into Colchester. With respect to county boundaries, it would have split in two a county which is a municipal entity; it would have disrupted the county lines federally, provincially and municipally. It would have been a most disturbing and far reaching change. That proposal was submitted by the hon.

member for Hants-Kings, and I felt I could not agree to it, and I am convinced to-day that I was right. The third proposal was to treat the county of Colchester as a unit, linking it with the county of Hants, making a population of 44,444—five fours—which is approximately the unit of representation, taking the rest of Hants-Kings, namely, the county of Kings, and joining it to the constituency of Digby-Annapolis and cutting off the municipality of Clare from the western end of Digby-Annapolis and throwing it into Shelburne-Yarmouth, which would leave the constituency that has been named Evangeline. That is the name given it by the committee but it can be changed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a beautiful name.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): That would leave the constituency of Digby-Annapolis and Kings with complete counties containing people of common interests maintaining their county and municipal lines with the exception of the municipality of Clare.

In effect, all that has happened to the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis is this. He has had a small portion cut off the western end of his constituency, namely, Clare, and he has had a larger portion added to the eastern end, namely, Kings. It is unfortunate, I admit, that this constituency is larger than desirable in population and area, and no one regrets it more than I do, but we had to come to that conclusion under the circumstances. Somebody in the province of Nova Scotia had to get hurt in this redistribution; someone had to make a sacrifice, and in the layout and recasting that presented itself to me I felt that the sacrifice would have to be made where recommended.

With respect to the length of the new constituency, my hon. friend said that it was 140 miles—he says now, 145. Well, according to the official map, leaving out that portion comprising Long Island and Digby Neck, the length of his new constituency as the crow flies is only about 100 miles.

Mr. SHORT: Not by the main highway.

Mr. SMITH (Cumberland): By comparison, as regards the length of the constituency, I would refer the hon. gentleman to the constituency represented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes), which has been stretched out to the extent of 220 miles. I would refer him also to the constituency of Inverness. These two constituencies combined have a length of 220 miles as the crow flies. I do not think therefore that my hon. friend has very much to complain about in that regard.

The hon. gentleman says he is being legislated out of his seat. There has been a lot of talk in this chamber within the last few days with regard to political majorities, and comparisons have been made between parties' standing, and no doubt this is important and significant. But we were up against a problem in Nova Scotia that had to be dealt with on a higher plane, a problem that had to be approached from the point of view of principle and ideals, and we could not take into consideration the question of party advantage one way or the other, because the problem did not lend itself to that sort of treatment, nor could we have solved it either on the island of Cape Breton or on the mainland if we started out on the premise that we had to carve constituencies in Nova Scotia with an eye to seeking political advantage one way or the other, either for the Conservative or for the Liberal party.

I do not know that there is much more I have to say except this. The hon. gentleman speaks about the large population of his constituency, and as I said it is regrettable that it is so large under the present arrangement; and he complains about the small population in the constituency of Antigonish-Guysborough. In 1924 when the unit of representation in the dominion was slightly over 36,000, a constituency was formed in the province of Nova Scotia containing a population of slightly over 17,000, less than one-half the unit of representation. On the other hand, there was another constituency formed containing three times that population. In the province of New Brunswick we have a constituency with less than 22,000, another one containing over 60,000 and a second one very close to 60,000. In the province of Quebec there are a good many rural constituencies containing well over 50,000 and a half dozen or so containing under 22,000. In the province of Ontario there is the urban-rural constituency of Welland containing 83,000; there are others with 60,000 and 70,000 and many under 22,000. There is an anomaly in the province of Nova Scotia the same as there is in New Brunswick, the same as there is in Quebec and Ontario, and I assume in every other province of the dominion. It would be impossible to deal with the questions dealt with in this and past redistributions without having anomalies. They are impossible to overcome under the procedure followed in the past and which is being followed to-day.

Mr. I. D. MACDOUGALL (Inverness): Mr. Chairman, in my humble judgment we have had an unduly and unnecessarily

protracted debate on this redistribution bill. Had I any selfish motive to serve I would not continue this discussion for a single moment. When I rise to say a few words I do so in no small, petty, party sense. Like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes), I have had added to my constituency about 110 miles of coastline. I am not quarrelling with that because in Nova Scotia we have not forgotten the fact that representation in the parliament of Canada is governed by the provisions of the British North America Act. There was not sufficient population in my constituency to have it remain as a single unit, although that constituency contains the finest races to be found in any part of Canada. It has splendid traditions. When confederation was consummated there was a great deal of opposition stirred up in the province of Nova Scotia. In the provincial elections immediately following the consummation of Canadian union there were only two members elected in the whole province of Nova Scotia. One was Doctor Tupper, afterwards Sir Charles Tupper, an outstanding Nova Scotian and Canadian statesman. The other was Hiram Blanchard from the county of Inverness. The element of religion sometimes enters into political discussions and it might be well to remember that at that time the constituency of Inverness was eighty-nine per cent Catholic. But they believed in Canadian union and they elected Mr. Blanchard against a Catholic opponent. That is a salutary lesson and one worth remembering by politicians, no matter to what party they give allegiance.

I do not intend to discuss this matter from the point of view of my constituency; I shall deal with it from the point of view of the province of Nova Scotia. In my judgment there are two unfortunate angles to this protracted debate. After listening to the speeches made by members of the official opposition, both in English and French—it is my good fortune to understand both languages—I have come to the conclusion that there is no desire upon the part of the official opposition to agree to anything in connection with redistribution. I am sorry to have to make that statement but to my mind that fact is abundantly clear. But there is something still worse. The people of Canada are interested in matters more important than the maintenance of line fences here or there in some constituency and deciding whether Tom Brown shall vote at polling booth number one in a certain constituency instead of number two in another. There are other matters in which the Canadian people are more interested, and one of them is the approaching world economic conference. This conference will mean much to this and every nation in the world. It is a conference to which the better thinking people who are not playing petty politics are looking with a great deal of hope. It will deal with most important problems, the problem of monetary reform and the problem of disarmament, which if satisfactorily solved will lead to the peace and security of many of the nations of the world. To my mind these things are of more importance than the haggling over a line fence in some constituency, whether it be in mine or in some other hon. gentleman's. After having evinced no desire to agree on this redistribution matter, hon. gentlemen opposite have put it up squarely to the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett). Instead of having an opportunity of studying these great matters of world import, the Prime Minister has had to remain in this chamber listening to—may I say this, Mr. Chairman? —a cat fight about boundary lines and whether or not somebody will vote Grit in this district or Tory in that district.

Much has been said about chivalry. That is a great word but I think that a little chivalry could have been exercised by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). He should have realized that the right hon. gentleman who leads this government has not had a holiday in three years. He should have realized that he has had a very strenuous session of parliament and must go to the most important conference at which any Canadian statesman ever attended. A little chivalry could have been exercised by saying to him: We will try to agree because, after all, the parties were equitably, fairly and ably represented on this redistribution committee. A little chivalry could have been shown to the right hon. gentleman by saying: We will wind up this matter, we will not play politics with the voters of the nation or with those problems that are of such vital importance to the whole world. We will give you a couple of days to rest, if you desire to rest, although we know you are not very fond of doing that, or we will give you an opportunity to devote your great talents to the study of those important problems which will come before the world conference. That, in my humble judgment, would have been a little chivalry on my right hon. friend's part.

Another point which struck me very forcibly was in the first speech of the leader of the Liberal party. I think he made three on this subject and I am not criticizing him for doing

so. My right hon. friend is an outstanding Canadian. He has for a number of years occupied the highest office within the gift of the Canadian people. He is a gentleman with high educational qualifications. Knowing the tender sensibilities of my right hon. friend and the chivalrous conduct of which he is always capable in this house and out of it, I was somewhat surprised in his first speech of record in Hansard of May 22 to find that he devoted almost all of it to a discussion of the boundaries of his own riding. He subsequently laid down the broad principle that ridings should not be of such very great importance; that redistribution should be discussed without reference to any members who happened at the moment to be sitting on this or the other side. In that he was quite right and I agree with him. Knowing his chivalry and his high cultured standards, I can readily understand—and I am going to speak very frankly to the Liberal party now—it must have been humiliating to my right hon. friend to have to spend so much time in talking about his own riding. But he gave us his reasons for doing so and as I say I wish now to speak frankly to his supporters. After all, loyalty is due to any political leader. The right hon. gentleman has given of his time and of his undoubted talents to the service of his party and his country. He has done this unselfishly and I could well understand the humiliation which he must have felt when in his speech he had to refer for two or three hours to his own particular riding. The reason was this: "If," he said, "they wish to legislate me out of my seat in parliament, they can do it in this way"—presumably referring to the committee on which his party was represented by very able gentlemen, "and if I am to be thus prevented from coming back to continue to serve my country in the House of Commons, I have no doubt I shall outside the walls of parliament find plenty to do to which I shall be able to turn with energy and zeal." I certainly also agree with that. But why should the leader of any party be faced with this dread of personal defeat in the constituency in which he elects to run? Were I supporting my right hon. friend I would immediately, when that statement was made, have stood up in the house and said: Sir, if you happen to meet with personal defeat and I happen to have won a seat, you can have mine because you are the leader of my party. But I did not see any Liberal standing up to say that. What I wish to say to the Liberal party is this: After your leader has given of his best to the service of his party, if he happens to be defeated in Prince Albert, surely to goodness you will find a seat for him somewhere else so that we may not be deprived of his undoubted talents and he may not, as he seems to dread, have to resume a position in private life. That is something that his party should disillusion my right hon. friend about because, evidently, according to his statement, he would not have spent so much time in discussing his own riding if he had not had this in his mind.

I am now going to speak of Nova Scotia and I make the claim that in the redistribution of 1924—and I speak not for my own constituency but in reference to all the people of my province irrespective of party allegiance—Nova Scotia was in that year deprived of a seat in the Canadian House of Commons. My reason for making that statement is this, that it is both the letter and the spirit of the British North America Act that for the purpose of representation in parliament the electoral unit of Quebec shall be taken, 65 members having been accorded to that province under the act. Dividing that into the population of Quebec we get the unit of representation which applies in all the other provinces. It is the letter, the spirit of the act that the population of Quebec for purposes of representation should be the population confined within the original boundaries of that province as at the time of confederation. I make the statement now that this was ignored in the redistribution of 1924. The ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), speaking in the house the other day, said that if mistakes were made in 1924, as probably they were, they should be remedied. We shall be charitable enough to say that they were mistakes that were made. There was one mistake that, instead of taking the population within the original boundaries of Quebec, they took that and added to it the population in that territory that was added to Quebec by the Quebec Boundaries Extension Act in 1898. The result was that they added 78,000 people to the population of Quebec for the purpose of determining the unit of representation throughout this country. That addition of 78,000 deprived the people of Nova Scotia, at that time, of one, if not two representatives. If I wished to play politics—and I do not wish to do so because the matter is too important—I would remind the committee that at that time when a seat was taken from Nova Scotia we had sixteen Liberals from that province supporting my right hon. friend opposite and we have not had our full quota of representation for ten years. The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) has pointed out that the redistribution

works a great hardship on him. For ten years we have been deprived, without any reason whatever and most unjustly, of at least one seat. I do not say that this was premeditated; it was probably due to the carelessness of some people who were not looking closely enough into the representation of the province which they represented, but the fact is that we lost a representative for ten years. As the ex-Minister of Justice said, if mistakes were made in 1924, let us remedy them now. This is a mistake that can be remedied. If we could be deprived of a representative in Nova Scotia unjustly, unfairly, in an unwarranted manner and also unconstitutionally, surely we can undo that wrong and allow the constituency of the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis to remain as it is. I wish to say in regard to the hon. gentleman that we from Nova Scotia need men of his type in the House of Commons. If you go over the population of that province you will find this, that where we have suffered most materially in regard to population has been in the fishing hamlets there. There is no one in this House of Commons who knows the fishing industry as well as my hon. friend from Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short). That industry is vitally important to the economic welfare of the province of Nova Scotia, and we from the province of Nova Scotia need his wise guidance in matters affecting the fishing industry of his native province and mine. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Justice said that the wrongs that were done in 1924 should be righted. May I again point out that in 1924 we lost a seat in Nova Scotia unconstitutionally and wrongly in every other way. We were deprived of that seat. I do not know and I do not care whether it was a Liberal or a Conservative seat, but I believe that in the province of Nova Scotia we have made sufficient sacrifices so that we ought not to witness, at every decennial redistribution the sorry spectacle of a diminution of our voice and influence in the central parliament of Canada in this union which Nova Scotia, and I say it advisedly, made possible, because Nova Scotia was brought in to act as a buffer and to bridge the gulf which unfortunately existed at that time between upper and lower Canada. Since, therefore, we have been deprived of a seat in the province of Nova Scotia for the last ten years, is there anything wrong in undoing now the wrong that was done in 1924, when Nova Scotia was deprived of one seat after the last decennial census? I put it to the sense of fairness of every hon. member of this house.

[Mr. Macdougall.]

There is another matter. In the population of Quebec there are to-day, according to the census, 78,800 aliens. They are not British subjects, they are not naturalized, and they have no right to vote. They cannot vote for any member whether he is on the Liberal or the Conservative side or attached to any other political party. Yet they are counted in, and naturally so, with the population of Quebec, and by the extent of 78,800 aliens who have not the right to vote at all, the electoral unit of representation is increased. We in the province of Nova Scotia have in the vicinity of 6,000 people who have no right to vote. If we take that into consideration there are enough aliens counted in the population of Quebec when determining the electoral unit to deprive Nova Scotia of a seat. But of that there is no account taken. In this regard the statements I make are correct; they are not debatable because they are questions of fact. I submit, Mr. Chairman, through you to the committee, following in the conciliatory spirit shown by my friend the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe), that this wrong that was done unintentionally or thoughtlessly in 1924 should, in view of the facts I have placed before the committee, be undone at this time, and only one seat should be taken from the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. JEAN FRANCOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): This afternoon we have listened to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson), who made an excellent speech, and to the hon. member for Toronto Northwest (Mr. MacNicol), who gave some explanations of the redistribution in the province of Ontario, and who promised to my hon. friend from South Perth a seat in the Senate. As he is in such a generous mood to-day, why does he not confer on my hon. friend from South Perth as he did on his right hon. leader the other day, a divine mandate? I would like to see him confer it right now in order that I might witness the process by which he can confer such a divine mandate on a human being. Then we heard some complaints from the hon. member from the Conservative constituency of Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short). He was answered by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Smith), who made an excellent speech and who repeated what every member on this side of the house has said since the beginning of this debate as to county lines.

As to my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Macdougall), he gave a lecture to my right hon. leader. He is a young man and he

will mellow with age. He is young and impetuous now, but much may be given to him on account of his natural gifts. If he finds that Bill No. 2, an act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, is a kind of holy book, let him kiss it and he will have cold sores.

I wish to refer to what was said in this debate on May 24 by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil). At page 5378 of Hansard he is reported as follows:

> But I ask, is it fair that we should take as a basis of a federal redistribution the changes in the county boundaries that were made by the province of Quebec? In 1924 more than thirty-three such changes were made in the province, excluding the city of Montreal.

Then my hon. friend from Charlevoix-Saguenay (Mr. Casgrain) and my hon. friend from St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) asked him to be more precise and to give details, and the hon. member for Compton mentioned several electoral districts. I have here the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, volume 4, which contains the Redistribution Act of 1924. The first constituency mentioned the other day by my hon. friend from Compton was Bagot. I find that in the act of 1924 the constituency of Bagot consisted of the county of Bagot. In 1933 the county of Bagot is annexed to part of St. Hyacinthe and part of Rouville. So there was no change in 1924, and there are several changes in 1933.

As to Beauce, what was done in 1924 to the parish of St. Benjamin is exactly the same thing as is done in the enactment of 1933. In the enactment of 1924 ten parishes of the county of Frontenac were left to Beauce, and in the enactment of 1933 six other parishes of that constituency are transferred from Beauce to a new constituency to be called Megantic-Frontenac. St. Severin and St. Elzear are transferred from Beauce to Lotbiniere, and St. Maxime is transferred from Dorchester to Beauce under the present redistribution. So all the changes of 1924 are incorporated in the enactment of to-day, together with other changes.

As to Bellechasse there are the same divisions concerning Honfleur and Ste. Sabine in 1933 as in 1924, and in addition there are three new changes in 1933.

As to Berthier-Maskinonge the provincial county boundaries were taken in 1924 and the same in 1933. There is no change there. The same applies to Brome-Missisquoi, where there is no change in 1933 as compared with 1924.

As to Charlevoix-Saguenay we have the same description in 1933 as in 1924, the only difference being that in 1933 a new parish Ste. Brigitte de Laval, is added to the constituency of Charlevoix-Saguenay, which is the largest in the whole country. That constituency is very well represented by my good friend the sitting member (Mr. Casgrain). It has a population which exceeds the unit by 6,000. Chateauguay-Huntingdon in 1924 comprised the counties of Chateauguay and Huntingdon as a whole. In 1933 that electoral district is divided into four parts. Chicoutimi includes the whole provincial county of Chicoutimi in 1924. The same description applies in 1933. There is no change made at this time. In 1924, Dorchester comprised the county of Dorchester, and the only difference in 1933 is that two municipalities are parted with or are taken away from that constituency. I believe in the amended bill two others are to be taken away. In 1924 the description of Drummond-Arthabaska showed that part of the municipality of St. Edmond in the township of Upton is excepted. Upton belongs to Bagot. In 1933 it includes, the complete counties of Drummond and Arthabaska. For Gaspé, in 1924 the only change was in the description. The old lines remained the same. In 1924 it included the two provincial counties of Gaspé, and also the Madeleine islands, which have been part of that electoral district since 1882. In 1924 nothing is changed in it, with the exception that two parishes from the old county of Matane were added. Therefore the only change has taken place in 1933. For Joliette there is no change in 1924. In 1933 Montcalm is annexed to Joliette. For Kamouraska there is no change in 1924 but in 1933, part of two constituencies are added to the electoral district of Kamouraska, namely parts of Témiscouata and L'Islet. The description in 1924 respects the old division which has existed since 1860, the date of the foundation of the parish of Notre-Dame-du-Portage. For Labelle there is no change in 1924, but in 1933 several parishes are taken from that constituency to be transferred to Argenteuil. For Laprairie-Napierville there is no change in 1924, but in 1933 that constituency is divided between Beauharnois-Laprairie and Chambly-Rouville. In 1924 L'Assomption-Montcalm was made up of two counties, whereas in 1933 L'Assomption is joined with parts of Terrebonne and Montcalm with Joliette. For L'Islet there is no change in 1924, but in 1933 that county is annexed to Montmagny, and five parishes are taken away. In 1924 Matane was comprised of the whole counties of Matane and Matapédia, the latter a subdivision of the former electoral district of Matane. The change in 1933 is that two parishes are taken from Matane to be transferred to Gaspé and four others in Matapédia are annexed to Bona-

venture. In 1924, there was no change in Megantic, but in 1933 part of Frontenac, a former subdivision of the electoral district of Beauce, is annexed, and six municipalities of Megantic are transferred from that county to the county of Lotbinière. In 1924 there was no change in Montmagny, but in 1933 part of L'Islet is transferred to part of it. Two big Liberal parishes are taken away from Montmagny. In Nicolet there is no change in 1924, but in 1933 part of Nicolet is united to part of Yamaska. In 1924 there was no change in Richelieu, but in 1933 Richelieu is annexed to part of Vercheres, and to part of Yamaska and part of St. Hyacinthe. In 1924 there was no change in Richmond-Wolfe, but in 1933 six municipalities of Wolfe are dispensed with, to be transferred to Megantic-Frontenac. In 1924 there was no change in Rimouski, but in 1933 four municipalities of Témiscouata are added to that constituency. For Sherbrooke there was the same description in 1924 as there is in 1933. For St. John-Iberville there was no change in 1924, but in 1933 the county of Napierville is annexed to the county of Iberville and part of the county of St. John. In 1924 there was no change in Shefford, and there is no change in 1933. For Terrebonne there was no change in 1924, but in 1933 part of the county of Terrebonne is annexed to the county of L'Assomption. In 1924 the description of Yamaska respected the ancient limits of the county with regard to part of St. Edmond in the township of Upton. In 1933 part of Yamaska is annexed to part of Nicolet. There has been no change in Wright as the description was the same in 1924 as it is in 1933.

I shall now quote the words of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil):

> I am willing and pleased to name the counties in which these changes were made, and if my hon. friends opposite want more details I will have those details typed for them and send them as many copies as they want. They are: Bagot, Beauce, Bellechasse, Berthier-Maskinonge, Brome-Missisquoi—here is another striking example—Charlevoix-Saguenay, Chateauguay-Huntingdon, Chicoutimi, Dorchester, Drummond-Arthabaska, Gaspe, Joliette, Kamouraska, Labelle, Laprairie-Napierville, L'Assomption-Montcalm, L'Islet, Matane, Megantic, Montmagny, Nicolet, Richelieu, Richmond-Wolfe, Rimouski, Sherbrooke, St. John-Iberville, Shefford, Terrebonne, Yamaska, Wright. If my hon. friends opposite want more details I have here all the territories by square miles that were transferred from one county to another between 1914 and 1924 by the provincial government and incorporated in the federal bill without any mention of it in the bill.

We have contended that the federal boundaries have always agreed with the provincial boundaries. Sometimes small changes have been made by provincial authorities, but the redistribution of 1924 which was carried on under a Liberal government was entirely in accord with the orthodox rules set down this afternoon by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Smith).

Mr. Chairman, may I ask you something? I wish to abide by the rules of the house, but I should like to know if the following four words are parliamentary: Onneyout, Goyogouin, Tsonnontouan, Onontagué?

Mr. STEVENS: I would suggest the chairman take those words under advisement.

Mr. POULIOT: I am not speaking French or English. They belong to a different language. They are the names of four Iroquois tribes, and I wonder if it would be parliamentary to apply one of those names to the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) who has made such misstatements to the House of Commons. I can say that he is an Onneyout, that he is a Goyogouin, that he is an Tsonnontouan, or an Onontague; that is what he deserves.

Now, sir, I have to condense sixty speeches into one speech, and I will not be long now I am the only member from the province of Quebec against whom the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec in 1925, 1926 and 1930 went to speak in his constituency. I am proud of that fact; it shows that they pay attention to me. First of all on October 17, 1925, Mr. Patenaude—he wears overalls now on Sunday in Montreal as a leader of a sort of branch of a club ouvrier or fédération, and they must be greasy—held a meeting at the city hall in Riviere du Loup One young man asked him a very bold question; you remember, sir, at the time that Mr. Patenaude was ashamed of his leader, the then Prime Minister, the right hon. Mr. Meighen, and the interrupter was bold enough to ask Mr. Patenaude: "Where is your leader, and who is he?" And Mr. Patenaude said, "Wait a minute, young man. On the matter of chieftain I will tell you more than your measure in a minute." And what was done? Did Mr. Patenaude speak? No, four or five strong men pulled the heckler out of the hall. That was the answer that was given. But I was elected by a majority of 2,000.

At the following election in 1926 I wrote to my leader, saying I had done my share for my party and I wanted a breathing spell to resume my legal practice. I said: "Sir, if you want to take another candidate in Témiscouata I am ready to support him, but if you want me to run I will do so as a

matter of loyalty to the party." Here is what I received in reply on July 17, 1926:

My Dear Pouliot,—

I was delighted to receive your letter of July 13. This is just to thank you very cordially for it and to wish you every possible success in the campaign.

You have had your share of contests, but that I believe has only helped to make you a better fighter.

Then at the request of my leader I was a candidate again in September, 1926. It was my third election within twenty months, as I had been elected first at a by-election in December, 1924. Then the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, who was the Prime Minister of the three months' government in 1926, held a meeting attended by 8,000 people in Rivière du Loup. They listened to him politely, as they do to all, and he said to them:

Even in the west I have fought for protection which is in the interests of the province of Quebec.

A man named Johnny Emond, who fortunately was not in the employ of the federal government, before the polling day went from house to house telling people it was not necessary for them to register, that he had received instructions to take their names and give them to the registrar. What did he do? He took the names of a great many people, selected the Conservatives and gave their names to the registrar and did not give the names of the others.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Shame!

Mr. POULIOT: Owing to that I lost about 500 votes in that election, but I was elected by over 1,900.

In 1930 the third leader of the Tory party within a brief space of years came to my constituency and held a meeting. He was very well received, I went to give him my good wishes, but I should have rather given my good wishes to the country if I had known what would be the result. Here is the program of my opponent as it was widely distributed in the constituency before the election day:

(Translation)

Program of Mr. Charles Eugène Dubé, Conservative candidate in Témiscouata:

1. The Honourable Mr. Bennett's program for the revival of our industry and the development of our agriculture;

That is fine—great success in industry and agriculture.

2. The Honourable Mr. Bennett's program to end unemployment immediately;

Mr. CASGRAIN: Immediately! Shame! He was to end unemployment at once.

Mr. POWER: It was a joke.

Mr. POULIOT: But unfortunately it was taken seriously.

(Translation)

The Honourable Mr. Bennett's program for a federal system of old age pensions;

Mr. CASGRAIN: He did not do it.

Mr. POULIOT: You will have to pay nothing to the federal treasury, we will pay all.

(Translation)

4. The Honourable Mr. Bennett's program for a Canadian preference in return for a British preference;

5. Canada for Canadians.

That is a St. Jean Baptiste phrase that we could find to-day on the lips of my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne). It is very nice theoretically, it would be very nice practically, but when we see my hon. friends opposite walking arm in arm with the Ku Klux Klan I cannot see Canada for the Canadians being so much in honour on the other side of the house.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): Has the hon. member forgotten that we are discussing Bill No. 2?

Mr. POULIOT: No, sir, I will explain why I read it. It is in consequence of the argument I made the other day, that each member should go back to the people who listened to these promises, within the same boundaries, in order that they may judge if they were fulfilled or not. I do not wish to impose on the time of the house, but I wish to tell you what has been said in my constituency and what my people have believed in, and I would like the same people within the same limits to meet the people who have believed them, who have tried this government as an experiment, to see what they will do when the bugle calls an election again.

(Translation)

6. For my county, Témiscouata.

(a) Revival of the project involving a branch line connection between Rivière-du-Loup and the Transcontinental;

Nothing has been done in that regard.

(Translation)

(b) Revival of the project to the development of our harbour;

I had a motion on that in the House of Commons; the Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Marine and the Conservative party as a whole voted against it.

(Translation)

(c) Restoring our railway shops to their former level of activity by keeping the work in the province of Quebec for the workingmen of Quebec and Riviere-du-Loup;

There are 800 railway employees in my constituency, 500 are laid off—this is the success my people have got.

(Translation)
(d) To end, by the economic revival of development of our industry and our agriculture, the five day week and the decrease in wages of our railway employees;

Now they are set back. It is far from being better; the farmers do not receive many cents for their products.

(Translation)
(e) The construction of a new station so long expected at Rivière-du-Loup;

About the Riviere du Loup station I have to say this, that it was not a new one; the old one was repaired. But if the government had been fair enough to settle the matter when it came first before the hon. Minister of Railways—and may I say that it was unfortunate that the hon. Minister of Railways had to go to Churchill at the time—you would never have heard me say a word about it except to praise the government. But I could not do it; I worked too much. I could only credit them with having done part of their duty.

(Translation)
(f) The carrying out of public works in the county (post offices, wharves, etc.) to give employment to the working classes and enable them to purchase from our farmers agricultural products at prices which will enable the latter to live on their farms.

No post office has been built. Moreover I had some money voted by parliament in 1930 for the building of a post office at Trois Pistoles and that post office has not been built and that money has not been spent.

Now, sir, there is something I wish to say about Notre Dame du Portage. That is rather a small parish, part of it is part of the old parish of St. André in the electoral district of Kamouraska, and part is part of the old parish of St. Patrice du Riviere du Loup in Temiscouata county. I know nearly everyone that lives there; they are all fine people and highly intelligent. The division lines have been the same for sixty years, ever since the creation of the parish, and some time ago I had the honour of assisting at a celebration in the parish at which there was present His Excellency Monseigneur Hallé, Vicar Apostolic of Northern Ontario. It is an excellent parish, and I have no reason for wishing to discontinue my happy association with the people. But a change has been made, for no other reason than that it has been requested by those who prevented the spending of $1.000 to repair the wharf there. That money was voted in 1930 and was available to make the necessary repairs to the wharf, but it was not spent. The people were told during the election that $15,000 would be spent there to complete an extension to the wharf, but nothing was done; the money was not spent. The result is that there is a great hole in the wharf, and it is in danger of drifting away by force of the ice in the winter. No wonder hon. gentlemen are ashamed to go there and explain to the people their actions in this regard. They can offer no excuse for not having spent the money in time for this purpose, and their negligence is all the more shameful when we remember that this is a splendid summer resort which is visited by people from Montreal and Toronto and other places.

Trois-Pistoles is another wonderful parish, one of the finest in my constituency. The farmers in that locality are just as prosperous as this government will permit them to be. They have very comfortable homes, as my hon. friend from L'Islet knows, as the hon. member for Kamouraska knows, and as my esteemed and respected friend and Quebec leader, the hon. member for Quebec East, also knows; indeed, no one knows better than he does. It is a wonderful part of the country and has belonged to the constituency since 1853, a period of eighty years. Now it is going to form part of another constituency. I shall congratulate my hon. friend from Rimouski if it goes through without change while the schedules are being considered in committee. I congratulate him because this is a genuine gift to him, for it is one of the most beautiful places in the whole province and, what is more, it is a summer resort. The people are all intelligent, fine people, and there are excellent schools, so that altogether I am justified in describing it as a wonderful section. I am sorry to see it go because I have fond memories of it. At Trois-Pistoles there took place some time ago the blessing of a monument which was erected at The Rasades, a small island, and the Bishop of Rimouski attended. It was during the summer and the gathering was great. This is one more link of remembrance that binds me to my constituents, and it is something that cannot be forgotten.

As regards Ste. Françoise, I may say that I was one of the godfathers of the church bells, and the bishop attended that ceremony also. People came from other parishes on that occasion. This is also a wonderful spot, situated in a valley between beautiful mountains, and it is a farming district as well.

The farmers there are good, law-abiding citizens, and I do not see why that parish should go to Rimouski. If the hon. gentleman from Rimouski is fortunate in having Trois Pistoles, he is twice lucky in having Ste. Françoise added to his constituency. Again, St. Jean de Dieu is a parish nineteen miles inland from the Canadian National Railways, with a population of two or three thousand, a place of which anyone might well be proud. Its agricultural society is a notable feature of it and the farmers are quite up to date; they win prizes in fairs, and they show a most enterprising spirit. My hon. friend from Rimouski is thrice happy in having these people join his constituency, and for my part I am thrice unhappy—yes, and four times, if you consider Notre Dame du Portage, which goes to the other constituency.

I have written, to one man in each of these parishes, the following communication. I prepared it and sent it off when I was first told that these parishes would be removed from the electoral district of Témiscouata:

(Translation)

You have all been too good to me that I should consent to sever the ties that bind me to any of you. Therefore, I would ask you to read this letter to all the electors of your parish, both Conservatives and Liberals, and to have petitions signed by the ladies who are entitled to vote as well as by the men, and forward same to me as soon as possible.

I look upon the county of Témiscouata as one large family and I do not want them to take away a single one of my electors, no matter what his political persuasion may be.

I consider myself in a priviliged position, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I am the only member who has presented to the house petitions from heads of families in my own constituency protesting against these changes. These petitions were signed by 113 electors of St. Francois; 180 electors of Notre Dame du Portage; 212 electors of St. Jean de Dieu; and 480 electors of Trois Pistoles parish and town—all heads of families.

Mr. ST-PERE: Were they only Liberals?

Mr. POULIOT: Both Liberals and Conservatives, and from St. Jean de Dieu I received a letter from the mayor saying that the petition was signed by all except two, who had their own reasons for not signing it, but who were equally opposed to the change. I can assure the committee that the people in that county will be outraged at these changes. I am not going to say anything further on that score but will simply leave it to my hon. friends opposite to do what is fair. These petitions were tabled in the house and I asked the chairman of the committee to call for them. He told me he did so, but the fact is that they have been entirely disregarded, notwithstanding that these parishes have been in the constituency for eighty years.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have a duty to perform, a duty which is neither pleasant nor unpleasant; it is not an elegy, it is merely a matter of form and course. In case there is an election this summer or in the fall, or in the interval at any time between now and the next meeting of parliament, I wish to say good-bye to my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Baribeau), whose constituency has been divided. I wish to say good-bye to my hon. friend from Berthier-Maskinonge (Mr. Barrette), who has two provincial counties. I wish to say good-bye to my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Bell), in whose constituency there is a change—all Conservatives. I wish to say good-bye to my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Belec), and to my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bourgeois), whose constituencies have been changed to serve him better. There is one member from the province of Quebec to whom I will not say good-bye, and to whom I will refer later. I am speaking now of the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan), whose dignity, efficiency and competency are admired by us all on this side. But I will say good-bye to my hon. friend from Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion), though I cannot congratulate him upon the mess the committee made of things. I wish to say good-bye also to my hon. friend from Lake St. John (Mr. Duguay), and to the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre), who is the member for Quebec West. To him I say good-bye and farewell. I say good-bye also to the Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau), and so far as he is concerned there is one thing that causes me regret—I will tell him frankly. Naturally he is fair; he has an excellent legal training and is one of the masters of his profession at the bar. He is highly respected in that profession, which he adorns. The only complaint I have to make is that he paid too much attention to the silly petitions and the unfair requests put before him. I have not had any business dealings with him but I like him very much personally. I bid good-bye and farewell to the hon. member for Levis (Mr. Fortin). He will be no longer a member of this house because the Solicitor General will run in that constituency. But I am sure he will be defeated by any candidate who runs for the Liberal party. I have known the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) a long time. I knew him at college where he was doing

better than I was because he was ahead of me. He was a member of the academic society, he had medals and all that. He does very well at the bar and I regret very much that he has not given a measure of his talents to the House of Commons. I regret very much that this committee cannot hear him arguing a case in court because he does it much better than any arguing he has done in the House of Commons. But that may be because he has better cases in court than he has in the house. To the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) I say, farewell, farewell! He can go to the Indian tribe and live with them. I say good-bye and farewell to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). However, I am sure he will be appointed assistant general counsel for the Canadian Pacific Railway within a very short time. I am sorry the hon. member for Richmond-Wolfe (Mr. Laflèche) does not feel as I do with regard to the parishes which have been taken away from his constituency. Apparently the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Larue) is sucking his nipper somewhere because we do not see him in the chamber. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Laurin) was here a short time ago but he has apparently gone to the washroom to brush his hair. I say good-bye to the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne). He should not change his attitude in the house, he should speak up like a man. He should say:

(Translation)

When I die, plant a willow in the cemetery. . . . To die for one's country, is the happiest fate, which is to be most envied. . . . Pro patria mori.

He should do better and act as a man in the House of Commons; he should preach by example rather than by words. I say farewell to the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Moore). He has been of no use in the house. He made a couple of speeches but they were most insipid. I am sure he will go without leaving any sore hearts. The hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Pickel) has said in the house that I had attacked his old age and infirmities. I told him that he was not old or infirm and that I had never referred to him in that way. He must have been suffering from amnesia because I had previously written him a letter congratulating him upon an excellent speech which he had made. He lost the full effect of my congratulations because I took back everything I had said. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) is a dear old gentleman. He is most inoffensive and unprovocative. He does not refer to the majority which he has behind him when he is acting Prime Minister. He is the antithesis of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) nor do I put them on the same level when it comes to the understanding of things. That is a different matter. To the Postmaster General (Mr. Sauve) I say: good-bye and farewell to thee. When he leaves the House of Commons I am sure Amédée Lesieur will give him nice quarters in the house he must have built with the profit of $20,000 which he made on the rural mail boxes.

Mr. O. L. BOULANGER (Bellechasse) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I could begin the brief observations I intend making with a sentence that we often hear in this house. I had not intended taking part in this discussion. As a matter of fact, I had promised myself not to open my mouth in the course of the present debate, and if I break the promise I had made with myself, I fear the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon) is responsible. Wednesday night, I believe, my hon. friend for Dorchester exhibited to the house the outline of the constituency I have the honour to represent, and it seemed to me he was trying to be witty in connection with that outline. He could have just as well exhibited the outline of the county of Dorchester which would not have appeared any better than that of Bellechasse. He tried to give the house the impression that the Liberal party was responsible for the present shape or outline of the county of Bellechasse. I wish to state to my friend from Dorchester that the county of Bellechasse as now shaped, save for one important change, was constituted in 1791. The county of Bellechasse, like the county of Dorchester, is one of the original counties created under the act of 1791. The only important change effected in the territory constituted as the county of Hertford, in 1791, which became in 1829 the county of Bellechasse, without any territorial alteration, was made in 1853, when the counties of Lévis and Montmagny were created.

In order to establish Montmagny, in 1853, the parishes of Saint-François, Berthier, Saint-Pierre were detached from Bellechasse, and the remainder of the territory was taken from L'Islet which was also an original county of 1791. The county of Lèvis was formed from a part of the county of Dorchester which prior to 1853, extended to the river. This is about the only important change that was made in respect to the boundaries of the county of Bellechasse since 1791. Therefore, the Liberals

are not responsible for the present shape or outline of the county of Bellechasse.

My hon. friend for Dorchester pretended to be shocked the other evening because two parishes are half in Bellechasse and half in Dorchester. He should know why this situation exists. These are two comparatively new parishes which the diocesan authorities placed astride the boundary, on both sides, if I may express myself thus. The parish of Honfleur which was settled about 1904 or 1905 is composed of part of the parishes of St-Gervais and St-Lazare, in the county of Bellechasse, and of part of the parishes of St-Claire and St-Anselme, in the county of Dorchester. St-Sabine was created about 1912 and is composed of parts of the townships of Bellechasse and Roux in the county of Bellechasse, and of part of the townships of Langevin and Ware in the county of Dorchester.

Provincially, as my friend from Dorchester knows—he is acquainted with the administrative customs and administrative law of the province of Quebec—each county is a civil municipality administered by a county council composed of the various parishes in the county. After the creation of these two parishes straddling the boundary of Bellechasse and Dorchester, it became necessary to include these two parishes in a civil county municipality, in order that the mayors of the new parishes may form part of a county council. They could be put either in Dorchester or Bellechasse. The Quebec legislature decided to place them both, in their entirety, in Bellechasse, and the boundary line was corrected accordingly.

The same thing happened as to the boundary between Bellechasse and Montmagny. I believe the member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett) raised this question a couple of days ago. There again, they created parishes straddling the boundary line of Bellechasse and Montmagny. The parishes are known as St-Euphémie and St-Fabien. And, in order to make the boundaries of the civil municipalities conform to those of the religious parishes, the Quebec legislature was only required to make some very slight boundary changes between Bellechasse and Montmagny.

The hon. member for Dorchester is shocked over the fact that the parishes of St-Sabine and Honfleur are divided between Dorchester and Bellechasse. Why did he not correct that in the bill which we are discussing today? I note that in this bill the situation created in 1924—possibly earlier, I do not know, but let us say under the redistribution of 1924—is left as it was: these two parishes remain divided between Bellechasse and Dorchester. The hon. member for Dorchester stated the other day that he appeared before the committee, that he told them what to do, that he insisted on the changes and alterations he wanted in his constituency. Since he considers the division of these two parishes between two neighbouring counties abnormal, why did he not ask to have this state of affairs changed, that this abnormal situation be remedied, when he appeared before the committee? He merely had to ask the committee to make the federal boundaries conform to the provincial limits.

I did not appear before the committee on redistribution, I did not even go into the room where the committee met. The members of the committee never consulted me respecting the changes they wanted to make in connection with the county of Bellechasse. I asked for nothing, I made no bargain and I agreed to nothing. I have a too wholesome respect for the feelings of the people.

I share many of the views and ideas of my friend from Montmagny (Mr. LaVergne), but I certainly do not agree with him when he says: "It matters little where they vote, so long as they vote!"

Mr. LAPOINTE Hear, hear.

Mr. BOULANGER: I believe the people have not only the right to vote but that they have also the right to vote at home; they have a right to vote for somebody they know and to vote where their vote will be most effective. I certainly did not ask for the parishes or the municipalities of the counties of Dorchester, Lévis and Montmagny that are being annexed to Bellechasse. My friend from Montmagny says: "It matters little? What has that to do with those people, so long as they vote"? I ask myself, for instance, if that would be very consoling for the inhabitants of the municipalities of St-Henri, the village of St-Henri, Rivière-Boyer, and St-Jean-Chrysostôme, if they were told:" "What does it matter to you if you vote in Bellechasse or in Lévis? You do not lose your right to vote." As I stated a moment ago, the people of these four municipalities, Rivière-Boyer, St-Henri Village, St-Henri-de-Lauzon and St-Jean-Chrysostôme, have formed part of the county of Dorchester, from 1791 to 1853, and since then they form part of the county of Lévis. They never had anything in common with the county of Bellechasse, they never had any connection whatever with the county of Bellechasse, they do not form part of the same judicial district, their registry office is at Lévis, there is absolutely no link between them and the people of Bellechasse.

Mr. GAGNON: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BOULANGER: With pleasure.

Mr. GAGNON: I observe that he has studied the regional history of his district closely. Is it not true that Rivière-Boyer formed part of the county of Bellechasse, in 1867?

Mr. BOULANGER: No. The line which divided the counties of Dorchester and Lévis prior to 1853, and which since then separates the counties of Lévis and Bellechasse, was never altered. It is the easterly line of the Lauzon seigniory, and no area of the Lauzon seigniory ever formed part of the county of Bellechasse. This line has remained unchanged since 1791.

Of course, I am speaking from memory, I have no notes before me, but I do not believe my hon. friend from Dorchester can contradict me on this point.

To return to what I was saying a moment ago, here are people who never had anything in common, since almost two hundred years, with the county of Bellechasse, who are told by way of consolation: "You are not losing your vote!" One thing must be borne in mind, the vote of those people in the county of Bellechasse, is merely one more drop of water in the ocean. It will have practically no influence in this county which normally gives a large majority to the Liberals. But, in the county of Levis, for instance, their vote could be much more effective; it would be sufficient to defeat the Conservative candidate.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The Conservatives want to avoid that.

Mr. BOULANGER: Those people have a right to cast a vote where it will be of most value, where it will be most effective, and there is no reason why they should be denied the pleasure they would experience in contributing effectively to the defeat of the Government candidate.

I asked myself, for instance, what my hon. friend, the member for Montmagny, would say, if his argument were invoked to console the people of the county of Russell,—if, perchance, it were to disappear—this was strongly mooted, for being denied the right, privilege and satisfaction of electing a representative of their race and language to the House of Commons. I wonder if it would be a great satisfaction to them, should their constituency disappear, were the hon. member for Montmagny to go to them and say: "What is the use of you being distressed because you are losing your county and the right to elect one of your people, you will vote just the same!"

I am sure the hon. member for Montmagny did not give it a thought. He never intended being so cynical and brutal when he submitted the following argument to the house: "It matters little where the people vote so long as they vote; what difference does it make whether they vote on this side of the river or on the other side, on this side of a tree rather than on the other side."

The counties form a large family, as already stated, they like to vote for somebody they know. Take the case of the five or six parishes that are annexed to Bellechasse. They will be like strangers in the midst of the population of old Bellechasse; they will almost feel they are mingling with unknown people. It is evident they will not have much say in the selection of the candidate at the next election. That candidate will be selected by the population of the old county and he will be a man which these newcomers will scarcely know. Thus they will be only a comparatively negligible quantity both with respect to the selection of the candidate and the vote they will cast, since it is only a matter of adding a few hundred additional votes to the already large Liberal majority in the county of Bellechasse.

I do not discuss this from a personal standpoint or from the standpoint of the person who will be the Liberal candidate at the next election in the county of Bellechasse. I consider the matter simply from the viewpoint of the people to whom the counties which they inhabit belong.

The people should have something to say in regard to alterations of county boundaries. They are not mere cattle that can be bartered on the public square; they are not a common herd which the government or its supporters can push to the right or to the left, unite or amalgamate according to their fancy. The government consulted nobody. It did not even consult the present representative of the county of Bellechasse in respect of the additions it proposed to make to this constituency, neither were the parties to be annexed consulted.

I do not want my hon. friend, the member for Dorchester, or other opponents, to place a wrong construction on my words. I said a moment ago, that I had asked for nothing, that I had not solicited additions to my constituency, that I made no bargain with any person and that I had agreed to nothing. I do not want my words to be interpreted as

meaning that I refuse to accept the municipalities that are to be annexed to the county of Bellechasse and that I do not want those people. Our opponents are capable of saying that.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): They can say anything.

Mr. BOULANGER (Translation): Our opponents are experts at misrepresenting our thoughts, words and attitudes. That is the reason why I am anxious to explain my attitude in that regard. We do not refuse to accept them with open arms and open hearts. whether I or another person is the Liberal candidate at the next election, we will do the best we can to treat those people just as if they had always formed part of the population of the old county. We will do even more; we will treat them with a special regard, goodwill and kindness, in order to make them forget "the great derangement" and "the dispersal."

Mr. POULIOT: I have just a few words to say to conclude. I am glad to see the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Moore) in the chamber now. I was saying that his silence was contributing a great deal toward enlightening the debate. As for the hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi (Mr. Pickel), he spoke often about the trouble in the dairy industry in his part of the world. That is because they have a pickle in the milk can. To the hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Sullivan), I say good-bye and I say good-bye and farewell to the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Tetreault). As for the hon. member for Mount Royal (Mr. White), who is the wise man on the other side of the house, I say: Au revoir and perhaps he will not be a candidate again. To each one of the members of the Conservative party from the province of Quebec I say good-bye and farewell.

Mr. QUINN: They might come back.

Mr. POULIOT: There is a comeback to everything. I say good-bye to my old seat on this side of the house; I say au revoir to the House of Commons and to my old seat on the other side after the next election. After that occurs, whether it be next year or this, if this legislation is not changed, we shall see a change of government and that is why I say farewell to hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Quebec, except probably the Secretary of State (Mr. Cahan), and why I say au revoir to the House of Commons and to all the members on this side.

Hon. gentlemen opposite who represent Quebec constituencies have a great responsibility because it is with their twenty-five seats that they gave a majority to the government. They have shown no independence; they have been slaves from beginning to end since July 28, 1930. They have shown no independence of character; they have not had the courage to tell the Prime Minister the truth, to give good guidance to him. They have supported him all right, but they have not been columns of light. I do not put into that category some of the front benchers for whom I have great respect and personal liking; but I say this, that if there has been something wrong in the government of this country; if the promises that were made to the electors have not been fulfilled, this is because each one of the Conservative members from Quebec, with the exception of the Secretary of State, have not had the courage to tell the truth to the Prime Minister.

Mr. M. RHEAUME (St. Johns-Iberville) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up too much time, but I wish to protest on behalf of the people of Lacolle whose municipality forms part of the county of St. Johns since almost 60 years.

The county of St. Johns was created in 1860 and at the time of the gerrymander of 1892, the parishes and village of Lacolle were annexed to the county of Missisquoi. This did not bring luck to the Conservatives who had made that change. Their intention in transferring the people of Lacolle to that county was to secure the election of the Conservative candidate. He was defeated nevertheless. At the time of the redistribution of 1903, the people of the municipality and parishes of Lacolle who previously had been annexed to the county of Missisquoi asked to return to the county of St. Johns. They had a right to make that request because from the standpoint of the county council, two parishes and a rather important village form part of the county of St. Johns, provincially. Yielding to the entreaties of the citizens of the parishes and village of Lacolle, the Liberal party restored them to the county of St. Johns in 1903.

After a lapse of 30 years, the government decides to transfer them to Huntingdon, in order to increase the population of Chateauguay-Huntingdon, where parishes were removed so as to establish a corridor linking Laprairie with Beauharnois. At all events, I am sorry to see them leave, because I had some good friends there, and I am sorry that they will no longer form part of my county, although my majority is not very

large. At all events, I wish to protest on behalf of the people of that part of my constituency.

I would also like to say a word in respect of the county of Laprairie-Napierville. The county of Napierville was created in 1860 and united with the county of Laprairie in 1892. My county does not contain the population it should have, only, I regret that the citizens of the county of Laprairie-Napierville should be separated after having lived side by side for a period of 41 years. I receive the people of Napierville with pleasure and I bid them a most cordial welcome. They are no strangers in St. John's. They form part of the same judicial district, they come to market at St. John's; they are worthy farmers and I know several of them. I can assure them that the population and I—having the honour to represent the county of St. John's-Iberville in this house—look on their coming very favourably.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to state that I could not suffer the removal of that part of my county, the parishes and village of Lacolle, without protesting on behalf of the people living therein and who desire to remain in this fine county of St. John's-Iberville from which they had been removed in 1892 and to which they had been restored in 1903 on their own entreaties. I greatly regret these changes that have been effected in my constituency and I wish the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Moore) all possible success with the people of that part of my constituency.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. ELLIOTT: The bill which I have says, The Representation Act, 1932.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know whether the government intend to have the date changed. If so there should be an amendment. We are now in 1933.

Mr. BENNETT: The reprinted bill meets that difficulty. There were some typographical errors in the bill as first printed, and to correct these and to meet the changes that have been made we are having the bill reprinted, so that it will be available to hon. members.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We have not a copy of the reprinted bill.

Mr. BENNETT: I have a copy and the leader of the opposition was sent a copy this morning.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I have seen a reprint of the seats in Ontario.

[Mr. Rhéaume.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have what is called a revise with the corrections as made last night. This was kindly sent to me during the course of this afternoon, but it is not a bill reprinted in form for distribution.

Mr. BENNETT: The one the chairman has says 1933, and I think the copy in the hands of the leader of the opposition says 1933.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): My copy says 1932.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The revise I have says 1933.

Mr. BENNETT: Then I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the figure "1933" be substituted for the figure "1932."

Mr. CASGRAIN: If we are going to discuss the schedules I think it is most important that members of the committee be supplied with copies of the reprinted bill. The leader of the opposition has one, but we have not copies.

Mr. BENNETT: I wholly agree, and I have endeavoured to expedite the printing, but last minute changes were made in some of these schedules and checked over by Mr. Castonguay after agreements were arrived at in connection with Ontario and in three cases I think in Quebec. The Saskatchewan schedule was also changed so that Touchwood becomes Yorkton, and there are other changes to which I shall allude. I think hon. members will find that at eight o'clock copies will be available for distribution.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to put some matter on Hansard when we come to section 3.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): We are on section 1 now.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I know, but section 3 may easily be passed unless I give notice now that I want to speak on it with regard to the schedules, which sooner or later, and I hope it will be sooner, will come before the committee. How in the world are we going to discuss them unless we have a map?

Mr. BENNETT: The same as we did in other years.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Other years is quite a while ago, and I do not just recall what was done. There have been a number of mistakes already, and in any event we would like to have a map to check over the description.

Mr. QUINN: You would tear it up.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The primary purpose of redistribution is to equalize the population in the different constituencies, but population seems to be the last thing under consideration in this bill. At all events, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some observations before we pass section 3.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the new bill or any part of it is being substituted for the whole or any part of the old one, some motion will have to be made to that effect; otherwise we shall be at sixes and sevens.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not a substitution. The chairman has the bill as introduced, and motions will be made as we proceed to deal with the changes. In connection with the schedule for the province of Ontario, for instance, I propose to move that a new schedule be substituted, the schedule that has been initialed by the committee and checked by the chief electoral officer and by the law officers and by the geographers—shall I say?—of the departments, so that there is no question as to the accuracy of the description. That is really what has been holding up the printing and distribution of the bill. As the right hon. gentleman knows, it is a difficult task to check up all these boundaries and be sure that they are accurate. Mr. Castonguay has been giving his entire time to the matter.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I understand some minor adjustments have been made concerning other provinces since the original bill was drawn.

Mr. BENNETT: Do I understand the hon. member to ask whether or not any changes have been made with respect to Manitoba?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Nothing, with the exception of the checking of spelling and some verifications made by the law officers and the chief electoral officer. There has been no change in substance at all, I am sure.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I believe there was a change, which was agreed to by the various groups, which was to be introduced. It was to be brought in at the time the schedules were being discussed.

Mr. BENNETT: Which one was that?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The change I refer to concerned my own constituency of Winnipeg North Centre, and particularly a certain block now belonging to Winnipeg South Centre. I was not on the committee, but I understand certain changes were agreed to by all parties concerned.

Mr. BENNETT: To date, no change has been made in it. We will deal with it when we come to it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The right hon. Prime Minister has stated a new schedule has been printed because some arrangements have been concluded so far as Ontario is concerned, and in regard to two or three places in Quebec. As the press stated yesterday and this morning that there had been arrangements made for Quebec, with the exception of one or two cases, I desire to correct that wrong impression. So far as I know there have been no arrangements made for Quebec, and the bill is just as bad to-day as it was two days ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Speaking of newspaper reports, I notice this evening's Journal has reference to changes which are supposed to have been made in the revised bill. If this is authentic I think it is extraordinary that the Conservative press should receive information ahead of parliament on a matter parliament is discussing. I should like to read from the Ottawa Evening Journal of to-day the article dealing with alleged concessions which have been made:

> Names Of Two Ottawa Seats Are Changed
> Constituencies Will Be Known as East and West Ottawa
> Concessions Made In Prince Albert
>
> In the new draft of the schedules of the Redistribution Bill, the proposed names of South Ottawa and North East Ottawa for the two constituencies of the capital have been altered to West Ottawa and East Ottawa respectively. Concessions have been made by Conservatives to Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Liberal leader, in the Saskatchewan riding of Prince Albert.
>
> It is definitely understood that the government is amending the representation measure to restore some 6,000 residents to Prince Albert. This, as was pointed out, leaves little uncertainty over the reelection of Mr. Mackenzie King in Prince Albert.
>
> Conservative members further explained that nothing was being done in West Calgary to further the reelection of the Prime Minister, who is the member for that seat. It was stated that the change being made in East Calgary, which is represented by Doctor G. D. Stanley, if anything, endangers Mr. Bennett's prospects.
>
> A deadlock was still in evidence to-day between Conservative and Liberal members over the redistribution in Quebec and Saskatchewan. Despite this it is forecast that parliament will certainly prorogue to-morrow. The opposition members have registered their protests and now all that remains is the formal approval of the representation bill.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask where the Ottawa Journal gets this information? The house has not yet even had a copy of the bill which, according to the report I have read, has been discussed in parliament.

Mr. MANION: May I say that the Evening Citizen has an article on the front page, too. I presume the newspapers got this information from somewhere.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That only makes it worse.

Mr. MANION: It is a different article.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The information must have come from a government source.

Mr. MANION: Not at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Information of this kind must have been given out.

Mr. TURNBULL: So far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, may I say that all the matters to which reference has been made in the article were only yesterday subjects of debate in this chamber. The concession in connection with Prince Albert was offered yesterday; the amount of population was mentioned, and is recorded in Hansard. In connection with the statement concerning the seat in Calgary, may I say that the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) made similar statements in the house to-day. The article appears to be merely a repetition of what has taken place in the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yesterday the government made no statement to the house as to what it was going to do with respect to Prince Albert constituency. Hansard will show that. May I say that if what has been done in Prince Albert is only what the Prime Minister said the government would then undertake to do, it is anything but a fair redistribution. If the change that has been made accords with what appears in the article I have read, or the bill I have as revised, the present constituency of Prince Albert has been gerrymandered from a safe Liberal seat into what would appear to be a safe Conservative seat. When the schedule is before us I wish to point out that the government has enlarged the constituency on one side so as to bring in an increased number of votes, and has only not taken away quite as large a portion of the southern portion of the constituency as was proposed in the map presented in the first instance. However, what has been done certainly has had the effect, if we take the figures of the last general election as any indication, of changing the constituency of Prince Albert from a Liberal constituency into what would be a Conservative constituency. In the face of that, I fail to see what authority any publication could have to say it understands:

—that the government is amending the representation measure to restore some 6,000 residents to Prince Albert. This, as was pointed out, leaves little uncertainty over the reelection of Mr. Mackenzie King in Prince Albert.

May I say that from any suggestion of restoring residents the public will assume that some reference is being made to the constituency as it existed originally. As a matter of fact when the bill was brought in there was such an obvious gerrymander of Prince Albert that the government itself admitted the lines were wrong, and it now appears that in one particular it has modified them, but certainly not in a particular which will make a fair redistribution of the constituency of Prince Albert. I just wish to protest against any impression going abroad, before this house has had any opportunity to see the changes which have been made, to the effect that what is being done in Prince Albert is being done in a way which will make that constituency at all safe for its present member.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Was the Prime Minister under the impression that these new up-to-date schedules had been distributed to the house?

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is the use of talking about them then?

Mr. BENNETT: I am sorry any incorrect statements should have appeared in the press, but I assure the right hon. gentleman that this government is not in any way responsible for them. When he protests against them, he is within his rights, as a matter of privilege, to assert that statements have been made for which there was no justification. The government is no more to blame for it or no more responsible for it than someone on the street. The truth is that in these modern days newspapers have ways of obtaining what they regard as accurate information which is printed and which in some instances turns out to have some foundation, and in other instances none. No one knows better than the right hon. gentleman that we have all suffered from that. For instance not long since I was amazed to read in some newspapers certain statements as to what was transpiring in connection with matters of considerable international importance. How the news could

have been discovered I do not know; it did not come from the government. I thought at the time that it was rather a bad thing that it should happen. In this instance I assure the right hon. gentleman that as far as I can ascertain the government is not responsible for this position.

As to the schedules, the usual course, I understand, is to move that the schedules be adopted, beginning with the province of Ontario. At the last redistribution the right hon. gentleman pointed out that the word was schedule, not schedules, but finally an adjustment was made by which each province was treated as a separate schedule. I propose, when that is done, to move an amendment wherever it may be necessary to make clear just what departure has been made from the schedule as printed. My constant effort during the day has been to have those amendments embodied in the form of a printed schedule that may be distributed to the members. Of course some constituencies are not affected at all except to the extent perhaps of a change in spelling, or a plural for a singular or vice versa. These are matters that ever since the bill came into this house have been engaging the attention of those responsible for them. It has been a rather heavy task for Mr. Castonguay and an equally heavy task for the law officers and those who have to double check it, those who are more expert than the chief electoral officer or the lawyers in the reading of maps, to make certain that the committee's conclusions are properly embodied in the bill. I certainly share the view of the right hon. gentleman, and I have expressed it frequently, that it is to be regretted that statements appear in the newspapers, statements which sometimes have some foundation in fact, but which are elaborated in such a way as to cause embarrassment and inconvenience in the transaction of public business before parliament has been apprised of the facts, or any opportunity given to members of parliament to consider or deal with them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is there a possibility that these schedules will be ready for distribution at eight o'clock?

Mr. BENNETT: I am very hopeful that that will be so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad the Prime Minister has made the statement he has about what I have quoted from the press. Seeing that it has appeared and that we have been discussing the matter, I would at once like to make clear the facts about any alleged restoration of some 6,000 of population in Prince Albert, if this is what has been done. Should such be the case I would like to point out that in the first map brought in, 12,000 had been taken away from the original constituency. It is now said 6,000 are being restored. How the remaining 6,000 have been distributed I shall point out when we come to discuss the schedules.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course the right hon. gentleman realizes that there has been an increase of population in the last ten years.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the present population.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Stirling): Shall clause 1 carry?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, please leave that until after the adjournment.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS—OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE ACT AMENDMENT—ORDER DROPPED

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I understand that on account of the public bill standing on the order paper in my name the ordinary procedure would require that Your Honour take the chair at eight o'clock. I wish to say that I do not desire to proceed with the bill; I will not have time to do so, and I shall have to ask that the order be discharged. Your Honour will therefore not be compelled to assume the chair for that purpose.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house again in committee on Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. Smoke in the chair.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Shelburne-Yarmouth): I wish to say a word or two with regard to the situation in the province of Nova Scotia. Hon. gentlemen discussed the matter this afternoon very briefly and I should like to point out what has been done in that province and at the same time to correct an impression which was left by the Prime Minister when he spoke the other day with reference to the situation down there. The right hon. gentleman's reference

to Nova Scotia will be found at page 5344 of Hansard. He said:

Now, what had the committee to face in that province? There had to be faced the question whether or not you would break up, as might have been done, the county of Colchester, represented in this house by a Liberal. Add half of it to Cumberland and you would still be under your population. You would not be over the population according to the unit and you have eliminated the one seat that had to be eliminated on the mainland. What did the committee do? Because county lines are so highly regarded in that province it left Cumberland, Colchester and Digby; it left Antigonish-Guysborough with its 25,000 and left Shelburne-Yarmouth with the addition of the parish of Clare from the county of Digby. It then took the county of Digby, the county of Annapolis and the county of Kings and made them into one riding without disturbing the lines, and this new riding has a population of 50,000. It is said that according to the principles laid down, that is unfair but the committee felt that rather than dismember counties, rather than split them in two and put part of the population here and part there, it was better to have a county which was 6,000 over the unit than to have all the consequent confusion and ill feeling which would arise from following the course I have mentioned.

Then he speaks of an objection made by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short), which objection was voiced again this afternoon. I am afraid that my right hon. friend has been unintentionally misled in regard to what was done in Nova Scotia. He professes in that passage to be exceedingly solicitous in this matter, not wishing to dismember or to split up counties. He asks what had the committee to face, and says that the committee wanted to regard county lines; therefore, he says, they left Cumberland, Colchester and Digby. Let me tell my right hon. friend this—

Mr. BENNETT: Not Digby, Pictou.

Mr. RALSTON: Perhaps my right hon. friend meant Pictou; he said Digby. The Prime Minister is pointing out how desirable it is not to dismember counties, and he says that the committee were faced with this problem. They might have cut up Colchester, adding part of it to Cumberland, and I suppose he suggests adding part of Colchester to Pictou. But he says they left these counties. As a matter of fact, what they did do was precisely the thing against which he was protesting; that is to say, they dismembered the county of Digby. They cut it in two. Digby county, I would point out, comprises the district of Digby and the district of Clare. That county has been electing members to the local legislature ever since there have been elections there; they have been electing members all these years locally and they have also been electing federal members. At least, they have been electing federal members until the Conservative government in 1914 dismembered the county and put Clare in with Yarmouth and Digby along with Annapolis.

Looking at the figures giving the population, I find that the district of Digby has 10,231, and the district of Clare, to which my right hon. friend referred as the parish of Clare, has 8,122. It is not a parish at all but a district. As a matter of fact, for municipal purposes it is a municipality, the municipality of Clare, but Digby county is one provincial constituency and has been electing members for many years.

My hon. friends on the other side have more than once suggested that provincial lines should not be disturbed, but here provincial lines are being disturbed with a vengeance; for never until the redistribution of 1914 had that historic district been dismembered for purposes of federal representation. As I say, Digby and Clare together have elected a local representative as well as a federal representative throughout the years. After Clare was restored to Digby under the redistribution of 1924, we find once more, in spite of the protestations against the dismemberment of counties, that the county of Digby is being broken up with the result that Clare district goes to Shelburne-Yarmouth and Digby district to Annapolis-Kings. My right hon. friend asks: What had the committee to face? Well, this is what they had to face. They had to face this question: Shall we add a portion of Colchester on to Cumberland and thus endanger the seat of the hon. member for Cumberland, by adding on a portion of Colchester which would give a Liberal majority, or shall we on the other hand add the other portion of Colchester on to the county of Pictou and thus make another Liberal constituency? Shall we put the eastern portion of the county of Pictou on to the constituency of Antigonish-Guysborough and have possibly a Conservative majority in East Pictou outvoted by a Liberal majority in Antigonish-Guysborough? Well, they acted on exactly the principle which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister laid down as reported at page 5342 of Hansard:

Undoubtedly where two courses were open our friends chose the course that was more helpful to them.

That is the real explanation. It was not that they did not wish to split counties, because they have in fact done so. My right hon. friend interrupted a moment ago to say that he meant the county of Pictou where he spoke about leaving counties as they were. I suggest that it was not because he has any

particular love for Pictou, and had it been regarded as advantageous I have no doubt the other course would have been followed. This however is the more "helpful" arrangement and this is the redistribution that has been made, with the result that Digby finds itself dismembered, with the municipality of Clare torn away and tacked on to Shelburne-Yarmouth, while in the other end Digby district is tacked on to Kings-Annapolis. My hon. friends had other alternatives such as I have spoken of with regard to Colchester and possibly with regard to Pictou. They had alternatives in connection with the readjustment of Halifax. They also had an alternative which would not have necessitated the dismembering of a single county line; yet they chose this particular course, with the result that Digby is wiped out. That is in the Annapolis valley, one of the richest parts of Nova Scotia, with a population who I believe treasure their representation. But, this notwithstanding, the Annapolis valley is made to lose a member at this time.

I sympathize with what my right hon. friend says, that it is undesirable to break up county lines, having people who have always voted together separated—people who, though they may have voted on opposite sides, have nevertheless voted in the same constituency and discussed their problems together. Suddenly they find that from one side of the street they are voting in one constituency, while from the other side of the street their friends are voting in another riding, though they are all in the same county. I can fully realize the undesirability of this and the heartburning there must be in counties that are thus dismembered. But that need not have been done here. What is the result? The result has been this. In the county of Hants-Kings, which is represented by my colleague (Mr. Ilsley), there was on the eastern end the county of Hants which give 189 Liberal majority. That county has been cut off this constituency. And what has been put in its place? A county and a half, that is to say, the county of Annapolis and half the county of Digby—with a Liberal majority, do you suppose? No, but 188 of a Conservative majority in that new western end. They cut off a Liberal majority of 189 and added a Conservative majority of 188. Two counties and a half have been put together. I do not think the hon. member for Hants-Kings was wrong when he protested against this disruption of his constituency.

Mr. SHORT: Is my hon. friend not aware that in the last election the county of Kings gave the hon. member a majority of over 900?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, but I know that this has been a fighting ground ever since it has been a county.

Mr. SHORT: It has given but two Conservative members.

Mr. RALSTON: In 1926 the Liberal majority was only about 100; in 1925 there was a large Conservative majority. The county of Kings has always been a fighting ground, although it gave the present hon. member a large majority at the last election. Generally speaking, that is the situation. They are now taking away the Liberal majority of 189 and putting in its place a Conservative majority of 188, so I say that the hon. member for Hants-Kings was quite justified in protesting against that injustice which is being done him at this time.

He had this further reason. He had run in two elections in the county of Hants; he knew the people and the people knew him. There has been a county and a half added and although he knows the people in a general way, he has not been in as close touch with them as he has been with those in his own constituency. So I say that he was perfectly justified in protesting against the disruption of his constituency.

This redistribution has been a selection from one of a number of different courses and, consciously or unconsciously, the committee has apparently succeeded in carrying out the ideas which have been expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett). He reiterates this idea at page 5343 of Hansard when he says:

—when a choice has to be made in one of two given ways you must expect that choice to be made in the way that will be most advantageous to the party in power.

Mr. BENNETT: It would be well to take the preceding sentence which says "both equally right."

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry but it does not say that.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I said before. I would not expect the hon. gentleman to make any reference to that, of course.

Mr. RALSTON: My right hon. friend can make any reference to it he likes.

Mr. BENNETT: I said that both ways were equally right.

Mr. RALSTON: My right hon. friend took pains to lay down without any qualification in two different places the principle that if there were two courses open, the course to be taken would be that which was advantageous to the party in power. Some-

where else he said something about the two courses being equally right. I think I have demonstrated that these two courses were not equally right, that the course taken was the one that was least right.

Mr. BENNETT: They all involved the dismemberment of counties.

Mr. RALSTON: I assure my right hon. friend that they did not all involve the dismemberment of counties. Arrangements could have been made which would not have involved the dismemberment of counties. The counties could have been left intact and the constituencies would have been no larger than those produced by this redistribution.

As a result of this redistribution the hon. member for Hants-Kings now has a constituency with a population of 50,885. If the county boundaries had not been disturbed a new constituency could have been arranged which would have been no larger. I should like to put on record for future reference the populations of the various rural constituencies in Nova Scotia as a result of this proposed redistribution. They are as follows:

Kings-Annapolis-Digby	50,885
Hants-Colchester	44,444
Lunenburg-Queens	42,286
Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare	41,546
Pictou	39,018
Cumberland	36,366
Inverness-Richmond	34,797
Victoria-Cape Breton	31,615
Antigonish-Guysborough	25,516

This new constituency of Kings-Annapolis-Digby will have a population of 50,885. Outside Hants-Colchester, which is 200 over the unit, this is the only rural constituency with a population above the unit of representation. Even the two Halifax seats have only an average population of 50,000 per member. This new constituency with its two and a half counties has a population equal to the city constituencies of Halifax. The Prime Minister says that the two courses were equally proper, but I say that they were not and that that redistribution should not have been made.

While I am on my feet I should like to refer to another matter mentioned by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Macdougall) this afternoon and to which I referred last November when this bill received second reading. It refers particularly to the representation for the maritime provinces, and I do not intend to allude to the province of Nova Scotia alone. This matter perhaps should be discussed under section 2 of the bill, but if the committee will bear with me I shall take it up while I am on my feet.

[Mr. Ralston.]

As I stated last November, we from the maritime provinces feel that applying the strict letter of the bond as laid down in the British North America Act, the results of the representation provision have resulted in a real injustice being done to our provinces. I have not the figures before me for New Brunswick, but in 1867 Nova Scotia had a population of 364,000 and a representation of 19 members. In 1933 we have 513,000 of population and according to this bill we are to have 12 members. I am not finding any fault at the moment with the calculation, but the result is that while we have had an increase in population of 42 per cent there has been a decrease of 37 per cent in the number of members. I am quite satisfied that such a result was not contemplated by those who had to do with the drafting of the act of confederation. They selected the province of Quebec as a unit because they regarded that province, while not having the largest population, as one in which the variations in population would be normal. They did not anticipate the increases in territory which have taken place since confederation. When they put in subsection 4 of section 51, which provides that if the proportion of population of a province as compared with the population of Canada does not decrease by more than one-twentieth then there will be no reduction in members, as a saving clause they regarded it as sufficiently protective. They never anticipated that there would be such an increase in the unit of representation that the smaller provinces would have their original representation reduced. Let me read just a sentence from what was said by the Hon. George Brown in introducing the resolution with respect to representation. He said:

> The practical result will be that while Lower Canada certainly will not be less and the lower provinces may increase in population, they cannot decrease in the number of representatives.

I ask hon. members to note that particularly.

> It keeps the house within a reasonable limit;

Sir Alexander Galt, three years before confederation, in dealing with its terms, said:

> We have supposed that the population of Lower Canada being tolerably equable in its character, would afford the best basis. But having respect to the rapid increase of Upper Canada, we think the lower provinces should not be reduced if they do not increase in the same ratio. Therefore the lower provinces would have the same as they have now—unless in the very improbable case of any one falling off by five per cent or more.

That decrease, when the fathers of confederation framed the bill, had to do with the four original provinces, namely, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. It was held by the privy council, I think in 1905, that that fractional proportion should be taken rather to have regard to the whole of the Dominion of Canada as it at present exists, and applying it in that way in the maritime provinces we are not protected by the saving clause, but our representation has been steadily going down.

I have read what was thought at the time of confederation. What has happened? A yardstick was set up as the unit of representation. That yardstick was this: Quebec will always have sixty-five members and the representation of the other provinces will be based thereon. The fathers of confederation did not anticipate that in 1898 more than 100,000 square miles of territory would be added to that yardstick, nor that in 1912 something like 400,000 square miles more would be added to it, so that now we find our unit of measurement completely out of line with what it was at the time section 51 of the British North America Act was drafted.

We have in section 51, subsection 3 of the British North America Act as emended in 1871, a provision for altering the limits of provinces. This is what it states:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution, or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

Let me point out that neither in 1898 nor in 1912 was provision, as is permitted in the subsection I have just read, made respecting the effect and operation of the increase of boundaries in relation to the provinces affected thereby. The result is, as I say, that we now find our yardstick completely changed with the consequence that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are going down hill in the matter of representation notwithstanding the fact of our increase in population.

Mr. BENNETT: But the population of the newly added territory in Quebec was deducted in determining the unit. The hon. member knows the statistician was very careful about that.

Mr. RALSTON: I am pointing that out in another connection, and it is this: In Quebec there is a possibility of increase in population by reason of the very large addition of territory. In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island there is no such chance of increase. The other day I got from the Canada Year Book some rather startling figures. What did I find? Hon. members may or may not be surprised at this, but I was. I find that the most densely populated province is Prince Edward Island, as one would expect, with a population of 40 to the square mile. The next province in density is Nova Scotia with 24.71. The tabulation is as follows:

Province—	Density of population per square mile
Prince Edward Island	40
Nova Scotia	24.71
New Brunswick	14.73
Ontario	9.45
Quebec	5.04
Saskatchewan	3.37
Manitoba	3.11
Alberta	2.94
British Columbia	1.98

That is, I think, from the Canada Year Book of 1932. I ask hon. members to visualize where Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces would be without a provision for a minimum to which I shall refer in a moment, if the other provinces keep on growing and acquire any density of population comparable with that which Nova Scotia has at the present time. When they begin to fill up their waste spaces, where will Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces be in the matter of representation?

Mr. BENNETT: They will always have the number in the Senate.

Mr. RALSTON: It will be said to me, as the Prime Minister mentions, that to some extent the situation began to be realized in 1914. That was not with regard to Nova Scotia, as he knows; it was rather with regard to Prince Edward Island, and at that time an amendment was passed providing that a minimum of not less than the number of senators should be given to every province. But remember that at that time Nova Scotia had a representation of sixteen. I do not believe it was anticipated then that in 1933 we would be passing an act giving Nova Scotia twelve members and it looks as if in 1943 we shall be passing an act giving her ten members, or down to the limit. That minimum is not adequate, having regard to the change which is taking place in the other provinces. When I point out that the density of population is so sparse in the other provinces, that simply means every other province than the mari-

times has an opportunity to grow and fill up its vacant lands. We are not, I agree, filled to saturation, but Prince Edward Island is pretty well populated; it has forty per square mile; Nova Scotia has over twenty-four, so that we are coming towards saturation for a province which is rural rather than urban. Before long I believe the necessary procedure will be taken for an amendment to the British North America Act providing that the minimum be increased.

Hon. members will say: Well, that was in the pact of confederation; representation by population, is, after all, the rule by which we go. I would point out to the committee that that is not so; that Manitoba when it came in in 1870 had sufficient population for one member according to the unit of representation at that time, but it did not get just one member; it got four. Population was not considered as the deciding factor in the matter of representation. In 1881 Manitoba had a population sufficient for three members and it was given five. Prince Edward Island in 1873 had a population for five members and was given six as one of the terms of its coming into the union. British Columbia is perhaps the most outstanding case. When it came in it had a population of 40,000. It got six members although as a matter of fact that population, according to the unit of representation at that time, would have been given only two. In 1881 British Columbia had a population entitling it to two members and again it got six. Further than that, as hon. members know, an express provision was inserted in the Imperial order in council admitting British Columbia, that it should never have less than six members. Therefore, I submit to the committee that population has not been the exclusive yardstick at least with regard to provinces entering subsequent to confederation.

What I am pointing out to the committee is this, that the minimum which was provided in 1914 is not adequate, not fair, not a proper minimum having regard to the importance of the maritime provinces in confederation. I realize that one cannot altogether alter the basis of representation, but I feel this committee and the country will consider and consider sympathetically a suggestion that the maritime provinces should have the representation which they had when they came into confederation, or at least a fair and adequate minimum at least comparable with their status in confederation and their economic and geographical importance.

Mr. BENNETT: That would give 85,000 people five members in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, I know, and I say I am not tying myself to any definite number at the moment; the number is a matter for consideration. I am endeavouring to show that in the matter of representation as it stands at present we are facing the possibility of a reduction to ten members perhaps the next time, and that that is not adequate representation for either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. Let me read just one paragraph from a speech that was delivered by Sir Robert Borden, then Mr. R. L. Borden, in this house in 1907, as reported at page 2202 of Hansard. He was speaking to a motion which was made by Mr. Hughes, a member from Prince Edward Island, to the effect that the maritime provinces should be entitled to a minimum representation based on the number with which they came into confederation. First of all he speaks of the Australian system, and points out that in Australia they provided in the constitution itself for an irreducible minimum. He says:

This—

Referring to the Australian system:

—is a direct illustration of the principle which has been contended for by my hon. friend from King's and by every hon. gentleman from the maritime provinces, and it seems to me that it would not be going too far to comply with the principle, and it would not be too much for this government to take immediate action—it might well have taken action before this—to consult the other provinces as to whether or not there would be objection to a proposal of that kind. I am inclined to think that the larger provinces would answer a question of that kind very much in the spirit which the Prime Minister himself has expressed and would be inclined to give the three maritime provinces, whose population has not increased so rapidly as that of other parts of the dominion, representation which should never be smaller than at the time when those provinces entered confederation.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking on the same occasion, gave utterance to very much the same sentiment. He said, as reported at page 2199 of Hansard of 1907, volume 2, that this is a matter in which we can afford to be generous. He said:

For my part I say without hesitation that this is a matter in which we can afford to be generous. Even if the balance of representation by population be not absolutely and minutely kept, even if Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick should have one or two members on the floor of this house beyond the number provided by the original constitution, the granting of such excess of representation would perhaps be a gracious and generous act and one which would redound to the benefit of confederation. But this house ought to hesitate in passing judgment until it has before it the views of all the provinces affected.

That request was made again at the provincial conference in 1913, when a resolution favouring that principle was passed but afterwards withdrawn. I say that the number of the minimum is a matter for consideration, but two of the original provinces of the dominion, hemmed in as they are by the sea, and as to which it was not contemplated that the present yardstick should apply, with no chance to expand and being the most densely populated parts of the dominion, should I submit have more adequate representation.

My hon. friend from Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) the other day expressed the view, in which I think the right hon. the Prime Minister concurred, that there ought to be before very long a general readjustment with regard to representation. Whether or not Quebec will remain the yardstick is a question, in view of the situation which has arisen in Quebec because of its increased boundaries, and increased population. Quebec under present conditions of territory and population being held down to sixty-five members makes one doubt whether the fathers of confederation correctly visualized the future when they drafted the provisions of the British North America Act regarding representation.

I would like to point out that the three provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are the only three provinces in the whole list of provinces of this dominion whose representation has been reduced below that with which they went into confederation. Let me put on Hansard the figures. Ontario had 82 and has 82 to-day; Quebec had 65, and has 65 to-day; Nova Scotia had 19, and in 1871 that was increased to 21, and under this bill it will have 12; New Brunswick had 15 and under this bill will have 10; Prince Edward Island had 6, and under this bill will have 4, the number under the last redistribution; Manitoba had 4, and under this bill will have 17; Saskatchewan and Alberta had 4 originally and under this bill will have 17. British Columbia had 6, and under this bill will have 14.

May I say one further word? It may be said that this is not in the pact of confederation, although I do not believe that will be said. I believe this is a matter as to which the letter of the bond may well be disregarded in view of changed conditions. The letter of the bond has not been adhered to closely, particularly in the last two or three years, when it has become necessary on account of emergent conditions to make special arrangements so that the combined strength of the whole dominion should be exerted for the benefit of particular parts. The letter of the bond has not been observed and nobody has insisted upon it being observed in the matter of relief. The letter of the bond was not observed in the matter of the return of the natural resources which were the property of the dominion. The letter of the bond has not been observed with regard to the extraordinary efforts which have had to be made in order that our people may be clothed and fed and in order that the emergent conditions in which we find ourselves may be met.

So, Mr. Chairman, although I realize it cannot be remedied by this parliament, I want to put on record once more what has already been put on by representatives from the maritime provinces before, namely, a plea that reconsideration should be given to this matter of representation of the maritime provinces, of those provinces which originally came into confederation, particularly Nova Scotia and New Brunswick which formed two of the cornerstones of that edifice, so that they may have adequate representation to which by reason of their contribution to the dominion, by reason of their geographical position, by reason of the social contribution they have made, by reason of their resources, their economic position and their importance, I think they are entitled under confederation.

May I just in that connection mention what has been said by one of our representatives in the past? The Hon. Mr. Pugsley, speaking in this house on June 11, 1914, at page 5305 of Hansard, said:

> We may be wrong in this,—

I do not admit we are wrong. I believe that all the members from the maritime provinces and the members generally will say that we are right:

> —but I should not be doing my duty as a representative of my province if I did not bring the matter to the attention of the house and say that I do not believe that the representatives of the lower provinces will acquiesce in that view. I believe that they will continue to raise the point again and again until they secure what they believe to be justice.

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to intervene in this discussion because I have always taken the attitude that if the house appoints a committee in which it has every confidence, and that committee spends weeks and months in close and attentive study of its work, unless there are sound reasons to the contrary the report of that committee ought to be accepted. I must say that I had every confidence in the report of that committee, and without the slightest desire to make invidious compari-

sons I must say that I had complete confidence in the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Smith), who represented the province of Nova Scotia from this side of the house.

But one or two observations by my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) require a word or two in reply, but I shall endeavour to compress what I have to say in the fewest possible sentences because it is not my desire at this stage of the session to delay the committee.

My hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth, in his opening remarks, made a statement capable of a party and political interpretation which the facts do not warrant. For example, he said that under the Conservative redistribution of 1914 the county of Pictou was dismembered. Let me point out to my hon. friend that that statement is not accurate. It is true that there was a Conservative redistribution in 1914, but my hon. friend has either overlooked or forgotten or neglected to remind the committee that the committee on redistribution at that time had upon it, as the committee of to-day has, representatives of the different parties in the house, and the Liberal party in the province of Nova Scotia was at that time represented by a very astute politician, E. M. Macdonald, afterwards, as is well known, a member of the administration of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). That committee brought in a report, and if hon. members opposite are interested they will find reference to that report in the journals of the house for the year 1914, at page 673. It is as follows:

> Your committee have prepared and unanimously agreed to report upon the description and the return of members contained in the several electoral divisions, which are set forth in the schedules hereto appended, in respect to the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory and upon the description and the return of the several electoral divisions which are set forth in the schedule hereto appended, in respect to the province of Nova Scotia, with the exception of that portion of the last named schedule which relates to the return of two members for the proposed united counties of South Cape Breton and Richmond, in the province of Nova Scotia, to which a majority of your committee have agreed.

In other words the division of Digby county was at that time agreed upon, not only in the committee by Mr. Macdonald, the then member for Pictou, but unanimously by all parties in the house. I recall that we had a whole day's discussion with regard to the constituency of Richmond West-Cape Breton. But there was not one word of objection taken either then or afterwards, in the House of Commons or in the country, so far as I am aware, with respect to the division of the constituency of Digby.

So, for the purpose of accuracy I wish to correct my hon. friend, because he has left the impression that the division of the constituency of Digby in the first instance was attributable to the Conservative administration of that day. My hon. friend characteristically has left himself in this position: He has taken exception to the redistribution, particularly with regard to the manner in which it has been effected so far as the mainland of the province of Nova Scotia is concerned, but he has taken care not to place on record any alternative proposal. To begin with I point out that salient fact. My hon. friend attempted to suggest that the Prime Minister had not been true to his professions when he suggested that we should maintain county boundaries. That has always been construed, not only in the province of Nova Scotia but elsewhere, as municipal boundaries —county boundaries if possible, but if a county has to be severed, then you must come to recognize the municipality.

Mr. RALSTON: It does not have to be severed.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend states it does not have to be severed, but I point out to him that the first variance which took place in Nova Scotia was in Digby, and was agreed to by all parties. But what are the alternatives? I will tell him the alternative suggested by his colleague upon the committee, the hon. member for Hants-Kings (Mr. Ilsley). His alternative was what?—to truncate the constituency of Pictou, that is to say, without reference to county, municipal, township or other boundaries, to sever it by drawing a lead pencil through the map. That was the suggestion made by the hon. member for Hants-Kings, and the only concrete proposal in opposition to the one suggested.

For the first time, so far as I am aware, my hon. friend has indicated that the redistribution in the province of Nova Scotia was dictated by political motives. I can assure him that a careful and close analysis of the results of redistribution as effected by this bill will indicate that the Conservative party, assuming that at the next election the voting population remains in the same position as it is to-day, stands to lose and not to gain by the proposals. In the first place, on the island of Cape Breton there are four seats to-day represented by Conservatives. One

seat has been eliminated, and to that course I note my hon. friend has taken no exception. Coming to the mainland another seat had to go. We might have played politics in another way with the constituency of Antigonish-Guysborough. My hon. friend has suggested that it was for political reasons that we did not carve Colchester in the manner his colleague suggests we should carve Pictou. I say it was because there was no natural boundary by which we could do it, as there was in the county of Digby. What we have done is this: We have placed an hon. member of this house, who has represented his constituency with satisfaction to his party and to his constituents—I refer to the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short)—in a position whereby, if he is again a candidate, at an advanced period of his life he will have to take on a very onerous task to retain the representation of his constituency. I am not for one moment suggesting that the proposed constituency of Digby-Annapolis-Kings represents a fair division of the population as between constituencies—not by any means. But unless we are going to divide the constituencies on the basis of counting heads, for one or two reasons which I shall indicate, no fairer proposal could be made. In the first place my hon. friend has referred to that constituency as being purely rural. I take exception to his description. It has within its borders seven incorporated towns, towns of some importance. Many of them have rich historic associations. Beginning with the town of Windsor, which formerly was the seat of King's college, we continue and pass through the town of Wolfville, the seat of Acadia university.

Mr. RALSTON: Are you speaking of the new constituency?

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: Then you should leave out Windsor.

Mr. RHODES: Yes, quite so. We begin with the university town of Wolfville, then go on to Kentville, Annapolis and Digby. Not only is there a comparatively large urban population, but there is no constituency to be found within the confines of the maritime provinces which irrespective of its size, is so compact from the point of view of community of interest and culture. They are a highly cultured people; their interests are common. There is no point of conflict between any two of these constituencies. The same may be said with respect to the constituency of Colchester-Hants. They come together naturally; they are contiguous. A portion of east Hants I venture to say does as much as if not more trading with, and has more communication with the town of Truro in the neighbouring county of Colchester to-day, and has for years, than it has had and will have with respect to the town of Windsor, the shire town of the county of Hants.

I do not desire to say any more on that phase of the matter, except to reiterate that with the possible exception of the Halifax Chronicle, which will always of course take an extreme partisan political point of view—I have not seen it with respect to this proposed redistribution—it has remained for my hon. friend to suggest for the first time in the house or out of it that there has been anything political in the manner in which this redistribution has been carried out.

My hon. friend has referred to the reduction of representation for the maritime provinces. I do not propose to follow him in detail with respect to the various phases of that question, and particularly with respect to the feelings of the people in the maritime provinces, although it is a very interesting subject. But let me say that any argument my hon. friend has to propose looking to the remedies which he suggested should be addressed to the committee on redistribution. That committee should make its report to the house, and as a result there should be a joint address, which would result finally in an amendment to the British North America Act. This ground has all been canvassed before very fully. I recall that very well because I had the honour of being a member of the redistribution committee in 1914. That subject was argued before us at that time at very great length. If my hon. friend will refer to the report of that committee he will find the following:

> Your committee also, have had under consideration the claim of the province of Prince Edward Island to have its representation restored to six members, as at the date of its entrance into confederation. The case on behalf of the province was very ably presented by the Honourable J. A. Matheson, the premier and the Honourable John McLean, member of the council. We have been unable to find that the case presented would justify us in recommending an amendment of the British North America Act for that purpose. For this reason, we have concluded that the representation of Prince Edward Island must be reduced to three members, in accordance with the provisions of section 51 of the British North America Act.

Let me say to my hon. friend that that report containing the paragraph I have just recited was agreed to unanimously by all parties on that committee.

> We are of opinion, however, that it was undesirable and indeed incongruous that any province in Canada should have a similar rep-

resentation in the House of Commons than in the Senate; and therefore recommend and report that an humble address should be presented to His Majesty praying; That the British North America Act, 1867, be amended by the enactment of the following section:—

51 (A) Notwithstanding anything in this act a province shall always be entitled to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of Senators representing such province.

I hope I shall not be accused of immodesty if I say that I was the author of that amendment. It was moved by me finally for this reason: that after all the representations had been made on behalf of Prince Edward Island and the other provinces with respect to the representation of the maritime provinces it was felt that the committee could not properly recommend that those provinces have restored to them their original number of members; but it was felt, as this report indicates, that it was incongruous that there should be a larger representation in the Senate than in the House of Commons in any province, hence this amendment. And I may say to my hon. friend had it not been for that amendment Prince Edward Island would now have two members instead of four; in other words, it has double the representation to-day that it otherwise would have.

The province of New Brunswick has now reached the irreducible minimum of ten members as a result of that amendment. It is true that the people of the maritime provinces very greatly regret that their representation in this house is smaller numerically than it was at the time of confederation, or after confederation for that matter; for, as pointed out by my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth, we had at one time as many as twenty-one members from the province of Nova Scotia. Yet as a matter of history we must not lose sight of this fact which had very considerable weight with the committee of that day, that although the House of Commons is very important, perhaps the most important branch of parliament apart from His Majesty's representative, we must remember that parliament consists, in addition to the representative of His Majesty, of the Senate and the House of Commons; and that the Senate has just as much voice in matters of legislation as the House of Commons. And whatever the position may be as far as representation in the House of Commons is concerned as between confederation and to-day, we have, not only in the province of Nova Scotia, but in each of the maritime provinces, the same representation in the Senate now as we had in 1867. Furthermore this fact must be borne in mind, that to a very great extent there is a community of interest between the historic province of Quebec and the maritime provinces; and there are twenty-four senators allotted to the maritime provinces under the constitution and twenty-four to the province of Quebec. Thus we have in those two older provinces of Canada half the Senate representation of Canada. Furthermore, to present that in a still more striking way, it may be said we have to-day as many senators in the maritime provinces as in the whole area west of the great lakes. That is a contributing factor of very great importance in maintaining to the people of the maritime provinces and the eastern part of Canada their opportunity to have full voice in the parliament of Canada. I may say it was one consideration which weighed with me very greatly in concurring in the report of the committee on redistribution in 1914.

There is much more that I could say, but my purpose in rising was only that of making one or two observations in reply to my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth, and I shall be content with that for the moment.

Mr. RALSTON: What I pointed out to my hon. friend with regard to Digby-Clare was that his leader had protested that they were anxious to avoid dismembering counties, and that the underlying principle which caused this particular redistribution was the desire to avoid doing so. I pointed out, and I reiterate it, that under a Conservative government in 1914 Clare was first taken from Digby. My hon. friend says the committee consented, but the government was in power, and we have heard enough these days to know it has control—

Mr. BENNETT: But it was a committee of the house that consented. It was done by consent of all parties.

Mr. RHODES: Does my hon. friend suggest that the government of the day throttled the hon. member for Pictou?

Mr. RALSTON: I am not suggesting that; I am pointing out what was done in regard to Clare, and I say it falls strangely from the lips of the right hon. leader of the government to suggest that they are not dismembering the county, yet the 1914 redistribution was the first time Clare was taken from Digby. I am pointing out that this is the second time, in spite of the fact that the right hon. leader of the government says that they are not dismembering counties, and that they want to preserve county lines. My hon. friend is ingenious, as he always is; he says: "Oh, by

county lines we mean municipal lines." He knows what we mean; we mean the lines of the constituency that elects the provincial representative, in order that the people who are voting together in provincial elections shall vote together in dominion elections. I am pointing out that by this redistribution he has made, the citizens of Clare will vote with their own county of Digby for provincial members but will vote with Shelburne-Yarmouth for the federal representative. That is the dismemberment which his leader was talking about the other day, which they desired to avoid.

With regard to the people of Kings-Hants-Digby, my hon. friend cannot say anything more complimentary or worthy of them than I can or anyone else who lives in Nova Scotia. They are admirable people in every respect, the very best citizens, none better in Nova Scotia. But my hon. friend surely does not suggest that the people of Digby Neck for instance are engaged in the same occupations as those in Hants-Kings—

Mr. SHORT: They are just as fine a class of people as any others anywhere.

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly they are, but my hon. friend was talking about them being engaged in the same industries as the people of Kings-Annapolis.

Mr. RHODES: No, I did not say that.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend was making the argument for this particular division. We have been told by the leader of the government, that they can make any division they like, but they should not attempt to justify it on grounds inconsistent with the facts. I was taking the position, and I repeat it, that my hon. friend has carved up this constituency of Hants-Kings by taking off from Hants-Kings a considerable Liberal majority at one end and adding one and a half counties at the other with a Conservative majority. The country can come to any conclusion it likes with respect to the motives when the facts are known. My hon. friend has been particularly nimble in getting by altogether the suggestion I made, that you can do this without disturbing any county boundary. He knows the province of Nova Scotia as well as I do, and he is well aware that it can be done, making a constituency no larger than the constituency as proposed, and it would not break up the county of Digby at all. My hon. friend slides by that suggestion however and talks about five incorporated towns.

Mr. RHODES: Seven.

Mr. RALSTON: That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SHORT: Seven.

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, there may be seven in the new one, but so far as that goes it does not make it necessarily urban. These are small towns which serve the surrounding country but they do not make it an urban constituency in the sense in which we generally understand that term. The situation, after what my hon. friend has said, is doubly clear. Hon. gentlemen opposite missed entirely the opportunities they had to deal with the situation in Nova Scotia without in any way interfering with county boundaries; but for some reason or other—let us leave the reasons to the judgment of the people—they have decided to make the redistribution in this way, thus dismembering the county of Digby, after all the protestations of the Prime Minister.

Perhaps I misunderstood my hon. friend's attitude; he spoke rather forcefully. I was surprised to hear him take what appeared to me to be a position rather hostile to my contention with regard to representation in the maritime provinces. The attitude which I understood the hon. gentleman to take was not perhaps the attitude he meant to imply; at least it should not be his attitude. The fact that he was the author of the minimum resolution with regard to the provision making our representation not less than the number of senators does not in my opinion count one way or the other with regard to the point I was making, namely, that the minimum was too small, and I should have hoped that he and other hon. members also would join with me in urging that when the British North America Act is to be amended some readjustment be made in this respect. I made my representations when the second reading of this bill was being considered. The committee on redistribution cannot change that situation; it must be done by means of an amendment to the British North America Act, so that all we can do now is to urge the matter in the house. I regret therefore that my hon. friend did not receive my suggestions in the spirit in which I hoped they would be received and in the spirit in which I hoped the committee would receive them. I believe that ten members for the province of Nova Scotia is too small. It is all very well to talk about quality, but Nova Scotia is entitled to a respectably large body of representatives in order that its voice may be heard and the views of the province be adequately put forward on the floor of this house, having regard to the

position in confederation of Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces. I repeat, in my opinion a minimum of ten is too small. It should be increased, and regard should be had to the fact that whereas we went into confederation with nineteen members, with an increase of nearly forty-two per cent in population, our representation is smaller today than at that time. On the other hand, every other province outside the maritimes has maintained or has had consistent increases in representation. That is why I urge that the minimum be increased for the maritimes, and some day sooner or later—sooner I hope—I trust that my hon. friend will join with me and other members from the maritimes and other parts of the country as well in an endeavour to have justice done in this regard.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: This afternoon, before my hon. friend came into the house, I made some observations with regard to the redistribution bill as it affects his province and mine. I am not talking politics in this connection, but I would ask the hon. gentleman whether there was anything in the British North America Act in 1924 whereby his native province and mine should have been deprived of a representative in this parliament. That representative might have been Liberal or Conservative; I am not concerned about that, but—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Not at all. I wish to have the united support of all members of Nova Scotia in an effort to have the largest number of representatives in this House of Commons from that province, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know whether my hon. friend was here when I spoke, but I did say, on the second reading of the bill, that we felt that if in the last parliament a calculation had been made strictly in accordance with the British North America Act, the added district of Quebec being excluded, we might have had another member.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: It is not a question of might; it is a matter of absolute mathematical fact. I am not attaching any blame to my hon. friend because he was not in the house at the time, nor was I here. But the fact is that there was stolen from the province of Nova Scotia, if I may use an extravagant term, a representative who might have been Liberal or Conservative, it matters not which. But that was done at a time when my hon. friend's leader was in power and when there were sixteen Liberals in Nova Scotia.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what the hon. gentleman is trying to imply. I would refer him to the Minister of Finance who sets such store by the unanimous report of a committee. I think he will find that the committee of 1924 was unanimous.

Mr. RHODES: While I should be quite content with the interpretation which the remarks I made a moment ago will bear as disclosed in Hansard, I owe it to myself not to allow to pass unnoticed the suggestion of my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth that I was hostile to the attitude he took. I thought I made it clear that I was quite in sympathy with the aspirations of the people of the maritimes in this respect. What I did say at the outset was that it was idle to discuss the question in an academic way in committee at this stage. I clearly pointed out that the procedure would be to make representations before the committee on redistribution and have that committee report to the house, as a result of which there would be an address which would lead to an amendment to the British North America Act; and I pointed out that this was the procedure that was followed in 1914.

Mr. SHORT: I wish to remove a misapprehension that has been created by my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth. He would lead the committee to believe that the county of Kings, added to my constituency, is a Conservative county, but I want to point out that only twice since confederation has the county of Kings ever returned a Conservative member to this house. It was traditionally Liberal, but in the year 1882 a Conservative was elected in the person of D. B. Woodworth, and never again until 1911, in the reciprocity election, was there a Conservative elected there. In that year A. de Witt Foster beat Sir Frederick Borden in that constituency. At every election since then the county of Kings has given a Liberal majority, and in 1930 it gave the present member a majority of over 900. How my hon. friend from Shelburne-Yarmouth can think that it is an advantage to the Conservative party to have that county added to Digby-Annapolis I cannot understand. I regret also that we are losing two members again this year but I would point out that we also lost two under the redistribution made by my hon. friend's party in 1924 when there were sixteen Liberals representing the province of Nova Scotia. You cannot find a word on the records to show

that they made any complaint at that time; they were perfectly satisfied to lose two members.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has not read the records. If he will do so he will find a resolution on the very subject introduced by the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Duff).

Mr. MACDOUGALL: And supported by how many members from Nova Scotia? I have read the record.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend can look; I cannot tell.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I have read the record.

Mr. SHORT: Because we are losing two members under this redistribution my hon. friend considers it is a terrible thing. I regret that just as much as he does, but the fact is that our population has decreased to such an extent that we must bear the penalty until the constitution is changed. I cannot understand why he should blame this government for Nova Scotia losing two members when the same thing happened in 1924.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend misunderstood me entirely; I did not blame the government.

Mr. SHORT: At that time Nova Scotia was represented by sixteen Liberals.

Mr. GOBEIL: Just before six o'clock the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) stated that the delay in reprinting the bill was due to certain changes made and agreements arrived at at a late hour in connection with some of the provinces, including the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) then got up and said that as far as Quebec was concerned no agreement had been arrived at and that the bill was now as bad as it was before. As a member of the Quebec subcommittee I cannot allow that statement to pass unanswered because it is absolutely inaccurate and contrary to the facts. With all due respect to the hon. member for Quebec East may I tell him that as he was not a member of that committee it was quite possible that certain agreements might have been arrived at without him being consulted. That is exactly what happened. On Wednesday night between eleven and eleven thirty o'clock there was a meeting of several members from the city of Montreal, including the hon. members for Hochelaga (Mr. St-Père), Maisonneuve (Mr. Jean), St. Mary (Mr. Desiauriers) and Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier). I do not think these hon. members will contradict me when I say that a final agreement was arrived at for the city of Montreal. Before leaving the room to go up to the committee room to see if the bill had been sent to the printers I asked these gentlemen, "Is this a final agreement?" and every one of them said, "Yes." I went up to the committee room but as we could not supply the boundaries at that time the matter had to be left over until the next morning. That is one of the reasons why the bill was late.

There have been included in the bill several changes suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite. For instance, the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) suggested the other day that the counties of L'Assomption, Joliette and Montcalm should be joined together. We did that. Certain changes were made in the county of Terrebonne by returning the parish of Ste. Therese to that county. Several other changes suggested by hon. friends opposite were made. When the hon. member suggests that the bill is just as bad now as it was before, he is not paying a compliment to his friends on his own side of the committee. I think this offers an illustration of the good faith of certain hon. members opposite in their work in connection with this bill.

Mr. DUPUIS: To whom does the hon. member refer when he mentions hon. members from this side? I want him to name them.

Mr. GOBEIL: If the hon. member had been a little more patient his desire would have been met, as I was just starting to give them. I am pleased to say that several of our hon. friends opposite have shown a real desire to arrive at a compromise, but I must say also that since the first time the hon. member for Quebec East appeared before the committee I have felt personally that he had no desire to arrive at an agreement and that whatever concessions were made would not satisfy him.

Mr. CARDIN: Will all due respect to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Gobeil), I am afraid that I must say that he is not reciting exactly what happened. Certain suggestions were made with regard to Montreal and certain points were in agreement between the representatives, but my information is that there was no final agreement and that the bill as it is now printed and the amendments as now made are not what was understood when several members from Montreal met with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DURANLEAU: In what respect?

Mr. CARDIN: As far as the other changes are concerned, I am afraid that the hon. member for Compton is not correct. But why should we discuss these points now? Let us dispose of the clauses of the bill and when we reach the schedules we can discuss the new proposals and the amendments contained in the reprinted schedules.

Mr. GOBEIL: I only wanted to correct an inaccurate statement.

Mr. CARDIN: The statement made by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) was absolutely correct.

Mr. GOBEIL: It was absolutely inaccurate and incorrect. I was not alone in the room; there were at least eight or ten other members.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We see what kind of diplomat we had on that committee.

Mr. GOBEIL: Those who were there do not deny the statement.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was not worth denying.

Mr. CYRILLE DUMAINE (Bagot), (Translation): Mr. Chairman, listening to the hon. member for Dorchester, one would gather that his friends to the right made all the sacrifices in the present redistribution.

I have followed the debate on Bill No. 2 with a great deal of interest and every time the Conservatives spoke they always posed as victims. They always said they were giving all the advantages they could to the members on the left. In my opinion, the government made no sacrifice for the left, or for French-Canadians or for the rural representation of the province of Quebec.

This bill affects all counties in the province of Quebec—I say: all counties except those represented by Conservative members. Not a single constituency represented by a Conservative is affected by the present redistribution of the province of Quebec. The Conservatives most effected by this bill are those whose counties were not touched, and in those cases where their counties were altered, this was done to enable them to secure a larger majority or to eliminate Liberals who might hamper them.

With respect to the present bill, Mr. Chairman, I believed the Conservatives supposed to be most influential in Quebec would face the situation like brave men, that they would retain their ridings such as they were in 1930 and that they would face the same electors. If we take the case of the ministers from the province of Quebec, we note that they each carve out a small Conservative fief for themselves, and, I, the member for Bagot, am the victim of this weakness of the ministers representing my province.

If the hon. minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) had retained his county of Chambly-Verchères, the county of St. Hyacinthe-Rouville would have remained as it was with a fine population. The hon. minister of Marine abandoned the county of Verchères to take only part of the county of Rouville, and because of that, the county of Bagot, which is a small yet fine county must almost as a matter of course be added to the county of St. Hyacinthe. The people have the same mentality, the same customs, I might say the same hopes; it is almost a natural union. Yet the county of Bagot which existed long before Confederation, which was established in 1854, is entitled to remain on the electoral map of the province of Quebec and the country. I see no reason why a new county that will not have a large population is established in the north of the province, when they disdained to retain an old county such as Bagot.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Is he aware that the county of Bagot has a population of only 16,914 according to the last census returns?

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Will the hon. member dare claim that this county should not be united to another?

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): The hon. minister will allow me to tell him that there was a very easy way of retaining the county of Bagot by uniting it not with Drummond-Arthabaska which has a population in excess of 53,000 but with Drummond only, this being a rural riding. The county of Bagot skirts by almost its whole width the county of Drummond, and it would have been possible to constitute a county of Drummond-Bagot with a population in excess of 33,000, including Drummondville. Drummond and Bagot would have formed a county where Liberals as well as Conservatives would have had a chance of retaining their identity. As I stated at the outset of my remarks, all sacrifices are made by the Liberal members who now represent these counties in this Parliament. I believe the union of Drummond and Bagot would have satisfied everybody.

Mr. Chairman, to amplify my argument, allow me to remark that the county of Bagot is united in its entirety with the county of St. Hyacinthe. I am happy over this. It had been originally proposed to include the parish of St. Pie in another county. I protested to the Committee with my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Fontaine) and the matter was settled. The county of Bagot united to that of St. Hyacinthe constitutes too large a population and the Government was compelled to dismember the county of St. Hyacinthe and place part of it, five parishes and one village, in the county of Richelieu. The parishes of St. Barnabe, St. Jude, St. Bernard, St. Charles and St. Denis belonged to the county of St. Hyacinthe since Confederation and even prior to that. Provincially, they belong to this county; their county council meets at St. Hyacinthe and their judicial district and shire-town are located there. They are detached from this county and annexed to the county of Richelieu. I know these parishes will be welcome in the county of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin), but I also know that the people of those parishes would rather remain in the county of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot, because they would not feel, I will not say like exiles but like strangers in another county. The parish of St. Barnabe is barely six miles from St. Hyacinthe; the parish of St. Jude, 8 or 9 miles; the parish of St. Denis is more distant, but citizens of these parishes will be compelled, when regional conventions or meetings are held, to leave localities situated 6 or 7 miles from St. Hyacinthe and travel a distance of 30 to 35 miles to attend a convention at Sorel.

I consider that such changes should not be made for the mere pleasure of one man or to oblige him, whether he is a minister or a member. Each county should retain its citizens who should form only one faimly.

I have no protest to make with respect to Rouville.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): If my hon. friend will allow me, we will settle this point. What would the hon. member for Richelieu have done with his population of 21,000?

Mr. BERTRAND (Translation): It would have been given to Yamaska.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I asked the question to the hon. member who is now speaking.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): I will tell the hon. minister that this county could have been added, either to Yamaska or to another county. I do not know the adjoining counties well enough to answer him in that connection.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): And what of Nicolet?

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): Nicolet could have remained as it was; it had a sufficient population, even larger than the populations of Stanstead, Shefford, Dorchester and Compton which are left to the Conservatives.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): And the new county of Chapleau?

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): And the new county of Chapleau will have a population of only 21,000.

It is not necessary to throw a whole province into confusion in order to increase the population of one county and assure the election of a Conservative. These changes could have been effected very easily. The redrafting of the electoral map of the province of Quebec could have consisted in giving two additional counties to the city of Montreal. All the members of the Island of Montreal, Liberals as well as Conservatives, were agreeable to accept the addition of two counties only. Two counties could have been merged without trouble, Bagot and Yamaska, or Bagot and Shefford, or L'Islet and Montmagny. The problem of redistribution would have been settled by merging a few counties. Our friends to the right did not face the question in that manner because they want to assure themselves of seats in the province of Quebec. The hon. Solicitor-General (Mr. Dupré) so stated in his speech the day before yesterday; he does not want a solid "bloc" in the province of Quebec any more. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the province of Quebec decides some day to elect a solid "bloc" to the House of Commons, it is not redistribution consummated by the Conservatives, to-day, that will prevent it from sending such a "bloc" to represent the ideas, ambitions and will of the people of that province.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Hear, hear!

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): No government can impose its will and force the people to act according to its desires. In our country, according to the constitution, the people govern. We must as much as possible allow the people their freedom. If I am opposed to Bill No. 2, as presently submitted to this house, it is because the government wanted to impose its will on the people without consulting them. They want to create Conservative fiefs and Liberal fiefs. Mr.

Chairman, we do not want Liberal fiefs in the province of Quebec, and we want Conservative fiefs still less. And I know that after the next elections few of my hon. friends opposite will return to the House of Commons.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): That is a wish that comes from the bottom of the heart.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Absolutely.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): I will make an exception in the case of the Hon. Solicitor-General.

I mentioned a moment ago the part of Rouville that remained in Bagot and the hon. Minister of Marine asked me a question. Allow me to tell you frankly that in so far as I am personally concerned, in so far as the county of Bagot is concerned, I am satisfied that such part of Rouville should remain in the county of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot because they are fine agricultural parishes belonging to our district. I do not know why the hon. Minister of Marine should refuse to accept parishes like L'Ange-Gardien, St. Paul-d'Abbotsford, the village of Canrobert, the parish of St. Césaire, also the village of St. Césaire. They are old parishes founded more than a century ago. The people of those parishes are peaceful, well-to-do farmers, excellent citizens, and despite their separation from the remainder of the county we are proud to retain them in our midst.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak at too great length. I have outlined practically all my grievances. I trust the Government will not request the adoption of the bill as presently submitted, I trust changes will be made, that families will be reunited, that so far as possible counties will be left as they are and that justice will be done to the province of Quebec, to both rural and urban representation.

Hon. ALFRED DURANLEAU (Minister of Marine) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to reply to my hon. friend in respect of the county of Chambly-Rouville. My hon. friend said: The Minister of Marine should have included the parishes of St. Césaire, L'Ange-Gardien, Abbotsford and other parishes in his county. I will point out to my hon. friend that I was not a member of the committee on redistribution. That committee decided after considering all the circumstances that the county of Chambly with that part of the county of Rouville had a sufficient population. The county as now constituted will have a population of 40,000 according to the 1931 census. My hon. friend is probably not aware that the population of the county of Chambly is increasing yearly and that at the present time it exceeds by at least 2,000 and 3,000 the population computed at the 1931 census. The hon. member is well aware that the county of Chambly is situated on the south shore, opposite Montreal, and with the means of communication established since last year, thanks to a motor bus service which I succeeded in securing for the south shore, the citizens of that county can now reach the business centre of Montreal within eight minutes. Since the establishment of this motor bus service, the population of the south shore, in the county of Chambly, is increasing daily and, according to the prognostigations of business men, the county of Chambly will have within five years a population of from 20,000 to 25,000 souls.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Railway revenues are decreasing on account of motor busses.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): The committee was acquainted with all these facts. It considered that the addition of the largest part of the county of Rouville to a county of this importance gave a just representation. My hon. friend says: The population of those parishes—St-Césaire, L'Ange-Gardien, Abbotsford—is a very fine population; we are proud to have those people in the county of St-Hyacinthe. I know the county of Rouville quite well and I agree with what my hon. friend says respecting the qualities of its inhabitants. I was brought up in that district. I was educated there and ties of friendship bind me to several citizens of the district, and had it depended on me only, the problem could have been settled very easily. But I do repeat that the representation given to Chambly-Rouville at the present time is amply sufficient, if one compares it with that of neighbouring counties.

My hon. friend stated a moment ago: Why did they detach certain parishes from St-Hyacinthe and link them with Richelieu? My hon. friend is well aware that Richelieu had a population of only 21,000. It was necessary, in order to give it proper representation, to add certain adjoining parishes to that county, and that was done. According to the bill now being discussed, Richelieu-Verchères has a population of only 35,000, whereas Chambly-Rouville has a population in excess of 40,000 and St-Hyacinthe-Bagot has a population of 42,000 in round figures. I believe the Committee made an equitable division, and I consider that my hon. friend has no reason to complain as he does. My hon. friend has just said that Bagot has a population similar to that of the county of St-Hyacinthe, a population with the same aspirations and customs; that Bagot forms

part of the judicial district of St-Hyacinthe and that the union of Bagot with St-Hyacinthe was quite natural, I believe my hon. friend admitted that a moment; then why does he complain?

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Well, yes!

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): When one admits that a county with a popuplation of only 16,000 had to be merged with an other county, in whole or in part, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that such remarks are made for political reasons and nothing else. The representation which the committee established is equitable and I am convinced this committee will accept that representation such as it is.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister of Marine has just made a statement in which he claims that redistribution as applied to St-Hyacinthe-Bagot and Chambly-Rouville is very equitable. The county of Chambly-Verchères had a population of 42,000 the same as the county of St-Hyacinthe-Rouville. The hon. Minister of Marine claims that he cannot accept what remains of Rouville. Why did the committee not consider the fact that the hon. Minister of Marine withholds three parishes of the county of Verchères; Beloeil, McMasterville and St-Julie-de-Verchères? Why does the hon. Minister retain that part of the county of Verchères when the committee was ready to annex it to the county of Richelieu? The county of Richelieu had a population of only 35,000. Why are parishes of Verchères detached and added to Chambly-Rouville. I know the reason, Mr. Chairman; it is due to the fact that those three municipalities gave a Conservative majority.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I beg your pardon.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): They gave a Conservative majority in 1930. On the other hand, the four parishes of the county of Rouville gave a large Liberal majority.

The hon. minister says he did not attend the committee meetings, but there are such things as coincidences that one finds amusing when one sees them from a distance.

A MEMBER (Translation): That is not politics!

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): The hon. Minister of Marine charges me with playing politics in this short ten minute speech which I have just made and he provides himself with a county for ten years under this bill. Which of the two plays politics the most?

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): As for the union of St-Hyacinthe and Bagot, it is a natural one. Only, had the hon. Minister of Marine retained his county I would have had a chance of retaining my own. I consider as the representative of the county of Bagot, I should secure justice in the House of Commons, to the same extent as any other member.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, allow me to revert to the question respecting Montreal and to tell the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) that he is absolutely right when he states that the members representing the city of Montreal had agreed upon a definite plan. I will add that the fault lies not with the Liberal members but with our friends if that plan was put aside. When we succeeded in eliminating the new county of Lafontaine and reestablishing the county of St. Mary's, it was understood between Conservatives and Liberals of Montreal, that we would have the privilege, we, the Liberal members for St. James, St. Mary's, Mercier and St. Denis, to divide our counties as we saw fit so as to restore to the map of Montreal the fine county of St. Mary's. The matter was so adjusted and accepted by our Conservative friends of the city of Montreal. When my friend the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Jean) was delivering his speech, he was interrupted by the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Laurin) who asked him whether there was not an understanding between the members from Montreal on certain points, and that he was still willing to accept that plan. That is true, and upon his request, my good friend ended his speech, believing that the proposed plan had been accepted. On the contrary, when he reached the point where we made final arrangements, the county of St. Denis was not to be touched. It was to retain the boundaries specified in the first redistribution bill. This was not in accordance with the agreement. Secondly, the county of Laurier-Outremont was to be divided in the manner mentioned in the bill as presently submitted to the house, but they still wanted to take away part of this county to create a fine seat for a friend by the name of Penverne. The members to the right, Mr. Chairman, are responsible for the changes made in connection with the agreement concluded and accepted by the members from the Island of Montreal, and as the hon. member for Compton was not a member of the committee he cannot definitely state what transpired. I was one of those members who acted as advisers, and I state that what took place is just as I have described. We are still ready to accept the

arrangements made, but one would imagine that certain persons have urged our good friends to delay matters or to change the arrangements previously concluded.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of speaking, because as was so well stated by the member for Bagot (Mr. Dumaine), from the very outset of the parleys, we told our Conservative friends from Montreal: With respect to the number of additional members to be given Montreal, the responsibility is yours; assume that responsibility and tell us if you are going to add two, three or five counties to the Island of Montreal; we will make plans accordingly.

It was decided to give Montreal two counties. The committee presented a plan, and we, Liberals of Montreal, submitted a counter-proposal. The plan we submitted had been approved by the majority of Conservative members of the Island of Montreal. Believing this plan too beautiful, they decided to add three counties to Montreal. We then made a second proposal which was again accepted by the majority of Conservative members of the Island of Montreal. It was as a result of prolonged parleys that we secured the elimination of the county of Lafontaine and the restoration of the beautiful county of St. Mary's which the present member (Mr. Deslauriers) represents with such dignity, so loyally and sincerely in this house.

If there are persons in this house, members who have respected the given word, they sit to your left, Mr. Chairman. When we concluded arrangements with the right, it was with the desire of avoiding a greater evil, for the members to the right never wanted to accept perfection. That is why you observe in this bill crying injustices to the representatives of the eastern portion of Montreal whose population constitutes almost two-thirds of the city of Montreal, which entitled it to two additional representatives, whereas by the terms of this bill two of the new counties are situated in the westerly part. The easterly part is content with one additional county although its population is almost double that of all the Conservative candidates on the Island of Montreal.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): May I ask the hon. member before he takes his seat whether he has perused the appendix respecting the Island of Montreal which was reprinted and has just been distributed?

Mr. DENIS: I have seen the reprinted appendix and state that it does not contain what the assembled representatives had agreed upon. The easterly limits were to extend as far as Papineau street; the northerly limits of the constituency of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) were to extend as far as the Canadian-Pacific railway tracks and now they cross two quarries and end at Belanger street. I am not complaining about the division embodied in the first bill; but, when I make an agreement with anybody, I keep my word and I wish those who enter into an engagement with me did likewise.

Although the county of St. Denis contains the largest population in the city of Montreal, I would rather still remain with my numerous family which has placed its confidence in me since 1921, than to see similar injustices done to my colleagues of Montreal. I am still ready to assume my responsibilities and to give satisfaction to the 140,000 inhabitants of the St. Denis division.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Do I understand those are my hon. friend's only objections?

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri) (Translation): As far as he is personally concerned.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): He complains about the limits of his county and those of the hon. Mr. Rinfret's county? Is that it?

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Not only about the boundaries of the hon. Mr. Rinfret but also with respect to the constituencies of my friends from St. Mary's and Hochelaga as defined in the reprinted bill.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Mr. Chairman, we would like to know exactly from the representative of the Liberal party on this committee whether the appendix now before the house appears acceptable or not to him.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): It is not acceptable.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I am putting this question to the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier). Otherwise, we shall revert to the delimitations which were established in the first place, because we consider them more in the interest of the people of the Island of Montreal. We have sought to please our hon. friends the Liberal representatives of the Island of Montreal, we have agreed to all their requests, and now one notes an effort to make political capital in this house by way of complaints against the appendix as reprinted. If the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont states he is not satisfied with the appendix as now submitted, we shall revert to the one which was prepared in the first instance because we deem it more advantageous to the citizens of the Island of Montreal.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Will the hon. minister allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I put a question to the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont, the representative of the Liberal party on the committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): There is no more committee.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): The committee no longer exists.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I would like to find out from the hon. minister if he is announcing to my hon. friend on the committee that he can only chose between death and the hospital.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I thank my hon. friend for his remark; it is very clever, very intelligent.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): (Translation): I would have preferred retaining Laurier-Outremont intact, such as it was, and that is the request I made to the committee. Within the past few days, outside influences have entered the committee, and as for the latest changes in the easterly part of the city of Montreal, I have not been consulted in that regard. Personally, with the bill such as it is to-day, I was compelled to accept the two divisions of Outremont and Laurier in order not to have less. Of two evils I necessarily chose the lesser, but I must tell the minister that I was not consulted with respect to the changes in the easterly part of the city of Montreal. I have not had the time to study them fully and I am not in a position to answer his question. However, I must say that we always asked our colleagues on the committee not to wipe out the county of St. Mary's. We succeeded, and we are all proud. As regards what took place in the easterly part of the city of Montreal,—and I repeat designedly what I have said,—I was not consulted; changes were made in the divisions of St. Mary's, St. James, St. Denis, Hochelaga, Mercier. I was not consulted in that connection and I am not in a position to answer. I must state that the bill presented in the first place as it applied to the divisions of Laurier and Outremont was acceptable to me. As for the changes made in the eastern section of the city of Montreal, I am not in a position to express an opinion.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): Mr. Chairman, for my own information and that of the committee, I will ask the hon. members for St. Mary's, Hochelaga and Maisonneuve who were present. I do not know the city of Montreal well enough to determine the boundaries of counties,—whether the arrangements we came to, Wednesday night, in room 272, arrangements concluded between our friends to the left and the member for Jacques-Cartier, are not those embodied in the schedule submitted to-night?

Mr. E. C. ST-PERE (Hochelaga) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday night, at about eleven o'clock, I was summoned to room 272, in order to accept what was suggested to me as a new layout of the electoral division which I have the honour to represent in this house since 1921. Our accredited representatives, those who had been in touch with the redistribution committee handling the electoral map of the city of Montreal had submitted to me a report which was known—I mean it was known at least to those in our circle—under the designation of report No. 4. It embodied the following boundaries for the Hochelaga division: eastern limit, Boulevard Pie IX; southern limit, St. Lawrence river; western limit, the centre of Frontenac street east, Rachel street north, Delorimier east to the south of Boulevard St. Joseph; western limit, Papineau street east; extreme northern limit, Rosemont Boulevard.

At the last minute my good friend Mr. Laurin, who was no doubt acting in good faith, asked me whether I would accept—and he did so in the presence of my friend Doctor Deslauriers, member for St. Mary's—the strip of land situated between Delorimier street east and Iberville street and extending as far as Belanger street. I was then told that following a previous agreement it had been decided to extend the boundary of the county of St. Mary's to Belanger street, also the county boundary of my good friend the mayor of Montreal, the present member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret). I was told to-day that the hon. Minister of Marine had suggested this plan in order to definitely settle the delimitations of the county of St. Mary's. Under the circumstances, I believed I was proving my loyalty to my good friend, Doctor Deslauriers; the objection which I now voice relates to the fact the hon. member for St. Mary's receives a much larger population than that embraced in several adjoining counties.

I may say I have adopted this old line of action based on sportsmanship, that is to help my neighbours as well as myself. I cannot state that I prefer the limits that I am now given to those embodied in report No. 4, which was presented to me, I believe, by my good friend Doctor Denis, at the time.

I must tell the house I do not approve the new limits mentioned in the bill under discussion as heartily as I did the limits described in report No. 4 submitted to your committee. Those are the explanations I wished to give this house at this stage.

Mr. MAURICE BRASSET (Gaspe) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, if the committee will agree, we will leave the large city of Montreal for the time being and proceed for a short stay in a county more to the east, the county of Gaspe.

When the committee decided to add two parishes to the county of Gaspe, I had an opportunity to discuss the subject with the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Larue) who asked me whether I would be satisfied to accept these two parishes. I told the hon. member for Matane that this change from a strictly political standpoint was favourable to me, and that I was in favour of the project. However, in justice to the population detached from the county of Matane, I deem it my duty to point out to the committee that Gaspe is already an immense county. It embraces three provincial counties and there is added to this county part of Matane, that is to say part of a fourth provincial county. Under the circumstances, if the committee decides to add to the county of Gaspe the two parishes mentioned in the bill now before the house, I will accept them and, from a political standpoint, I will be quite satisfied and do all in my power to act fairly towards those people. However, I believe they would be represented more equitably if they were left in a more restricted area. The county of Gaspe, as I stated, is very large and has at the present time a population of 47,000 souls. These two parishes which it is proposed to add were not very distant from the county town of Matane, whereas my new electors will be required to travel between 225 and 250 miles in order to reach their new county town. Under these circumstances I believe it incumbent upon me to ask the committee to take these two parishes out of the county of Gaspe and restore them to the county of Matane to which they belonged previously, this notwithstanding the fact their addition to my county would constitute a political advantage for me.

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I deem it my duty in the circumstances to give some explanations to the house respecting the county of St. Mary's. This constituency has been wiped out and restored several times a week. Proposals aiming at an arrangement have followed one another and been multiplied. It is true that at the outset, when bill No. 2 was presented, I had no choice as my county was completely wiped out. The first project that aimed at retaining the county of St. Mary's on the electoral map of which I had any knowledge appeared satisfactory to me to a certain extent, it was for that matter acceptable. I felt I should recommend its acceptance and I believe it was accepted. That was plan No. 4 to which the hon. member for Hochelaga referred. This plan proposed the creation of the county of St. Mary's with a population of 76,000 souls. This plan was set aside. As stated by the hon. member for Hochelaga, we had an interview at about eleven o'clock; new proposals were made with respect to the county of St. Mary's and they were accepted I am not opposed to them, the hon. member for Hochelaga agreed, and I believe that is the arrangement the hon. member for Compton spoke about.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): Thank you.

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): This project gives the county of St. Mary's a population of about 96,000. According to the plan we accepted the population of the county of Hochelaga is reduced to probably 78,000.

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): That is still respectable!

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): That is still quite respectable, quite reasonable. And the county of St. James extending to Belanger street, as well as the counties of St. Mary and Hochelaga would have a popula- of 74,000. These new conferences resulted in a new arrangement. It lowered the county of St. Mary's a peg or two, brought it back to a population of about 82,000 and gave the county of St. James an almost equivalent population. But this deranged the boundaries which we had agreed to accept that night at about eleven o'clock. This proposal was approved.

Now, the government is quite free to adopt the eleven o'clock proposal to which we acceded; it is also free to accept the proposal approved at noon to-day. So far as I am concerned, I have only one word, I was offered something, I said I accepted it—I am still ready and always willing to accept it.

Mr. GOBEIL (Translation): I thank the hon. member for St. Mary's for the statement he has just made and which justifies me entirely. The hon. member for St. Mary's tells me that another project was submitted at noon. I was not aware of that. I put

the question to my friends opposite for the information of the house and for my own enlightenment, because some changes might have been made without my knowledge. I asked them whether it had not been decided at eleven o'clock, Wednesday night, that I was to see the secretary of the committee in order to advise him of the final arrangement concluded between my hon. friends to the right. The hon. member for St. Mary's is no doubt aware that a new arrangement made at noon to-day utterly precluded the possibility of printing a new bill by to-night.

Mr. ST. PERE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to add a few remarks. Certain details have come to my attention—at least, I believe so. It was stated in the event of the retention of St. Mary's division and the disappearance of the county of Lafontaine, the counties of St. James, St. Denis, I believe also St. Mary's and Hochelaga were to absorb the population of this county that was to disappear. Following a survey which the future member for Mercier, I would venture to say, made in his county, he noted—one must state the facts as they are—that the population of the constituency was too large and he may have asked that part of same be absorbed by the other members. Mr. Chairman, I agreed to accept my share, and since the hon. member for Compton is ready to describe as chivalrous those who respect their word—I am not asking for any such qualificatives—I must state that I never was opposed to accept the surplus population represented by that new chimney added to my county which forms a quadrangular figure. If the hon. member for St. Mary's is willing to accept the enormous population that is added to his county, it goes without saying that the member for Hochelaga will follow the same line of action and will do his utmost as in the past to retain for the Liberal party the county of Hochelaga which he represents in the House of Commons since 1921. That is my statement.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—Number of members.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, before this section carries, I would like to point out to the house that it is stated in the bill under discussion that the Yukon will be represented by one member. The note opposite page 2 of the bill reads:

The representation of the Yukon is not determined by the British North America Act, but is within the competence of parliament to decide. In the following statement it is presumed it will continue to be represented.

I understand the representation given to the Yukon is the same as that given in years past. I note however in examining the statistics that the population of the Yukon district has not increased to any extent since the last redistribution.

We note in the report of the chief electoral officer covering the 1930 election returns that the number of electors entered on the lists was 1,719 of whom 1,408 voted. We note in the census report that the population increased by only 73 from 1921 to 1931. Moreover, if we look at the bill which is now before the house and the explanatory notes with reference to basis on which the representation in the House of Commons is established, we read the following in respect of the Yukon:

The representation of the Yukon is not determined by the British North America Act, but is within the competence of parliament to decide. In the following statement it is presumed it will continue to be represented.

Thus, there is apparently no justification for granting a representative to that territory, when the representation is to be determined by the House of Commons, especially when one bears in mind the times in which we live and when by reason of circumstances, heavy expenses and the debts which the country must pay, everybody is urging economies. One must also consider another point. I do not believe there is any likelihood that the population of this territory will increase in the future to the same extent as in the past, seeing it did not increase measurably between the years 1921 and 1931. So, when it was decided in 1924 to grant representation to that district, it was assumed that the population would show an increase in the following years.

You will allow me to submit another question to the consideration of the committee. At the present time, there are certain regions in the province of Quebec as in other parts of the country that reflect greater activity and development, and while they are developing faster, their population shows a greater ratio of increase and industries are being established; however, it has not been deemed proper to give them a representative. In the county which I represent for more than 15 years and where I again hope to appeal to the electorate, because the population has always given me a kind welcome and accorded me the most loyal support, there is a large district from Tadoussac to Labrador, including the island of Anticosti, which numbers all told a population of about 19,000. There is said to have been some talk for a time to divide my county and to create a special

county with a representative in the house. I know this question was very much to the fore in the Quebec legislature some years ago. Rumours reached me that certain requests had emanated from certain parts of the county for the division of this county and to have a member represent that part of the territory I have just mentioned. However, Mr. Chairman, those requests and petitions never reached me, were never handed to me. As I was not a member of the committee, I was unable to represent the interests of those people who claim they are entitled to a member in this house.

Now, I am aware there was a somewhat recent agitation on the part of certain newspapers and a certain Conservative press of the province of Quebec asking in view of the disappearance of the county of L'Islet, that the part of the territory which I have the honour to represent and which embraces a large area be detached and divided by a line running from Chateau-Richer to Pointe Desrochers and extending to the Straits of Belle Isle. These suggestions were put forward by the Journal of Quebec in an article published on May 12. The article mentioned these facts in detail and stated that owing to the disappearance of a county in the Quebec district,—L'Islet,—a member should be added for that district and territory. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it is rather difficult to grant a member for that region, today, in view of the fact the territory embraces an extensive area and does not contain the population considered necessary. However, I deemed it my duty to lay these facts before the committee, so that it may be well understood that the persons who might have made these requests did not address themselves to me but applied to members on the right. I do not know whether those requests reached them. At all events, I am in no way responsible for that.

Another observation and I will close. According to the reprinted bill, I believe a new parish is added to my county,—a parish situated to the north of Montmorency Falls. This parish forms part of the county of Montmorency at the present time. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that I never meddled with the affairs of the committee and never asked a favour from anybody. I did not ask that such and such a thing be done in the district which I have the honour to represent until now. Yet, while the committee decided to add that distant parish to my county, a parish which can only be reached by a road that does not connect with the remainder of the county. I am happy to state, Mr. Chairman, that I welcome this new population of Ste. Brigitte de Laval in the county of Charlevoix-Saguenay, and I will do for those people as much as I have been able to do so far for the county which I have the honour to represent.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Division into electoral districts.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I ask that that section stand, and that we proceed with other sections.

Section 3 stands.

Sections 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

On the schedule—Ontario.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): I presume that we shall now take the schedule for Ontario, which begins at page 3 of the bill. I shall call No. 1, Algoma East.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the province of Ontario the bill which is in your hands has been before the committee and has been subject to some amendments since it was printed, and the reprint on the table to-night embodies all those amendments with the exception of some technical errors in description, and typographical errors. These have been corrected, and I now submit a schedule embodying the corrections, all of which have been submitted to and approved by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Elliott), who represented the opposition on the committee. We have agreed upon all these changes, and they have been checked by the electoral officer and the officers who prepared the descriptions. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. MacNicol, that the schedule of the bill with respect to the province of Ontario be stricken out and the following substituted therefor. The substitution is in the terms of the schedule as it appears in the reprinted bill, with, as I have indicated, certain minor technical and typographical errors.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Before the motion is put may I say that while the schedule is not as I should like to have it, and while as a matter of fact there are in it some things which I much dislike, nevertheless I have realized throughout that the government has the majority and that the government must take the responsibility for this redistribution. A great deal of time has been spent on the Ontario schedule. It was unfortunate that the opposition was represented by only one member from a province containing eighty-

two constituencies. The changes involve a great deal of detail. I suggest that whoever may be in the house at the time of the next and subsequent redistributions should regard representation on redistribution committees from the standpoint of the number of constituencies in a province. I do not believe it is fair that a province such as Ontario, containing one-third of the total membership of the house, should have an opposition membership on the committee of only one.

In view of what has been said by the Prime Minister and other government members since this bill was introduced I believe the redistribution schedule as now recommended is as good as we are likely to obtain, even if we were to spend the next two weeks of the time of the house and a good deal of the country's money in further discussion. Some concessions have been made, and if the schedule is put through as finally passed by the committee, I do not purpose taking up further the time of the committee of the whole house at this time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall the schedule as amended carry?

Mr. SANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like some explanation in regard to schedules 46 and 49. Number 46 is:

Oxford, consisting of the county of Oxford and that part of the town of Tavistock that lies in the county of Oxford.

Then number 49:

Perth, consisting of the county of Perth, excepting therefrom the townships of Fullarton and Hibbert, but including the city of Stratford, the town of Mitchell, and that part of the village of Tavistock that lies in the county of Perth.

In number 46 Tavistock is described as a town and in 49 as a village.

Mr. BENNETT: I noticed that. Which is it, a village or a town?

Mr. SANDERSON: It is a village.

Mr. BENNETT: At the top of page 10 the word "town" should be "village."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): Shall the schedule carry?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not like to allow this schedule to carry without protesting very strongly against what I think is a ghastly gerrymander of the constituency of North York. That constituency as it was framed and kept by the redistribution of Sir Robert Borden of 1914 was a compact rural constituency, essentially rural with important towns and villages. It included the village of Stouffville. In the redistribution of 1924 two townships in the county of York were added, rural townships, Vaughan and Markham, but leaving the constituency a compact, purely rural constituency. The present redistribution takes out one of the townships which was added in 1924, the township of Markham, but what is more extraordinary it takes out the village of Stouffville which is in the township of Whitchurch, and in so doing makes a considerable jag in the side of the constituency as it has been heretofore. While the whole of Markham township is taken out there is added to the southern part of the constituency the township of North York, a township which reaches down close to the city of Toronto. It makes a constituency that is semi-urban, and certainly it loses the aspect of cohesion and compactness which a constituency of the kind should have.

I cannot believe this change has been made for any reason other than to give a distinct advantage to whoever may be the Conservative candidate. In the election of 1930 Markham township, which is being taken out at the present time, gave a Liberal majority of 248; Stouffville village a majority of 282, and Markham village a Liberal majority of 25, a total Liberal majority of 555. That will all be taken away when the township of Markham and the village of Stouffville are taken out of the constituency. On the other hand North York township is being added, which gave in 1930 a Conservative majority of 615. So if we take the figures of 1930 we shall soon see why the present distorted shape has been given to this old historic riding of North York. The position of the Conservative candidate, whoever he may be, will be bettered in the following way:

Liberal majority lost..	555
Conservative majority added..	615
Total gain..	1,170

And this notwithstanding that as the riding stood the Conservative candidate had a majority in 1930 of 298. That, I think, indicates very clearly what was in the mind of those who have been urging and who have insisted upon this change. The change is the more regrettable for a reason which I gave the other day, namely, that speaking broadly and generally, rural opinion is too little represented in this parliament in comparison with urban opinion. I think every effort should be made to see that rural constituencies should be as largely as possible distinctively rural. As the Prime Minister mentioned, we have now reached a point where the urban popula-

tion of Canada exceeds the rural, a tendency I believe wholly in the wrong direction, in a country like Canada; and that tendency is being artificially furthered where constituencies are being gerrymandered in this manner. Looking at the constituency as it will hereafter appear it has a resemblance to a Turkish scimitar. It does not resemble any properly designed compact riding fashioned with regard to the regular boundaries of townships, but has this extraordinary gash in its side, giving it a semi circular appearance with a sort of handle provided through the addition of York township in the vicinity of Toronto, an addition which I do not think can be justified in connection with any constituency which should be classed as a rural constituency.

I would like to say a great deal more. There is one point for example that I would mention, namely that Yonge Street, which is the main highway running from Toronto to Lake Simcoe, will hereafter run through the centre of the lower part of the constituency, and through the centre of the upper part, but alongside only one of the townships in the middle of the constituency. The township of Markham which has been taken out on the other side of Yonge street is thrown into another constituency altogether. Richmond Hill, which is one of the villages located on Yonge Street, finds half its population in the constituency of North York and the other half, which since the distribution of 1924, has been in North York, has gone into some other constituency. A more glaring and ghastly gerrymander I do not think could be presented to a House of Commons, and I certainly protest as strongly as I can against the schedules for Ontario passing so long as they include that particular riding in the distorted form in which it now appears.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): There is a word to be changed in 46, suggested by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Sanderson). The municipality of Tavistock is described as a town, while in 49 it is described as a village, I move:

That in 46, second line, the word "town" be struck out, and the word "village" substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

On the schedule—Nova Scotia.

Mr. SHORT: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn), that the names of constituencies No. 7 and No. 11 be changed. I move that No. 7 be amended by changing the name from Evangeline to Digby-Annapolis-Kings.

Amendment negatived: Yes, 28; nays, 29.

Mr. BENNETT: Pairs were observed on one side and not on the other.

Sir EUGENE FISET: I was paired and I did not vote.

Mr. POWER: I was paired and I did not vote.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I never thought that this was a government amendment.

Mr. BLAIR: I was paired and I did vote, but I should not have done so.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): I was paired and I voted inadvertently. If it be possible to withdraw my vote, I am willing to do so.

Mr. RINFRET: I observed my pair with the Secretary of State and did not vote.

Mr. ROBINSON: I was paired and did not vote.

Mr. SHORT: There seems to have been a misunderstanding and I think the vote had better be taken again.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that in all fairness the vote should be taken again, because a number of gentlemen have observed their pairs while others have not. As I understand it, it is perfectly competent for all hon. members to disregard their pairs. The ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) suggests that pairs need not be observed unless there is an arrangement to that effect; the amendment was moved by a private member and not by the government.

Mr. POWER: A discussion has already arisen in the house with respect to pairs, but I believe that each individual member has an arrangement with his pair, and so far as I am concerned my arrangement with the hon. member for Muskoka-Ontario (Mr. McGibbon) is that I shall not vote when he is not in the house. That is a private arrangement, nothing being signed.

Sir EUGENE FISET: By arrangement with the Minister of Health I was not to vote when he was not in the house, and I did not vote.

Mr. SHORT: I have a similar arrangement with my pair. I thought the hon. gentleman was in his place but I notice that he has just come in. I should not have voted.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My arrangement is the same, that I am not to vote when my pair is not here.

Mr. RHODES: I fear that inadvertently this matter has become complicated. The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) did not put his motion on one sheet of paper. He announced, when he moved it, that he intended to propose an amendment with respect to Shelburne-Yarmouth and Clare, to preserve the name of the district of Clare as part of the new constituency of Shelburne-Yarmouth. There may be some misunderstanding as a result of the vote that has been taken.

Mr. SHORT: I have another amendment to move with respect to Shelburne-Yarmouth and Clare, which I did not include in the original motion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are several members on the committee who have not really appreciated the significance of my hon. friend's amendment. Perhaps he will tell the committee just what each amendment is. I am inclined to agree with the Prime Minister that we should take the vote over again.

Mr. SHORT: The explanation is this. I object to the name Evangeline—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Why?

Mr. SHORT: Because we lose the identity of our counties, and Evangeline is known historically in but one of the three counties. I do not want to lose the identity of the counties, and I think the name I propose is much more appropriate. For that reason I move to have the name changed. The second motion was that the constituency of Shelburne-Yarmouth, which has had Clare added to it, be changed in name to include Clare. I move these two amendments.

Mr. CASGRAIN: With regard to the question of the observance of pairs, I should like to know whether the government assumes responsibility for the motion in connection with that particular constituency, because it would have something to do with our voting on the motion. I have here a copy of the undertaking which is generally signed by members on both sides of the house with respect to pairs. It reads:

> We, the undersigned, agree to pair for the present session of the House of Commons upon the following conditions:
>
> Our pair is to be in force on all divisions on measures and resolutions introduced by the government or for which the government assumes responsibility, also on divisions on all measures and resolutions introduced or supported by the official opposition.
>
> The agreement is to apply not only when the Speaker is in the chair, but also when the house is in committee of the whole.

It is therefore of considerable importance whether or not the government assumes responsibility, because, unless hon. gentlemen make special arrangements among themselves, as indicated by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), they are relieved of their obligation only if the government does not take the responsibility for any motion that is put. If the motion is moved by a private member hon. gentlemen are free to vote as they please.

Mr. QUINN: What objection is there to a private member making a motion with regard to the title of a constituency in which he is primarily interested?

An hon. MEMBER: No objection.

Mr. QUINN: Why should the government take responsibility for it? Are you denying a private member the privilege to which he is entitled? As seconder of the motion moved by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) I ask that it be put now.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the statement made by the former Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) as to why he voted indicates clearly the appreciation of the committee of the character of the motion before it. It is a motion of a private member that the word "Evangeline" be stricken out and the words "Digby-Annapolis-Kings" be substituted therefor. It was not in that sense a government motion and I think the hon. member for Quebec East was right in voting for it. His pair with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie) I think is in the terms of the document read by the chief whip of the Liberal party (Mr. Casgrain). There are pairs which are made on an entirely different basis, such as the pair of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) with the hon. member for Rimouski (Sir Eugène Fiset). Their pair is that when only one member is in the house the other does not vote. I am not quite sure of the character of the pair which I have with the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) but in a general way I do not think either of us would vote if the other was not in the house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have proceeded on that basis, although I do not think we have had a distinct understanding with respect to private members' motions.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think we have had any differences about that, because we

have both usually been in our places when votes have been taken. Having regard to all the circumstances I think it would be better if the vote were taken over again as a means of ascertaining in a fair and equitable way just what is the position of the committee with respect to the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): I submit that once a vote has been taken it cannot be taken a second time.

Mr. RHODES: A motion to rescind would be in order. I therefore move that the vote just taken be rescinded.

Motion (Mr. Rhodes) agreed to.

Mr. SHORT: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) that number 7 of the schedule for Nova Scotia be amended by eliminating the word "Evangeline" and substituting therefor the words "Digby-Annapolis-Kings."

Mr. RALSTON: I am sorry I was not in the house at the moment when the motion was put. I have not had any direct representations with regard to the wishes of the citizens in these counties but I have no doubt that the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) has taken steps to inform himself. As far as I am concerned I intend to favour the motion of my hon. friend to maintain the names of these counties in order that their identities may not be wiped out. While I am on my feet I might refer to another matter which will be reached in a moment. There is a proposal to change the name "Shelburne-Yarmouth" to "Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare." As the citizens of Clare are to be added to my constituency I thought I should ascertain their wishes in this regard. I find that their wish is that the name "Clare" should appear in the name of the constituency. Therefore, if my hon. friend will make the motion, I am glad to support it. There is a good deal of justifiable pride and sentiment about the retaining of these old names. I may say further that my thought is that one of these days some change may be made and it might be just as well to preserve the identity of the divisions in order to make that change with the least possible dislocation.

Mr. BENNETT: I may say that that is the sole reason that influenced me. All the constituencies with the exception of this one bear the old historic names of counties. It will be observed that the description of this constituency reads as follows:

[Mr. Bennett.]

Evangeline consisting of the counties of Kings and Annapolis and that part of the county of Digby exclusive of the municipality of Clare.

That is the reason why I supported the motion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry if this change is to be made in Nova Scotia. I was pleased when I saw in the report that the fine name of "Evangeline" was to be given to a constituency in a province which has been made famous by its sons and daughters. I am sorry to have to oppose this change and I hope my hon. friend will not take it amiss when I do.

Amendment (Mr. Short) agreed to on division.

Mr. SHORT: I move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) that number eleven of the Nova Scotia schedule be amended by adding the word "Clare" to the words "Shelburne-Yarmouth" making the name of the constituency read "Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare."

Mr. MERCIER (St. Henri): I do not know the first thing about the motion now before us. I wish the chairman would speak loud enough so that we could hear.

Mr. RHODES: The new constituency will be composed of the counties of Shelburne and Yarmouth and that part of the county of Digby contained in the municipality of Clare, and it will be called "Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare."

Amendment (Mr. Short) agreed to.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Before the Nova Scotia schedule is carried, and without wanting to be at all parochial in this matter, I should like to find out from the members representing Nova Scotia whether or not the facts which I laid before this committee this afternoon are worthy of consideration.

Mr. RHEAUME: Sit down.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Will you stand up, please?

Mr. RHEAUME: I can stand up better than you can.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: I wish to register a last objection as a Highland Scotchman. After all, we remember that in the days of our forefathers we fought to the last, and we will fight to the last until we drop the clay-

more. There is no question that in the last ten years because of the actions of the Liberal party—

Mr. RHEAUME: Sit down.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Stand up. This matter is important to the people of the province of Nova Scotia and I want an answer from those who represent Nova Scotia constituencies in this committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, I think you had better call it eleven o'clock.

Mr. MACDOUGALL: Under the Liberal regime of 1924 a seat was stolen from the province of Nova Scotia. I want to ask—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, it is eleven o'clock.

Schedule as amended agreed to on division.

Progress reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

FREE CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE IN VIEW OF AMENDMENTS

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, before the house rises I would like with its consent to deal again with the criminal code amendment. It appears that the Senate does not feel like amending its own amendments and we do not feel like amending ours, so it will be preferable to have the resolution passed by the house this afternoon rescinded and to move another resolution asking for a free conference between the House of Commons and the Senate. Therefore I beg to move:

That the resolution passed by the house this day, disagreeing with the amendments made by the Senate to subsection 3, section 3 of Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, be rescinded.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate respectfully requesting a free conference with their honours to consider a certain amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, to which amendments this house has not agreed and upon which the Senate insist, and any amendment which at such conference it may be considered desirable to make to said bill or amendments thereto.

That the clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Saturday, May 27, 1933

The house met at eleven o'clock.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

The house resumed from Friday, May 26, consideration in committee of Bill No. 2, to readjust the representation in the House of Commons—Right Hon. R. B. Bennett—Mr. Smoke in the chair.

On the schedule—New Brunswick.

Schedule agreed to.

On the schedule—Prince Edward Island.

Schedule agreed to.

On the schedule—Manitoba.

Mr. BENNETT: Certain questions were asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) in connection with this matter and it was decided that an amendment would be moved by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Burns) who was on the committee to be seconded by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps). This has been embodied in the description which has been agreed upon. I suppose a formal motion should be made that the schedule now printed in the new bill should be substituted for that in the old. Am I right in assuming that the descriptions now given in the reprinted bill are correct?

Mr. HEAPS: They are satisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT: My amendment would be that the schedule in the reprinted bill be substituted for the schedule in the old bill.

Amendment (Mr. Bennett) agreed to.

Schedule as amended agreed to.

On the schedule—British Columbia.

Mr. STIRLING: I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for East Edmonton (Mr. Bury) that the schedule in this bill respecting the province of British Columbia be stricken out and the schedule as appearing in the new bill be substituted therefor. This is in accordance with the arrangement arrived at between the members for British Columbia, it having been signed by them.

Mr. MUNN: Is this amendment the same as printed in the new bill?

Mr. STIRLING: In the reprinted bill.

Amendment (Mr. Stirling) agreed to.

Schedule as amended agreed to.

On the schedule—Alberta.

Mr. BENNETT: In connection with this schedule it seems to be necessary to make certain changes. The following amendment is being suggested:

(a) By adding after the words "fourth meridian" in the sixth line of said description, the words "including Edmonton settlement" and deleting the said last mentioned words from the eighth and ninth lines of the said description;

(b) By deleting the word "and" in line eight of said description, and by adding in said line after the figures "(24)" the words "and of twenty (20) east of the centre line of 101st Street Edmonton or its production northwards."

Mr. STANLEY: I may say that this was a technical error and we took it up with the chief electoral officer. I also spoke to the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart) who went into the matter carefully and the amendment was drafted in conference with the chief electoral officer. I move the amendment accordingly.

Mr. KENNEDY (Peace River): Possibly the hon. member for East Calgary will explain the effect of the amendment.

Mr. STANLEY: There is no alteration whatever in the agreed boundaries. The northern boundary of a very small portion was omitted from the original description as it is in the schedule. When I was speaking to the chief electoral officer, he said that he thought it would be preferable to have the amendment as suggested. He stated that he had the power to make the change when he came to officiate, but he would prefer to have it put into this new schedule.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule as amended agreed to.

Schedule—Yukon Territory—agreed to on division.

On the schedule—Quebec.

Mr. GOBEIL: As there were several technical errors in the bill as originally printed and some changes have occurred since, I move, seconded by Mr. Tétreault, that the schedule of the bill with respect to the province of Quebec be stricken out and the following substituted therefor. The substitution is in the terms of the schedule as it appears in the reprinted bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: So far as this schedule is concerned, there has been no change from the original schedule as regards the twenty-five constituencies which are considered as being in the district of Quebec. Twenty-three out of those twenty-five are being altered in some way or another. I do not desire to repeat my objections to those changes. I expressed my views three days ago and they stand as I expressed them on that occasion. Since then I have received many letters of protest from various constituencies, one letter in particular from Causapscal which was transferred to Bonaventure, being couched in language which would hardly conform to parliamentary rules. I desire again merely to register my protest as to all those changes, more particularly with regard to Témiscouata, Lévis, L'Islet-Montmagny and Dorchester. I will ask the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Gagnon), who is at present in the chamber, to give the committee the reasons for the change contained in the schedule with respect to his constituency. The municipalities of St. Luc, St. Maxime, St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurélie are being transferred, St. Luc being placed in the constituency of Bellechasse and the three others in the constituency of Beauce. I will ask my hon. friend to give us the particular reasons for which each one of these changes is made.

Mr. GAGNON: I would suggest that the hon. member proceed with his speech and afterwards I shall be entitled to answer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think I am entitled to know the reasons for these changes. Why does my hon. friend favour the throwing of those four municipalities into other constituencies?

Mr. GAGNON: I was not a member of the redistribution committee, but I am not afraid to speak.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would ask a member of the committee, a member of the government or, indeed, anybody to give the reasons we should approve these changes in the county of Dorchester.

Mr. GAGNON: I shall speak right now if the hon. gentleman insists, because he might say in another quarter that I am afraid to answer him.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member is afraid to keep those parishes.

Mr. GAGNON: Will the hon. member keep calm and quiet. I cannot answer three or four hon. gentlemen at once. The reasons for these changes are very clear. First of all, I may say, at the outset of my remarks, that in spite of the fact that the so-called conciliation committee was formed last week in order to reach some agreements, I think I can safely

state with respect to Quebec that the hon. member for Quebec East has not at any time been willing to come to any arrangement; what he did was only to repudiate the arrangements which had been made with the hon. gentleman of the Liberal party who was on the redistribution committee. I think when an hon. gentleman wishes to make some change in his constituency, the first thing he ought to do is to try to see the hon. member representing the neighbouring county where the different parishes will have to be joined. What he has to do is to see that the members of his party who are on the redistribution committee, make an arrangement with the member who represents the other party. The arrangement was made between the Conservative members of the committee and the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont (Mr. Mercier) that, with respect to Dorchester, the parish of St. Luc would be joined to Bellechasse and the parishes of St. Maxime, St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie would be joined to Beauce. So far as Beauce is concerned, the hon. member for that constituency (Mr. Lacroix) agreed to accept those parishes. He agreed to such an extent that the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) stated the other day in this house in the presence of the hon. member for Quebec East that the hon. member for Beauce had put in writing that he agreed to accept the parishes of St. Maxime, St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie. This has not been denied. The parish of St. Maxime in Dorchester it is true has belonged to the electoral division of Dorchester for provincial purposes for about twenty years. But up to the year 1924 the citizens of St. Maxime always voted in the electoral division of Beauce.

I have here a statement of all the electoral returns from the year 1900 up to the year 1930. I shall not take up the time of the committee to give the figures, but I can do so if I am challenged by the hon. member for Quebec East. It appears from the electoral returns that the citizens of St. Maxime have voted in the electoral division of Beauce up until the year 1925, but in the Redistribution Act of 1924, upon the demand of the former Solicitor General, the parish of St. Maxime was joined to the electoral division of Dorchester.

With respect to the parishes of St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie, in the Redistribution Act of 1924 they were described as being in the township of Metgermette and Metgermette North. Those parishes always up to 1931 belonged to the provincial county of Beauce. It is true that for twenty-five years the citizens of those parishes had voted in the district of Dorchester for electoral purposes, but nevertheless the parishes of Metgermette, Metgermette North, St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie had up to 1931 always belonged to the electoral division of Beauce for provincial purposes.

But after I had been elected member for Dorchester in 1930 the provincial government, following its usual tactics of changing electoral divisions at its will and fancy, began to make changes in a great number of counties which had elected Conservative members for federal purposes. I have here the statutes of Quebec, 21 George V, 1930-31, and I would refer the hon. member for Quebec East to chapter 15, section 1 of which reads as follows:

> The township of Metgermette North and that portion of the municipality of the north part of the township of Metgermette North forming part of the electoral district of Beauce are detached from such electoral district and annexed, for electoral purposes to the electoral district of Dorchester.

The hon. gentleman challenged the member for Stanstead the other day to quote one instance of a provincial change in provincial electoral divisions. There is one change.

I would also refer the hon. gentleman to the same statutes, 21 George V, 1930-31, chapter 16, section 1 of which reads as follows:

> The lots of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth ranges of the official plan and book of reference of the cadastre for the township of Ware are detached from the electoral district of Bellechasse and annexed to the electoral district of Dorchester, for all purposes including school purposes, and as to such school purposes, from the next school year, and are declared to have formed part in the past, for school purposes, of the parish municipality of Ste. Sabine, county of Bellechasse; they are declared to form part of the parish municipality of St. Luc, county of Dorchester.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in 1931-32 not only did the provincial government annex the provincial parishes of St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie to the county of Dorchester for electoral purposes, but they also attached some lots from Ste. Sabine in the county of Bellechasse to the county of Dorchester.

In a statute passed in the following year, 22 George V, 1931-32, chapter 18, section 6 provides as follows:

> The name of the township municipality of Metgermette North is changed, by this act, into that of the "municipality of St. Zacharie," and the name of the municipality of the north part of the township of Metgermette North is changed, by this act, into that of the "municipality of Ste. Aurelie."

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when the first bill was drafted the members of the committee, including the Liberal members, were

not aware apparently of the changes which had been made by the provincial government since the Redistribution Act of 1924, and consequently when they drafted the bill they did not insert the names of Metgermette North, St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie. But when the so-called conciliatory committee sat last week, the hon. member for Quebec East did not object to the changing of St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie because he stated himself to the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Gobeil) and the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion) that he had no objection to the removal of the parishes of St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie from the electoral division of Dorchester to the adjoining electoral division of Beauce. But now that the bill comes before the house and amendments have been made only in order to meet the difficulty which has arisen in view of the change made in the boundaries of the county of Dorchester by the legislature of Quebec in 1931 and 1932, the hon. gentleman from Quebec East, only with a view to making political capital, tries to make this committee believe that some new changes have been made since the printing of this bill. Such an opinion is absolutely unworthy of the high reputation of the hon. gentleman who, as I repeat, stated last week that he had nc objection to the parishes of Ste. Aurelie and St. Zacharie, which had always belonged for provincial purposes to the county of Dorchester, being joined to the county of Beauce. As I stated in my speech the other day the hon. gentleman last week in his speech said that people resented being changed from one district to another for voting purposes. Well, Mr. Chairman, if people resent having to vote in another district, I think the electors of the county of Dorchester will resent the fact that their majority might be swollen or drowned by the votes of the people living in the division of Beauce I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that I am perfectly in order in asking that the limits of Dorchester comprise the electors of the county of Dorchester alone. I think those details are sufficient, but if the hon. gentleman has something else to say I shall ask permission to answer him later.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall ignore the personal attacks of my hon. friend.

Mr. DUPRE: There were no personal attacks.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He has demonstrated the truth of the maxim that when one has no case the best thing to do is to abuse the other party.

[Mr. Gagnon.]

Mr. BENNETT: Abuse the attorney.

Mr. LAPOINTE: However, I shall try, Mr. Chairman, even from my hon. friend's own statement to demonstrate how unfair this change is in Dorchester county.

First, the parish of St. Luc, which gives a strong Liberal majority, has never been elsewhere than in the county of Dorchester. It is a place which when it was erected as a municipality was situated in the county of Dorchester, and it was erected civilly and canonically, as we say in the province of Quebec, in the constituency of Dorchester, and placed there for all purposes, and it is now being put in Bellechasse because it gives a strong Liberal majority.

As to the other place, namely St. Maxime de Scott, it was erected in 1895, canonically and civilly, in 1897 and was placed in the county of Dorchester. It always was part of the county of Dorchester, provincially, and was not added to that county federally because, if hon. members will look at the redistribution acts of 1924, 1903 and previously they will find that so far as the schedule in the province of Quebec was concerned it was stated that the counties of the province of Quebec would remain as at that time constituted except in certain particulars. So, when there was no mention of any change the counties remained as they were federally, and the provincial changes did not affect the constitution of the federal ridings. St. Maxime de Scott voted provincially in Dorchester all the time, and as there was no mention of it in the federal redistribution act it continued to vote in the county of Beauce until in 1924, at which time the provincial counties were accepted as the basis, except where changes had been made.

It has been stated that those changes have been made there and automatically applied to the federal redistribution act because the province of Quebec had a Liberal government. Let me tell the committee that when in 1897 St. Maxime de Scott was declared by the legislature of Quebec to be in the county of Dorchester, that province was under a Conservative government headed by the late Mr. Flynn, and the provincial member for Dorchester, the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, Conservative, was attorney general. On January 9, 1897 the legislature of Quebec erected the parish of St. Maxime de Scott, at that time stating it was part of the county of Dorchester.

As I have stated, had the changes been made in 1924 we would have had no objection to the undoing—to use the Prime Minister's word—of what had been done. According to all principles, St. Maxime de Scott is and

should be in Dorchester. But because automatically in 1924, after being in Beauce federally it was transferred to Dorchester, I had no real objection to its being replaced in Beauce, because I have stated that I had no objection to the Prime Minister undoing what he said had been done in 1924. But if that argument applies to St. Maxime de Scott, why not to Ste. Aurelie and St. Zacharie? I have consulted all the electoral reports and although St. Zacharie and Ste. Aurelie were in Beauce provincially, they were in the federal district of Dorchester not only in 1924, 1914 and in 1903, but before that. I went even to the election of 1887, when Mr. Duchesnay and Mr. Lesage were candidates in Dorchester. Those places have always been part of the county of Dorchester. Surely my hon. friend does not want to throw them away because in 1924 they were placed in his constituency. They were there before that. When the other day I said I would have no objection, because I had been told that federally they had been in Beauce, I was misinformed, because I find that they were not. I have learned that they were and have always been part of the county of Dorchester. So my hon. friend is taking four Liberal strongholds and sending one to Bellechasse and three others to Beauce. I say it is unfair for him to try to select his own constituency in that way. I say that the people in that constituency who elected him in 1930 will resent his action and I protest against the change. It is manifestly unfair, and cannot be justified or excused. It has been done for political purposes, and my denunciation of such practices will not be confined to this place.

Mr. C. E. FERLAND (Joliette) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to deliver a long spech. I simply wish to add a few personal observations to the vehement protests of the opposition against this proposal to redistribute the federal electoral districts, which, as we have noted, is not colourless, scentless or tasteless. In a word, I consider this bill reeks with the most odious stupidity and fanaticism that was ever found in any piece of legislation unless one excepts possibly what was labelled the "Stolen Wartime Elections' Act."

The bill converts the electoral boundaries of the province of Quebec into a regular jigsaw puzzle. I know the words which I might utter and the remarks I might make will bring about no change, since the Government with its haughty and arrogant majority may accomplish anything and has the power to enact this legislation.

The Conservative party submitted three projects respecting the county of Joliette during the consideration of this bill. By the first project inscribed on the electoral map which we found at the sub-committee on redistribution, they had first of all annexed the county of Montcalm to Joliette minus St. Donat where the electors give a majority to the Liberal party. They had also thought of adding the parish of Lavaltrie to Joliette and to take away at the same time from Joliette the parishes of St. Paul and Crabtree-Mills. They were annexed to L'Assomption whose population totals 15,323; then, they took that part of L'Assomption and united it to the Island of Montreal, with a population of 50,000. In the face of our protests, our friends of the Conservative party were not slow in realizing that this was a stupid project and told us not to waste any time in discussing it as they were going to abandon it.

Then, they submitted a second project to us. Before being modified, it involved the transfer of the entire county of Montcalm to the county of Joliette. I have had occasion of visiting my county since the debate on this bill got under way, and the people of my county told me they approved this project—at least those whom I met at Joliette where they go to transact business. They stated they were quite satisfied with the proposed union of the county of Montcalm with Joliette. It was quite logical, for the county of Montcalm forms part of our judicial district, it forms part of the diocese of Joliette and the citizens of Montcalm go regularly to Joliette on business matters. So the people seem to be delighted to have their county annexed to the county of Joliette.

Since then, in view of the injustice done to the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm, a new readjustment was proposed and the latter county will form with Joliette the finest diocese in the province of Quebec and will henceforth be called the county of Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm. From a religious standpoint, all the electors of the county of Montcalm, as I have said, also a few parishes of the county of L'Assomption form part of the diocese of Joliette. The new county as proposed in the bill becomes certainly the largest, perhaps the most populous, and the most beautiful county in the province of Quebec. It comprises two classical colleges, one at L'Assomption and the other at Joliette; three very distinguished provincial members in the person of my friends, Messrs. Reid, Duval and Bastien, respectively members for L'Assomption, Montcalm and Berthier; a Legislative Councillor, my very distinguished friend Notary Daniel; a senator no less distinguished, the Hon. Mr. Casgrain, finally, a town of the importance of Joliette. This new

county will have a population of 56,773. I may add that you will also find among the provincial members, my excellent friend, Mr. Lucien Dugar, of Joliette.

The population of this county is divided as follows: Joliete, 27,585; L'Assomption, 15,323; Montcalm, 13,987. The two counties of Joliette and L'Assomption-Montcalm had the following population: the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm, 29,188 and Joliette, 27,585. You can see that the two counties contained a sufficiently large population without the necessity of adding thereto. They would have been justified in increasing the population of Argenteuil which is less than 30,000. It is a crying injustice to increase the county of Joliette to such a great extent by annexing thereto L'Assomption-Montcalm to give it a rural population of more than 40,000 and an urban population in excess of 15,000, when the population of neighbouring counties is much smaller.

Take Three Rivers, for instance. The member for this constituency who took good care of his seigniory simply gave himself electors in his city to the number of about forty thousand. It is said he is afraid of the "country" and he rid himself of the rural parts of his county.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): Of the Liberal sections only.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): We find in Berthier-Maskinonge a population of only 30,000. The hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Baribeau) that dauntless fellow who fears the coming elections, took good care to delimit his county in such a manner as to retain a population of only about twenty thousand. They created a new county in the region, St. Maurice-Lafleche, which also has a population of only about thirty thousand souls. As for Joliette and Montcalm which constitute a magnificent region, which form beautiful counties, they said: We will make them larger, more beautiful and they will find men sufficiently industrious and qualified to represent a lot of people. The likes and consent of the electors count for little, we will create a county with a population of 57,000 souls in a region that covers an area of more than one hundred miles, this no matter whether it suits or does not suit the people of these counties.

The salient feature of the present redistribution bill, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the Conservative party went to great pains to create for itself nice little sky-blue counties and to achieve this end, to form large Liberal strongholds, solidly Liberal. The redistribution project is not fair to the Conservatives of the county of Joliette. In that county the Conservatives had an even chance of electing one of their representatives from time to time, as they did succeed in the past. With Joliette-Montcalm, there still remained some prospect of electing, perhaps one of these days, a Conservative candidate, and I know that one of the most eminent Conservatives of my district—who became a judge—I will not say in what court, expressed the opinion one day that the Conservatives would win the county of Joliette the day it was united to Montcalm. But it is evident now that the Liberal stronghold of L'Assomption-Montcalm is annexed to Joliette, that my friends of Joliette for whom I have much sympathy, have lost all their chances. They will tell the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Sauvé) who had his party in opposition at Quebec financed by one of my friends, Mr. Jos. Dufresne, a former provincial member, they will say: Sir, you are satisfied with your work, now that you have immolated us on the political altar in order to secure for yourselves small Conservative counties in the province of Quebec!

Mr. BARIBEAU (Translation): May I put a question to the hon. member?

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. BARIBEAU (Translation): The hon. member has just stated that the new county of Champlain will have a population of about 20,000 souls. I will tell him that the population will total 37,500, about double the figure he has just mentioned.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): You rid yourself of 15,000.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): I knew my hon. friend had taken care to decrease the population of his county considerably. I quoted these figures from memory, but the principle remains the same.

Mr. BARIBEAU (Translation): There is a very great difference.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): My hon. friend lacked courage. He was elected by a population of about 45,000 or 50,000 and he became frightened on the eve of the election and said to himself: I cannot be reelected member at Ottawa if I retain that population, because I did not carry out any of the promises which my leader and I made to my people.

Mr. BARIBEAU (Translation): We will see as to that later on.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): It is extraordinary to see how badly our friends look after their interests in the province of Quebec.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): They are real cowards.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): People are crying out in all parts of the province of Quebec that the project is unjust and hurts the Conservative party. They are so afraid of the people that they listen to the protests that come from all sides, from Conservatives as well as Liberals, ad they persist in wanting to have this bill approved. The most beautiful photograph of their stupid project was presented in one of our newspapers, L'Action Populaire, of Joliette, which in a remarkable article dated April 30, 1933, and written by my good friend, the Rev. Albini Lafortune, priest, gives the following sketch: The party in power, he states, usually avails itself of the opportunity to enlarge its fief or consolidate its positions. In the circumstances, there is no better tailor.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order. The hon. member knows it is strictly forbidden by the rule to read newspaper articles commenting a debate or a question actually under discussion in the house.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Talking about the tailor, as the Evenement says, when one carves out a county, one may also ride to a fall.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): To sum up, this article states—I can at least comment on it—he runs the scissors as he likes through the home-spun cloth; he cuts to the right, cuts to the left, scallops on the sides; he lengthens one end, shortens at the other end; destroys here, patches there.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): It is a counterpane!

Mr. FERLAND: (Translation): To put it in a nutshell, he tries to dye as much as possible according to his own colour. I think, sir, you are well advised to prevent me from reading what the newspapers say about this infamous bill. It is very clever of you, sir, to suggest to me not to read what the newspapers have written in that connection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): I am not preventing the hon. member, the rule prevents him.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): The session would last until New Year's Day.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): Even the Conservative newspapers insulted you. Who could ever have thought that the Conservatives of my province whom I love, esteem and admire and for all of whom I bespeak fair treatment, would find themselves in this situation? Did you ever conceive a more shocking spectacle than that of this great Conservative party being insulted even in Conservative newspapers? You all know what the Evenement said about you, Conservatives of Quebec, in its issue of May 22 relevant to this iniquitous measure we are now considering. Everybody knows that the Evenement is a great Conservative daily, loyal to the Government party, loyal to the Ottawa Conservatives. In its issue of May 22, that newspaper went so far as to state that the Quebec Conservatives who advise the right honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) are fools. They even used a language that is unparliamentary; they used a language I would be compelled to withdraw were I to use it in the House of Commons.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member does not use it, but he is on the border line.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): There remains very little after that!

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): They stated among other things that the Prime Minister's French-Canadian advisers are good fellows, if you will, but not very intelligent

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): They are not advice-boats!

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): Fortunately they are good fellows.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): But they are not brave fellows.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): Protest against the insults of the Evenement, do not let them say such harsh things about you! Defend yourselves against such attacks! If you are not courageous enough when it comes to appear before those who elected you, be at least courageous in defending the rights of your race.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order! The hon. member must not address his colleagues. If he has harsh comments to make, let him address them to me.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): The Soleil said less than the Evenement.

Mr. FERLAND: (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I was addressing myself to my country over your head. My learned colleagues to the right believed perhaps that I was addressing

myself to them. I will address them shortly in another language; I will be courteous and polite.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): One sure thing, the hon. member did not address himself to his pair in that manner.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): We do not belong to the same family!

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): One must not forget that he is not my father in the natural order of things, otherwise I would have a poor father. He is a charming fellow, naturally, who honours me greatly by pairing with me. Our friends generally—I will name nobody, since I must address myself to you, Mr. Chairman—our friends wanted through the remaking of the electoral map to carve out little counties which they believed "sure things," which they believed unmistakably Conservative. They wanted to carve out counties which I might call, permanent, everlasting. One would imagine that taking their inspiration from our ancestral traditions they wanted to imitate our Canadians of old, who, in marriage contracts, always gave their daughter "an everlasting cow and a reasonable pig." I can see your efforts to be delivered of an everlasting cow, but I do not find your pig reasonable.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Hear! hear!

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the worst feature about this bill is not the fact my county has been enlarged, that they have created a diocese for me, it is not the fact some of my friends will have much more work and many more people—we do not fear the people, the more we have the happier we are—but the fact that even Conservative newspapers like the Montreal Gazette, independent newspapers, like Le Devoir, l'Action Populaire, l'Evenement, have found that we French-Canadians must everlastingly be the dupes—that is what I do not like.

Mr. Chairman, fear is evidently what characterizes our hon. friends to the right. It is said fear is the beginning of wisdom, and they deem wise to seize the opportunity to rid themselves of many counties, of a large number of people who elected them. They are all afraid. They removed from each of the counties which they reduced in size a certain number of electors because they considered them Liberals.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): They are afflicted with colic.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): I am sure it is because they are afraid. Thus, the hon. member for Champlain who interrupted me a moment ago might be justified in being afraid. For all that, he is a good fellow.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): He is not very brave.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): He has not had as great an opportunity to distribute political favours as our minister. As for our French-Canadian ministers is it not astonishing to see how afraid they are, how they are frightened, notwithstanding the fact they gave positions, replaced postmasters, expended possibly hundreds of thousands of dollars holding investigations and making changes in post offices, and have important "patronage" at their disposal. How does it happen they are afraid?

A minister in a small county such as Chambly-Vercheres whose population is not very large would be afraid of his electors? A minister, a barrister in Montreal who did us honour as batonnier, who has a big voice, who speaks loud, who makes many promises at election time and who even erected a monument to himself by building with unemployment relief money on the banks of the St. Lawrence a wall that resembles those monuments one finds on the Marne or at Verdun and which are nothing else than monuments erected to the memory of the dead! Since when does one erect monuments during one's lifetime? Has he a presentiment that he is going to die when he erects such a monument to himself on the shores of the St. Lawrence? When we pass that spot on our way to Montreal, we see this monument, this large cement wall in front of which the beautiful St. Lawrence river traversing the region of Montreal flows by.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): He is so to speak an unreliable minister.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): There is no doubt about it; my hon. friend is right when he says he is an unreliable minister. He trembles so much he cannot conceal his fear. It is true he is the leader of the marine boys, but he does not wear the sailor's wide-legged trousers to hide his shivering limbs when the electors approach.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): They should give him a "tam-o'-shanter" to wear.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): Is it not astonishing, Mr. Chairman, to see the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Sauvé) tremble. Has he reason to fear?

Sir EUGENE FISET (Translation): He is accustomed to run away.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): The hon. Postmaster General has a small county, Laval-Two-Mountains. This county was sympathetic to him to the extent of electing his son to the Quebec legislature.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): He wanted to have it wizened up.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): It is astonishing to see that the hon. Postmaster General is also afraid of his electors. The municipalities of Pont-Viau and Laval-des-Rapides are in the Laval-Two Mountains district. It is said French-Canadians live in that district. Is he afraid of the rapids? He fears that in retaining Laval-des-Rapides he will be carried away by the rising wave of the people and he transfers them to my friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Jean). It is amusing to note that our Franch-Canadian representatives who have power, "patronage" and might should be such cowards. Yet, one would have expected from the hon. Postmaster General a vehement protest against anything that savoured of injustice. I remember, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Postmaster General always had countless virtues in the province of Quebec.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): He never practised them.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): He was for a long time leader of the Opposition and he was so virtuous that the prime minister, Mr. Taschereau, and his party wanted to keep him always at Quebec. Had the Quebec people not discovered New Zealand butter in 1930, they probably would not have lost their opposition leader. I have heard him sometimes in the course of patriotic addresses, moralizing on everything and nothing. He asks us to follow the ancestral traditions, and to practise the virtue of justice. It is extraordinary that people like him allow such injustices to be committed. I would like to give you an example showing how Mr. Sauvé —I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman; I withdraw; I should not have named him, I broke the rule unintentionally, I am very sorry. Here is what the hon. Postmaster General said in 1921. He was better than us, he was better than you, Mr. Chairman, because he said things. . . . A friend tells me the comparison is odious. I have much sympathy for you, Mr. Chairman, you are one of my colleagues at the Bar, I must be very careful as you might be appointed judge some day and I would not want to jeopardize the interests of my people in the cases which you might hear. I would rather offer you compliments. The hon. minister is better than others. Here is what he said after the elections of December 7, 1921:

> The electorate evidently displayed the resentment they harboured for a long time against the federal government. . . Since 1911, the Ottawa government has been a source of care and trials for the old party of Cartier in the province of Quebec.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a point of order. I have listened with impatience and patience—with both feelings—to the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Ferland). I claim he has no right to speak as he has done for the past ten minutes and I believe I am perfectly right in calling the hon. member to order. There was a mistake in connection with that letter and La Presse—I say so beforehand—published a rectification two days later. How can that concern the people of L'Assomption-Joliette and of Montcalm? I would ask the hon. member for Joliette—

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of discussing the merit of the counties of L'Assomption, Joliette and Montcalm. If my hon. friend wishes to voice an objection against certain words I may have uttered, he can voice it, but he has no right to take my place and deliver a speech.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): It is the first time the sun rises at ten minutes past twelve!

Mr SAUVE (Translation): He failed in his play to the gallery.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Order, gentlemen!

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): Will the hon. Postmaster General allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): On the point of order, I am inclined to believe the references quoted by the hon. member for Joliette are not very relevant to the debate, but at the outset of the discussion on the redistribution bill I wanted to call one of our colleagues to order and bring him back to the subject matter of the debate; unfortunately, the right hon. leader of the government ruled against me. I am therefore compelled to give the member for Joliette the same latitude as is given others and to declare the point raised is not well taken.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): What I was going to say, when the hon. minister did me the honour of interrupting me, was that

he found his party had been more Tory than Conservative, from 1911 to 1921. At that time, it was no virtue to be a Tory, it was a dreadful crime. My hon friend said his letter published in La Presse on December 7, 1921, was corrected later on—

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I never sent any such letter to La Presse I repeat La Presse made a correction on December 9 and stated there had been a mistake.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member is bound to accept the hon. minister's denial.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): I accept his denial. I merely want to ask him whether La Presse published a letter bearing his signature in its issue of December 7, 1921?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Yes, but there was a mistake, as I have just shown.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): The letter was published by mistake? That is to say it was not intended for the newspapers?

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): I do not have to undergo a cross-examination at the hands of the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member must accept the hon. minister's explanation.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): I will not insist on reading that letter because it contains such ridiculous things that I would feel ashamed for my learned friend.

Mr. SAUVE (Translation): Precisely, that is the reason why La Presse rectified the mistake.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): I wish to be courteous, gracious, and not avail myself of every opportunity to trample on my opponents.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): It is easy when they are on all fours.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): I now refer to the fear of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion), my pair. He was in his seat a moment ago. I see him conversing with the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): It is not the member for Quebec-Montmorency, it is the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dupré).

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): West and South.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): My hon. friend from Quebec West is also in a blue funk on the eve of the election.

[Mr. Ferland.]

An hon. MEMBER (Translation): That is natural.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): He had another kind of fear, fear of Quebec's solid Liberal "bloc" and of Liberal domination in the province of Quebec. As he candidly admitted to us the other day, with redistribution as effected: "We are sure now that there will no longer be any solid Liberal "bloc." Liberal domination in the province of Quebec is ended," he said. If he means he is afraid to see French-Canadians uniting around a standard or an ideal, a mentality or one policy, then he would rather see his compatriots divided than united. Has he forgotten, he who cannot deliver a speech without recalling the memory of Cartier and Macdonald, has he forgotten the promise of Sir Georges-Etienne Cartier, one of the fathers of confederation? When Sir Georges-Etienne Cartier was approached for limiting the number of members to 65 in the province of Quebec, is it not true, he replied, that we could secure the triumph of the just claims of French-Canadians in the province of Quebec by the formation of a solid "bloc"? He did not want to say it would be a solid Liberal or Conservative "bloc," he simply said: "When your interests are threatened, you, French-Canadians, you will have no need to fear the English majority of the country, all you need do is to form a solid "bloc" around your national flag and your ideal and there is no party that can win or hold its place at Ottawa if it lacks the support of the province of Quebec." Is it not true that the future justified him? Is it not true that the Conservative party only succeeded in achieving power temporarily in 1911 and in 1930, thanks to the province of Quebec? Without the province of Quebec, were it not for the mistake made by that province in 1911 when it voted against reciprocity—which the prime minister hopes for now—were it not for the mistake made by the province of Quebec in 1911 which made us lose twenty years' benefits which would have accrued from that reciprocity treaty, were it not for the mistake made by the province of Quebec in 1930, the Conservative party would never have been solidly maintained in power. My hon. friend from Quebec West is wrong in fearing the union of his French-Canadian compatriots. It seems to me it is not important and necessary to the extent of wanting to immolate and sacrifice the French-Canadian minority in the country in order to achieve one's political ends.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): There are others also who are afraid. Unfortunately, they are not all in their seats.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): They have the shivers.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): One of your friends, Mr. Chairman, made a rather witty remark in your presence, a remark that characterizes—

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): Since my hon. friend has concluded his remarks about me, would he allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): Certainly.

Mr. DUPRE (Translation): He complains of the manner his county was arranged: Is he aware that this readjustment is absolutely in line with the suggestion which the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin) made in this house on May 23, 1933?

Mr. CARDIN (Translation): The hon. minister will force me to say something.

Mr. FERLAND (Translation): I know that speech. After all, one must choose the lesser of two evils. I would rather have Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm than to see L'Assomption sacrificed and the people of that county smothered in the population of Montreal or compelled to go to the Laurentians, to St. Jérôme or Terrebonne.

I believe, sir, one of your friends made a rather witty remark in your presence that characterizes the situation respecting all the poisonous matter contained in this bill. I do not assert it was in your presence. I know there were several Conservative members at the committee. He said jokingly and laughingly: Look at the map of Richmond-Wolfe and tell me whether the arrow (Laflèche) does not point to the scene of the crime. My hon. friend from Richmond-Wolfe is one of our most sympathetic colleagues in the House of Commons. I have had occasion to travel quite often with him for several years. I esteem him very much, but it seems to me that he also, although he is a physician and capable of curing himself, it seems to me he is afraid of swallowing the pill at the next election; he has taken care to reduce the size of his county and he is also afraid of returning before the same electors.

The CHAIRMAN (Translation): The hon. member has spoken forty minutes. He may continue after one of his colleagues has spoken.

Mr. FONTAINE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words on behalf of the county of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot which is described in appendix No. 39 of the bill. First, I would like to make a few observations respecting the designation of this county. As one may read in the bill, the new county consists of:

1. Of the largest part of the present county of St. Hyacinthe, from the standpoint of population;
2. Of the entire county of Bagot;
3. Of a comparatively large section of the county of Rouville.

I think it would be but fair that the designation of this new county should take in the name of Rouville into account and I can see no objection to that as in certain other counties the names of three counties are retained. In the case of the hon. member who spoke before me, his county bears the name of Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm. In other cases, four names are retained. One must remember that part of the county of Rouville remaining attached to St. Hyacinthe, as defined in the bill just presented, is fairly large. As a matter of fact, this part of the county of Rouville comprises more than one-third and almost one-half of the total population of this county, that is to say about 5,000 souls or, more exactly, 4,938.

It seems useless at this late hour to cover once more the whole ground of discussion that has taken place on this score, but if as claimed, it was absolutely necessary that Bagot should be annexed to St. Hyacinthe, to which I personally have no objections, I conceive it might have been difficult to retain Bagot intact, St. Hyacinthe intact and Rouville intact. But when this bill involving the remaking of the electoral map was first considered, when there was talk of annexing part of the county of Bagot to St. Hyacinthe, I took, in company with my colleague from Bagot, steps and made representations, both orally and in writing, to the committee charged with the task of readjusting the representation in the province of Quebec, to the effect that if Bagot must of necessity form part of the county of St. Hyacinthe, they should respect the entity of the two counties, that is to say, maintain Bagot in its entirety and St. Hyacinthe in its entirety.

They granted my request with respect to Bagot and also in regard to one parish in St. Hyacinthe, that of St. Damase, which they wanted to annex to St. Johns, but they did not grant my request respecting the remainder of the county of St. Hyacinthe or the county of Rouville. As I stated previously, I regret it, as the county of St. Hyacinthe, like that of Rouville, is one of the oldest in the province

of Quebec, and never had been subdivided before. It is partitioned in this bill, and this should never have been done, neither in the case of St. Hyacinthe nor that of Rouville.

I will not further discuss St. Hyacinthe, as everything that had to be said was said and repeated, but I subscribe fully to the remarks, observations and protests made in that connection by the hon. members for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) and for Bagot (Mr. Dumaine). I have myself registered my protests in that respect, both orally and in writing. But the point I do wish to stress at this stage is the fact that while they leave me part of Rouville which I accept with pleasure, they take from me an important section of the county of St. Hyacinthe which they should have left in this new county. And I do not think my colleague whom I esteem very much, the hon. Minister of Marine, could have objected to that. He keeps as his share in the county of Rouville a larger section than the section which he leaves in St. Hyacinthe-Bagot. Matters should have been left as they were, and as I told the members of the committee when I voiced my protest, if changes were necessary, they should have respected the entity and present limits of Rouville, St. Hyacinthe and Bagot. That part of Rouville which is left to me is very important, not only from the standpoint of population but also by reason of the fact it contains three prosperous parishes and two or three large villages, one of which is the seat of the principal business college in the county of Rouville, a college well known throughout the province and even in the United States.

If one takes the population figure of that region into account, it would be proper to retain in the designation of the new county of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot the memory of the county of Rouville. I think it would be quite possible to say: St. Hyacinthe-Bagot-Rouville, as we will say: Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm. I reiterate I can see no objection why the designation of the county could not be altered in that way.

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): Does the hon. member believe we could use the word Rouville in the designation of two counties in the same province? There is already Chambly-Rouville. That part of Rouville annexed to Chambly comprises a population of 8,838 citizens. Is it not more fitting to use the word Rouville with Chambly and to leave the words St. Hyacinthe-Bagot? It must not be forgotten that the word Rouville is already on the map with Chambly-Rouville.

[Mr. Fontaine.]

Mr. FONTAINE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I fully understand the hon. minister's reply when he remarks that the part of Rouville remaining in the county of Chambly is larger than the section joined with the county of St. Hyacinthe-Bagot. I also understand that if it were a case of annexing only a couple of parishes it would perhaps not be necessary to add the name, but I think one must consider that the part of Rouville remaining with St. Hyacinthe-Bagot constitutes more than one third and almost half its population,—almost 5,000. That part is not quite as large as the part of Rouville joined with the hon. minister's county, but I believe the hon. minister should not object to the word "Rouville" being used twice in the province. If there was any confusion, one could possibly add the words Rouville East, which does not appear necessary to me. There should be no objection to this word being repeated in two counties, following the practice that prevails in certain parts of large cities, such as Winnipeg and others; and that is what I request.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Before recording a final protest against the bill under discussion, you will allow me to make a rectification. At page 5695 of unrevised Hansard, French edition, I stated in reply to a question of the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) that the total population of Nicolet, following redistribution, would be 47,000 and a few odd hundreds. As I gave those figures from memory, I confounded the 1921 census returns with those for 1931. The total population of Nicolet-Yamaska after the coming redistribution, with the union of Nicolet and Yamaska, will be exactly 43,493, which is about the normal unit for the province.

I repeat I do not understand why six parishes are taken from the county of Nicolet and a half parish from the county of Yamaska, when these two counties united completely would only form a population of 45,493.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Translation): Will the hon. member allow me? The hon. Solicitor-General (Mr. Dupre) moves that the Committee report progress and the Speaker take the chair for a few minutes. The hon. member may then continue his remarks.

Progress reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

FREE CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE IN VIEW OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that a message has been received from the Senate informing this house that the Senate hath agreed to a

free conference desired with the Senate for the purpose of considering certain amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, to which amendments the commons have not agreed and upon which the Senate insisted; and any amendments which at such conference it may be considered desirable to make thereto, and hath appointed Hon. Senators Graham, Chapais and Meighen as managers on its part at the said conference, and also that the managers of the free conference on the part of the Senate will meet in Senate room 258 forthwith.

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General) moved:

That Messrs. Lapointe, Heaps and Dupré be appointed managers on behalf of this house of the free conference with the Senate with respect to the amendments made to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith, and

That the clerk do carry the said message to the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

Mr. BENNETT: I desire to thank the hon. gentleman who was speaking for his courtesy in this matter.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, in the course of my speech last Tuesday, I believe I treated my hon. friends with all possible politeness, kindness and courtesy. I stated my case most earnestly when I asked the hon. gentlemen to reconsider their decision with respect to the county of Nicolet-Yamaska. I see by the newly printed amendments that no change has been made in Nicolet or Yamaska. Will the hon. Minister of Marine tell me why, having regard to the normal population of Nicolet-Yamaska, the committee decided to take away half the small parish of St. Michel? Can the hon. minister tell me why that was done?

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): The hon. member knows perfectly that I was not a member of the committee, and in order to answer him, we would have to discuss once more the map of that whole region of the province of Quebec. However, I will tell my hon. friend: Had we not detached a few parishes from the county of Nicolet and annexed them to Lotbiniere, the hon. member would have noted that Lotbiniere had a much smaller population than that of Nicolet-Yamaska. Even with the addition of several parishes from Nicolet to the county of Lotbiniere, this county has a population of only 38,546. As I stated in the course of this debate, we wanted to give the citizens of the province a unit of representation that was as equitable as possible. That is the reason why a few parishes of Nicolet were united with Lotbiniere.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): Why half a parish?

Mr. DURANLEAU (Translation): I do not know that detail.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I cannot accept this reply from the hon. Minister of Marine. If he really wanted to do justice to me and the people of my county, he could have used his influence with the members of the committee on redistribution. When he tells me he acted thus merely to equalize the population of the county of Lotbinière with the population of the adjoining counties, I think the hon. minister gives a rather specious answer. The county of Lotbinière, minus the population of 5,000 taken from the county of Nicolet, would still have a population of 33,000, which is larger than the population of Dorchester, Argenteuil and other counties. The county of Nicolet by retaining its entire present population and the present population of the county of Yamaska, will still have a population of only 45,493, which is a smaller population than that of the counties of Charlevoix-Saguenay, Drummond-Arthabaska, Chicoutimi, and that of many other counties. I believe I can detect the whole manoeuvre underlying this matter. Half of the parish of St. Michel is taken from the county of Yamaska, because it is a Liberal parish. Six parishes, also Liberal, are taken from my county. And why? Unless it be to create a fief, a safe constituency for the future Conservative candidate. And when the hon. Minister of Marine dares accuse us, Liberals, of only playing politics in connection with this bill, I ask myself what one must call this method of dealing with the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): It is an abomination!

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): It is a national crime!

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I protest once more and as strongly as I can against the present bill No. 2. The people of my county and those of the county of Yamaska are being treated unjustly. In support of my renewed protest, I will read to this house a last appeal

of the people of the county of Nicolet. Here is the telegram which I received in that connection:

Mr. L. Dubois,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

We are sending you copy of a message forwarded to the right hon. prime minister and we urgently request you to use all your influence to secure justice for us. Here is the text of the message addressed to the prime minister. Mr. Premier, respectful representations have been made to your Government asking that the county of Nicolet which has a sufficient population be retained as a distinct entity, but if a union is necessary the two counties of Nicolet and Yamaska should be united in their entirety. We had understood your Government had condescended to adopt the second alternative that was so just and legitimate in every respect and decided to merge completely the two counties of Nicolet and Yamaska. To our surprise, the bill as presented dismembers and subdivides not only the counties of Nicolet and Yamaska but also the diocese of Nicolet by the annexation of half a parish to the county of Richelieu, St-Hyacinthe diocese, and of six parishes to the county of Lotbinière, diocese of Quebec. We believe it sufficient to point out this involuntary error in order for you to have it corrected in such a manner as to give complete satisfaction to the interested authorities and taxpayers. We are submitting the same request to your French-speaking colleagues and to the member for Nicolet. We remain,

H. N. Biron, mayor,
J. Alfred Gaudet, barrister,
Secretary-Treasurer of the Municipality of the Town of Nicolet.

I will point out that this Mr J. Alfred Gaudet, barrister, is the very man who was my opponent in 1930 and I must bear witness in this house to the fact that he is no coward. I must bear witness that he had enough courage and honesty not to ask for the dismemberment of the county of Nicolet. Mr. Gaudet is ready to run again at the next election, with the same county and same parishes which he faced in 1930.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): He is courageous.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I am convinced this dismemberment effected in the county of Nicolet and in the county of Yamaska was requested by Mr. Comtois, defeated candidate in the county of Yamaska. This gentleman has not the courage to again face all his electors of 1930, and to-day he asks the Government to dismember the county of Yamaska and the county of Nicolet, in order to try and secure a somewhat safer riding for himself. I have no compliments to pay to the gentleman, but I am proud to be able to say that my opponent of 1930 appears to me to be much more courageous than the candidate who was defeated in the county of Yamaska.

Those petitions which I mentioned the other day, those resolutions and telegrams were sent to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) and to the members of the committee, and I observe that those documents received no consideration whatever. They were thrown into the waste paper basket and no recommendation was taken into account. They preferred deciding with a ruling majority to drive six parishes out of the county of Nicolet and expel half the parish of St. Michel from the county of Yamaska. I understand, sir, that those sitting on your right are mighty enough to do such things, but magnanimous people can never be made to understand that might is right. I ask that Bill No. 2 be modified. The clause that reads as follows:

This Act may be cited as The Representation Act, 1933, should read: The Deportation Act, 1933.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): Hear, hear.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I consider it most deplorable that six parishes in the lower part of my county and the parish of St. Michel should be compelled to form part of other counties at the next election when they expressed the explicit desire to remain with their old counties. This bill is a cowardly, deceitful and felonious measure. In order to justify the expulsion of these parishes they try to make me and my people believe that this is being done to establish a uniform unit of representation in the province of Quebec. What deceit! I am about through, Mr. Chairman, and if you will allow me, I will make a comparison. On September 5, 1755, more than 400 Acadians were assembled in the little church at Grand-Pré. Winslow who was instructed to read Lawrence's orders to the little gathering deprived of all means of resistance was seated at a table in the aisle. One of my ancestors formed part of the group. That night, the clock struck the end of century of tranquillity and happiness. The following morning, those poor Acadians were looking at their homes and farms for the last time. They were being expelled. And it happened to be a Saturday, just like to-day! I need not tell you that history branded the perpetrators of that villainy of 1755.

Mr. SEGUIN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, before this appendix of the redistribution bill relating to the province of Quebec is adopted, I trust you will allow me to add a word of protest against this government's arbitrary measure that involves the disappearance of the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm as an entity.

The first project conceived by the Conservative party which had sworn to wipe out the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm, involved originally the union of Montcalm with the county of Joliette and the annexation of L'Assomption with Maisonneuve.

The attention of these gentlemen having been called to the absurdity of uniting an essentially rural county with a city county, they deemed fit to give up this ridiculous project and to add the county of L'Assomption to that of Terrebonne.

It is true, concessions were made when they agreed to give up this more or less stupid second alternative and not separate the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm whose common interests require that its component parts remain united, but take the whole county of L'Assomption-Montcalm and join it with the county of Joliette.

Viewed from certain angles this project might appear rational and, of the three proposals I believe it should be in the interests of the people of the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm.

Yet, I do not want to be understood as exonerating the heads of the administration who apply the saying: "Might is right," and unite two electoral districts whose respective populations are sufficient to secure each one its separate existence, particularly when one considers the Conservatives create under the present bill a new electoral district, that of Chapleau, whose population is smaller than that of the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm by 9,000, and smaller than that of Joliette by 7,000, and when this same bill provides for the maintenance of the county of Argenteuil as a separate entity with a population of less than 20,000.

The present government realizing its unpopularity by reason of the complete failure to implement any of its promises, is trying by all possible means and every possible injustice to mend its fences. Allow me to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the Conservative party has so deceived the people, that no matter what it may do, the next appeal to them will witness its defeat, and with all due deference to my hon. friend, the Solicitor-General, despite the efforts he and the honourable French-Canadian ministers have made to improve their prospects, it might well happen that the province of Quebec may once more form a solid bloc to show it cannot be deceived with impunity. Moreover, when the province of Quebec forms a solid bloc it has good reasons for doing so.

If I am bound, sir, to accept the provisions of the present bill that are imposed on us, I must inform you again that it is simply a case of choosing the lesser of two evils. My hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Ferland) and myself cannot help but feel the insult that each of our electoral districts suffers in not being allowed to retain their respective identities although they both had an absolute right to remain as they were.

Those are, Mr. Chairman, the few remarks I wished to make before the adoption of the appendix to the bill respecting the province of Quebec.

Mr. FAFARD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I would be lacking in dignity were I to complain about the treatment I have been subjected to. I do not intend complaining about what was done to me as member for L'Islet. Therefore I wish to protest once more on behalf of the county of L'Islet against the political crime that is about to be perpetrated.

Since it is the last time the county of L'Islet, as a county, may be heard in the House of Commons of Canada, I want the last words I am to speak to be devoid of bitterness. I simply want to avail myself of this opportunity to thank the people of L'Islet for the confidence they have reposed in me since 1917. I thank the Liberals, I thank the Conservatives; they were both excellent soldiers and on the morrow of the battle, they knew how to join hands and work for the prosperity of their district. I also wish to thank my colleagues for the support they have given me. I thank particularly the hon. members for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and for Quebec South (Mr. Power) who lent me their full support in trying to preserve the beautiful and historic county of L'Islet. Unfortunately, we failed to achieve the results we were seeking, but I am proud of one thing, we did not get on our knees, we remained standing.

Mr. DUPUIS: Mr. Chairman, I desire to avail myself of the precedent established last night by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short). I move, seconded by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dumaine), that number forty of the schedule for Quebec be amended by adding the word "Napierville" after the words "St. Johns-Iberville." This would give the new constituency the following denomination, "St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville."

Amendment (Mr. Dupuis) agreed to.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, there have been some petitions tabled which were in proper form. They were signed by interested

parties, people living in the four parishes which are to be taken away from the constituency of Témiscouata. They were signed by both Conservatives and Liberals. The clerk of the house said that they were presented in regular form. I will therefore ask of the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) three questions: first, what has been done with those petitions? Second, why have they been disregarded? Third, at whose request?

Mr. DUPRE: I have nothing to answer. I do not know what has been done with those petitions.

Mr. POULIOT: Who knows about them?

Mr. DUPRE: I am not supposed to take care of them. They are not under my care.

Mr. POULIOT: That is the answer Cain gave about Abel: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Mr. GAGNON: I rise to a point of order. Surely, to compare a minister of the crown with Cain is unparliamentary.

Mr. POULIOT: Is the hon. gentleman the guardian of the Solicitor General?

Mr. GAGNON: I ask you, Mr. Chairman, kindly to see that those words are withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the comparison in the way it was used by the hon. member for Témiscouata was unparliamentary.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Toutes les comparaisons ne sont pas odieuses.

Mr. POULIOT: I will ask another question of the Solicitor General. The government has enfranchised the Indians—

Mr. DUPRE: I will tell my hon. friend at once that this is not a court and I shall not stand for any cross-examination from him.

Mr. POULIOT: I have never in my life seen anyone so dumb.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order. That expression is certainly not parliamentary.

Mr. POULIOT: Then I shall withdraw it and say that I have never heard anyone speaking so little apropos as my hon. friend has done.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must go further than he has done.

Mr. POULIOT: I have withdrawn the expression. I always abide by the rules.

Mr. TURNBULL: Perhaps I can clear up the situation. In committee, in the course of the discussion I was informed by the chairman that the petitions to which my hon. friend refers had been received from the clerk of the house by the select committee on redistribution and had been before that committee and considered.

Mr. POULIOT: And therefore they were disregarded and thrown into the waste paper basket. But I have to say this and I shall ask another question of the Solicitor General about the course that he will follow with regard to this legislation. The parishes of Notre-Dame-du-Portage, St. Jean-de-Dieu, Ste. Françoise and Trois-Pistoles are not in Témiscouata county; they are in the county of Rivière-du-Loup which is not mentioned in this bill on account of the ignorance that has been shown by either the members of the committee or by somebody else. The description is wrong.

What I was about to say is this: When the government is giving the franchise to the Indians, why do they refuse it to the French Canadians of those four parishes? That is the question I ask of my hon. friend and I also ask him whether it is not the intention of the government at least to change the description so as to state that those parishes are taken away from the county of Rivière-du-Loup in order to give those people the right to vote, or whether my hon. friends wish to create a most abominable gerrymander by depriving more than 1,000 people of the right to vote. That is the question. They would not have the right to vote because Témiscouata as described in this bill does not exist; it is twenty-five miles from there.

Mr. DUPRE: I will answer my hon. friend.

Mr. POULIOT: Let him answer then.

Mr. DUPRE: Yes. Nobody will be disfranchised, and if my hon. friend is right and this description is wrong, we shall see that we get the correct description.

Mr. POULIOT: So much the better. It is wrong.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is the county of Rivière du Loup and Témiscouata.

Mr. DUPRE: I may tell my hon. friend that the hon. member for Témiscouata has already raised that point. We consulted the officers who told us that this description was the right one, but we shall once more make sure about the matter.

Mr. POULIOT: The hon. member should look at chapter 16 of the Quebec statutes of 1931 and he should show it to the officers and learn it himself.

I have two things to say now. I received two letters one from Notre Dame du Portage. I will first ask the Solicitor General whether the old lines of the former constituency of Témiscouata will be changed around in the amendment, or whether the parishes will be taken away as mentioned in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the schedule carry?

Mr. POULIOT: I ask that question of the Solicitor General.

The CHAIRMAN: He does not answer.

Mr. POULIOT: I ask him whether, in the amendment changing the description of the county so as to make it correct in order not to deprive those people of the right to vote, he will restore the actual lines as they are now or whether he will take away the four parishes mentioned in the bill?

Mr. DUPRE: We shall leave the schedule just the way it is. If the definition is not correct, we shall see that it is corrected.

Mr. POULIOT: That is all right.

I wish to mention two letters I have received, one from Notre Dame du Portage. It is asked whether it is because the Prime Minister has been appointed Knight of Grace of St. John of Jerusalem that we receive so many Palestine oranges in this country. The second letter is from St. Jean de Dieu saying that when the right hon. gentleman goes to the world economic conference, he should see that there is no Bible on the boat—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: —because if the sailors read the story of Jonah and the whale they will throw him overboard.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Témiscouata should take his seat or at least talk like a gentleman.

Mr. POULIOT: I am. I am quoting the Bible.

Mr. CARDIN: I think there is a mistake in the Quebec schedule so far as the county of Chateauguay-Huntingdon is concerned. If you read the schedule with respect to that county, you will find that it states that the county of Chateauguay-Huntingdon consists of:

(a) the county of Châteauguay except such part thereof as is included in the municipalities of Ste-Philomène, St-Joachim, the town of Léry and of Châteauguay;

(b) that part of the county of Beauharnois as is included in the municipality of St-Etienne;

(c) that part of the county of St-John as is included in the municipalities of St-Bernard de Lacolle, Notre-Dame du Mont-Carmel and the village of Lacolle.

The county of Huntingdon is not mentioned in the reprinted schedule which I have in my hand.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): It is mentioned in the French version.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

The committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. CARDIN: I have just a few remarks to offer. It was suggested this morning by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Dupre) that the addition of L'Assomption-Montcalm to Joliette had been done practically at my suggestion. That is not representing exactly what I had said. If the report of my observations is read carefully it will be very clearly understood that my suggestion, made with a view to reaching a compromise, was this: First of all I object to the disappearance of the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm. I contended that it should be kept as it was because of its importance for comparison with other constituencies. But I said that if the county of L'Assomption-Montcalm had to disappear it should disappear by being joined in its entirety with the county of Joliette. I said that this would create a large county, but it would not be the only county with a large population. My suggestion was made in order not to destroy the limits of the constituencies as they exist at the present time. I object to a part of the county only being taken to be added to an adjoining constituency. That was my main contention. My suggestion was that L'Assomption-Montcalm should be added to the county of Joliette in its entirety rather than be divided up, and that all the other constituencies in the northern section of the province be kept in their entirety without any subtractions from their territory. But in the reprinted bill which we have before us I find that that part of my suggestion has not been carried out. It is true that the county of Labelle is going to remain in the same condition as it is at the present time, and the same is true of the county of Argenteuil and of the county of Terrebonne, but that is not the case with Laval-Two Mountains. That county is being changed. Two parishes from the north of the county, the municipality of St. Colomban and the municipality of St. Canut are being added to the county of Argenteuil. It is a matter of only one thousand of a population; it does not amount to very

much; so why change it, and two other parishes in Laval-Two Mountains are being transferred over the river Desprairies to Mercier on the island of Montreal. We have all been complaining that the population in the island of Montreal was large enough, and it was due to that fact that we had difficulty in adjusting the rural seats in the province of Quebec. If that is the case, and we are all agreed on that, those two municipalities transferred should have been left in the county of Two Mountains.

What is going to be the result of this? We are increasing the population of many constituencies in the province of Quebec, because we say they are not large enough as compared with others, but, in the case of Laval-Two Mountains, the population is being reduced. We are making a large county of L'Assomption-Montcalm-Joliette, giving that new county a population of over fifty thousand, and we are destroying the limits of the county of Laval-Two Mountains and reducing its population to 25,000. The population of Laval-Two Mountains in the reprinted bill which is going to pass, because nobody can prevent it passing now, if the government is determined to put it through, is reduced by nearly five thousand. The population of the constituency of my hon. friend the Postmaster General is going to have a population of 25,000, and the adjoining county of Terrebone 35,000, and the new Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm is going to have over 50,000. That is the kind of a redistribution which is presently offered. Hon. gentlemen opposite always speak of equalizing populations. That was to be their main objective so far as possible. But everybody can see in what way they are equalizing the population in the different constituencies in the province of Quebec. They are equalizing the population where equalizing is to their advantage, and reducing the population when they think they can derive from it a certain political advantage.

Mr. DURANLEAU: That is my hon. friend's opinion.

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly it is my opinion, and the interjection of my good friend the Minister of Marine reminds me of something which can be said in regard to his constituency. He said that he was not disposed to take the whole county of Rouville because with that county as established, not to say carved, by the present bill he would have 40,000 of a population, and he said: "think of the development of that section of the province of Quebec with the service that I have established over the Montreal bridge." He said: In a few years you will have that constituency increased by 20,000 or 25,000. If that is the case it would not have been worse for him to keep the constituency of Chambly-Vercheres, where he had a population of 39,000, instead of 40,000, and then he would have been in a position to take care of the development of Chambly if these important developments are going to take place in the next two or three years. But if he wanted to get rid of that part of Vercheres that is his business. He knows why and I know why this change is being made. The reason is obvious. But there is no justification for him saying, "I cannot take the whole of the county of Rouville because it would give me too much population because I will have to take care of the future development of the county of Chambly." His position would be exactly the same, indeed he would be better off, if he kept the county of Chambly-Vercheres which has done him the great honour of electing him as its representative after that seat has been represented in this house by many distinguished Liberals. I think he should be a little more fair to his people in Chambly-Vercheres and show a little more appreciation of what they have done for him in keeping him within their fold; and obviously he could do more for them as a minister of the crown, if his government were returned to power, than any private member could. So I say that there is nothing in his argument as to population, because his population would have been the same and he would have been in the same position to take care of the future developments in the county of Chambly.

Mr. GAGNON: May I in a few sentences show how inconsistent are my hon. friends opposite, especially the former Minister of Marine (Mr. Cardin). Speaking in this house on May 23, for about one hour and a half, the hon. gentleman said, as reported at page 5328 of Hansard:

> Instead of separating L'Assomption and Montcalm, I think we would be ready to join with Joliette, not only Montcalm but also L'Assomption. It is true that that would make a very large constituency but the county of Joliette—
>
> M. Dorion: Nous sommes prêts à accepter cette proposition de l'honorable député.

I will translate Mr. Dorion's remark into English, "We are ready to accept those proposals of the hon. member." The former Minister of Marine continued speaking for

a further hour, and at page 5335 of Hansard he said:

We object to that, but if the question with regard to L'Assomption, Montcalm and Joliette can be decided without regard to these requests from the Postmaster General we will agree.

Those words implied very clearly that if the three counties of L'Assomption, Montcalm and Joliette were joined there would be no objection from my hon. friends opposite. Now that it has been done in order to please hon. gentlemen opposite, we have hon. gentlemen opposite standing up and blaming us for doing what they asked us to do.

Mr. CARDIN: It takes some courage for the hon. gentleman to speak in the way he does. If I were looking for a witness to corroborate the truth of the statement I have just made the hon. member who has just spoken would be the best witness. If he would read intelligently his words he would find that they are corroboration beyond dispute of what I said previously. We were ready to accept if the Postmaster General had not insisted upon destroying the line of the county.

Mr. SAUVE: I never insisted. The representative from the opposition agreed to it.

Mr. CARDIN: There is no such agreement.

Mr. SAUVE: If you do not know, I do. I will not be denied by others.

Mr. CARDIN: There have been negotiations to settle difficulties. Certain representations have been made from this side of the house. We were ready to go a certain length if hon. members opposite would go a certain length. We find in the bill some of our proposals but not others which were to serve as compensation. They have not accepted the proposals we made.

Mr. SAUVE: On Thursday at noon the hon. member for Richelieu told me that he accepted the proposition.

Mr. CARDIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was ready to accept the proposals if something were done for us.

Mr. SAUVE: No, not on Thursday.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It seems useless to fight.

Mr. CARDIN: I was ready to accept certain proposals provided something were done. But I ask hon. members to look at the bill and they will not find that any of our requests have been granted. The hon. member for Dorchester has just mentioned the conditions which were made, an agreement concerning the adjoining two counties, provided the Postmaster General did not insist upon reducing his own constituency. But he does not agree. He persists in his desire to keep the population of his constituency down to 25,000.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): When the committee rose at one o'clock there was a question as to Chateauguay-Huntingdon not being mentioned in the schedule.

Mr. GAGNON: I have an amendment to move. The hon. member is quite right. The bill which was drafted in the first instance was correct, but in reprinting it yesterday the printer left out one line. Therefore I move the following:

That the description of the constituency of Chateauguay-Huntingdon in the schedule be stricken out, and the following substituted therefor:

12. Chateauguay-Huntingdon consisting of:

(a) the county of Chateauguay except such part thereof as is included in the municipalities of Ste-Philomene, St-Joachim, the town of Lery and of Chateauguay;

(b) the county of Huntingdon except such part thereof as is included in the municipality of Ste-Barbe;

(c) that part of the county of Beauharnois as is included in the municipality of St-Etienne;

(d) that part of the county of St-John as is included in the municipality of St-Bernard de Lacolle, Notre-Dame du Mont-Carmel and the village of Lacolle.

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont): Before considering the amendment I should like to say a few words. I do not know whether or not I understood the hon. member for Dorchester, but I thought he said that the representative on this side of the house on the committee had accepted certain proposals in reference to the county of Dorchester. As this committee knows, the subcommittee worked very hard. When our deliberations were concluded we differed in regard to Levis, Montmagny-l'Islet, Dorchester and Temiscouata. One night—I believe it was Tuesday night of this week—we thought we had come to a settlement. There was a question of leaving the constituencies of Dorchester and Temiscouata as they were. I should like to explain right here and now the authority under which members of the committee operate. Representing the Liberals I would not take upon myself the responsibility for settling anything at all; especially in regard to the county of Dorchester. I have great admiration for that county, but I do not know anything about the parish of St. Anselme, or anything of that nature. For that reason I could not take upon myself responsibility for settling things about which I knew nothing

No more did the hon. members for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion) and Compton (Mr. Gobeil) take upon themselves any responsibility for settling anything without referring to those people who were especially interested. I was acting for Liberal members on this side of the house. I had a mandate; I was not the principal at all. Any proposals which were made by hon. members opposite must be submitted to hon. members on this side of the house, and I followed out the instructions I was given. The hon. member for Compton did the same for hon. members opposite. We made proposals and counter proposals and tried to agree upon this and that. We went away at night in good humour and said, "It looks pretty good to us; tomorrow everything will be settled." But when we came back next day it was all off. On Tuesday night of this week the question of a settlement concerning Temiscouata again engaged attention, and the suggestion was made that Temiscouata should be left as it was. Levis was to include that part of Levis which had been transferred to Bellechasse and so far as I can remember—and I am speaking subject to correction—an arrangement was made concerning Dorchester. Prior to 1924 St. Maxime de Scott was not in the county of Dorchester, but in 1924 the Liberals put it back into that county. If I remember correctly the ex-Minister of Justice said that if the parish of St. Maxime de Scott were put back in the county of Dorchester we would be willing to stand by it. When our committee ceased deliberations we could not agree on—well, as a matter of fact we did not agree on anything at all—but our main objections concerned Montmagny-l'Islet, Dorchester and Temiscouata. And when these learned, white-haired gentlemen came in and superseded us they deliberated and worked hard. Although the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) is not in his seat I must say we admired his diplomacy. In fact, because he was so diplomatic we conferred upon him the title of the Count of Talleyrand. But the new committee of wise men broke up. We did not accept anything. So far as the province of Quebec is concerned there was no question at any time of accepting the proposals in connection with the constituencies to which I have referred. I do not know whether or not it was the hon. member for Dorchester who said someone else or myself had accepted the proposal concerning that constituency, but I say now there was no acceptance in regard to Dorchester, Montmagny-L'Islet or Temiscouata. It was on these questions that the subcommittee on redistribution for the province of Quebec and the committee which superseded it failed to come to an agreement. I want to go on record as saying that I did not know anything about the county of Dorchester any more than I knew about L'Islet; I referred it to my friends, got my instructions from them, and whatever they told me I accepted. I did not want to take any responsibility for it any more than members on the other side took any responsibility for constituencies they did not know.

For Laurier-Outremont I could accept responsibility; I knew about that. I wanted it to remain as it was; I did not want it to disappear. The Minister of Marine (Mr. Duranleau) is a good friend of mine; although we differ here, he was an elector in my constituency and I wanted to keep him there.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Mr. BENNETT: I understand that the representatives of the territory covered by the new constituencies of St. Mary and St. James are of the opinion that the population would be better distributed if certain changes were made. Therefore, to meet the wishes so expressed, I move:

That the description of the constituency of St. James in the Quebec schedule be amended by adding after the word "Papineau" in the fourteenth line the words:

"to the centre of the Canadian Pacific railway tracks, thence following the centre of the Canadian Pacific railway tracks to the centre of Dolorimier avenue; thence following the centre of Delorimier avenue."

It consists, I understand, of a few thousand people, and this is to equalize the population as far as that can be done. I am not doing this at the instance of the Conservative party or of the Conservative members on the committee, but to meet the wishes expressed to us, that this would be a more equitable distribution of the population.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to put a question in order to ascertain why the committee refuses to extend the eastern limits of my county to Papineau street as was agreed at the meeting I mentioned yesterday, in view of the fact the population of my county is smaller than that of the counties of St. James and St. Mary's?

Mr. MERCIER (Laurier-Outremont) (Translation): I believe the hon. member for St. Denis (Mr. Denis) is right.

Mr. BENNETT: That correctly interprets the request, doesn't it? The amendment I have moved was requested on behalf of those concerned in the constituencies in question

Mr. DENIS (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I desire the implementing of the agreement whereby the county of St. Denis was to extend to the east as far as Papineau street and from the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks as far as Belanger street.

Mr. POULIOT (Translation): I had no agreement and I am much better off.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that my question deserves a reply.

Mr. LAURIN (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I believe there was an agreement at the outset with the hon. member for St. Denis and he was quite satisfied with the boundaries of his county. There is no reference whatever to the county of St. Denis in this amendment.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): I beg your pardon, when an agreement was made with the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Laurin) it was understood that the easterly limits of the county of St. Denis would extend as far as Papineau street and from the Canadian Pacific Railway tracks to Belanger street. The changes made are satisfactory to me, but if my friend from Maisonneuve discontinued his speech it was due to the fact an agreement had been reached that provided for the extension of my boundaries to Papineau street. That does not mean I am not satisfied with the limits I have, but I want the given word to be respected.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Under protest.

Quebec schedule agreed to.

On the schedule—Saskatchewan.

Mr. TURNBULL moved:

That the schedule of this bill with respect to the province of Saskatchewan be struck out and the following substituted therefor.

Then follows the schedule as it appears in the reprinted bill, with one or two minor changes which neither add to nor subtract from the arrangement. The first is in paragraph 10, Prince Albert, where after the word "portions" in the first line the words "within the province of Saskatchewan" are added. The second is in paragraph 15, striking out the word "to" in line 11. The next is adding in line 30 of the same paragraph the words "in range 27 west of the second meridian."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As is apparent from the remarks of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull), the only changes in the schedules as they appear in the revised copy are those that affect the constituency of Prince Albert—

Mr. TURNBULL: They are only typographical changes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —and incidentally the boundaries of the constituencies affected thereby. For that reason, what has already been said in the course of the discussion would apply equally at this time, with the exception of what might be said in regard to Prince Albert. As to Prince Albert constituency I said at the time we were discussing the matter that I would make my appeal to the government and would leave the question of the boundaries in the hands of the government. I have made my appeal to Caesar, and I propose to abide by the decision that has been given and not argue the matter further. However, I wish to state exactly the position in which the constituency of Prince Albert is placed as a result of the redistribution which is now proposed under the bill revised. What I say about no further discussion with regard to Prince Albert, is subject, of course, to the understanding that further discussion is not provoked by anything I may say just now or anything that may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite. I would ask the hon. members from Saskatchewan on this side who are here to-day, since we are all anxious to conclude this afternoon if possible, to direct their remarks—

Mr. BENNETT: With the consent of the right hon. gentleman I should like to make a brief statement which may shorten this discussion. With respect to the constituency of Prince Albert, to which my right hon. friend has referred, so far as possible having regard to the redistribution as arranged we have endeavoured to meet the views of the right hon. gentleman. A few days ago it was suggested that the southern boundary of Prince Albert had been fixed in 1914, when both the Minister of Finance (Mr. Rhodes) and myself were members of the committee under the government of Sir Robert Borden. I suppose it is unnecessary to remind the right hon. gentleman or this committee that since 1911 two censuses have been taken, one in 1921 and the other in 1931, and obviously during that period of twenty years, with the increase in population which has taken place the boundaries of most of the constituencies must be altered if regard is had to the unit of population. In 1914 the southern boundary of Prince Albert, as perhaps the right hon.

gentleman will observe, commenced at the extreme eastern boundary of the province and then moved straight west, forming the southern boundary of several constituencies as well as the boundary of Prince Albert. The 1924 redistribution did not affect the southern boundary of the constituencies of Melfort and Prince Albert as they had been constituted. Unfortunately, with regard to our being able to meet the wishes of the right hon. gentleman, I only desire to point out that the shifting of the population in the last ten years has involved the adjustment of boundaries and the increase of representation. On the new map—and I went into it with some degree of care—there is built up a new constituency called Rosthern which, if one has regard to the returns in former elections, will return a Liberal candidate with a substantial majority. Unless there is a change in the voting sentiments of that population there is very little doubt, according to past returns, that a Liberal candidate will be returned in this constituency. The town of Rosthern lies within the present constituency of Prince Albert, under the redistribution of 1914, and is north of the line fixed in that year. The redistribution measure now before the house involves moving the line, which is the southern boundary of Prince Albert, twenty-four miles north, which would leave the town of Rosthern in the new constituency of the same name.

Mr. TOTZKE: If the right hon. gentleman will pardon me, the southern boundary is moved only twelve miles north.

Mr. BENNETT: Pardon me; I should have said twelve miles, and I thank the hon. gentleman. I now suggest, in order at least partially to meet the views of the right hon. gentleman and his friends, that the southern boundary of Prince Albert be moved north not twelve miles but six miles only.

Mr. TURNBULL: That is correct; it was twenty-four miles previously and now it is twelve miles.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what I thought; my memory is fairly good. I was right in that we moved the southern boundary line of Prince Albert twenty-four miles north in the original draft; that is, four townships of six miles each. I now suggest that instead of moving the boundary line twenty-four miles north we meet the right hon. gentleman half way and move it only twelve miles north. Instead of carrying it straight through to the point of intersection with the boundary of Melfort, it is now proposed that we proceed east as far as the Duck Lake reserve, then up the side of that reserve and easterly until we strike the river, and then proceed downstream to the point of intersection with the westerly boundary of Melfort. The effect of that will be to throw out a triangular piece of territory in which I am told, according to the last election returns, there was a majority adverse to the right hon. gentleman of about 250. Instead of the line being moved twenty-four miles north, therefore, it would be moved only twelve miles north, and the town of Rosthern would be included in the new constituency of the same name, which has been built up. Instead of proceeding east in a straight line to the intersection of the constituency of Melfort, when the boundary reached the Duck Lake reserve it would proceed downstream to the western boundary of the riding of Melfort. I believe this will not make any appreciable difference to the right hon. gentleman from the standpoint of voting power; the population in that triangular strip of land to which I have referred, lying south and east of the Duck Lake reserve, between that reserve and the point of intersection with the Saskatchewan river, will be withdrawn from that constituency.

I may tell the committee frankly that it is quite impossible to readjust the boundaries without involving a general change, and those who have followed the matter know that this results very largely from what was done with regard to the constituency of Melville. Because of what was done in that regard the plans have been entirely changed, because it must be remembered that this is a redistribution not of seats but rather of population. That is the difficulty in Saskatchewan. There is no change in the number of seats but there is a change with regard to population. The whole difficulty arises because of the need to equalize as nearly as possible the population in the various ridings. With regard to Melville we have yielded to popular clamour; hon. members from Saskatchewan have been most insistent that Melville should remain unchanged. They have importuned members of the government; they have told us that if this were done all would be well. Man after man spoke to me and asked me if I did not think this should be done. I foresaw what would happen; the result has been exactly what I expected. Those who listened to the address delivered in this house the night before last by one who was thus accommodated will realize how sound was the view I took. I only mention this in passing, and I want to say that I have done the very best I could, conscientiously and carefully. I consulted my friends on the committee, not only the hon.

gentleman who sits to my right at the moment (Mr. Turnbull) but others as well, and so far as I can see the only way to meet the situation is by moving the line only half the twenty-four miles originally suggested. This will compensate for not bringing it the whole distance that the right hon. gentleman is suggesting. We are giving half the territory that lies to the south and east of the Duck Lake reserve and between there and the western boundary of Melfort and south of the river. As I say, I have done this after consultation with the members of the committee and with a most earnest desire to meet the wishes of the right hon. gentleman so far as I could having regard to the fact that the constituency of Rosthern had been built in. The last election returns indicate that this territory would be favourable to the opposition. As was originally intended, the town of Rosthern would be within this territory. I have done the best that could be done under the circumstances and have endeavoured to make an equitable disposition by making certain changes in the original electoral map.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, for the time and trouble which the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) and those associated with him have given to the matter of the readjustment of the boundaries of Prince Albert constituency, I should like to thank them. I appreciate what has been done, although it is far from meeting the views which I expressed as to what I thought would be fair and just. Nevertheless, it is a change for the better as compared with the boundaries of the constituency as contained in the original report of the special committee to this house, and which the Prime Minister himself quite frankly stated were recognized as not satisfactory boundaries even from the point of view of the government. They were not boundaries that were intended to be retained, and they were evidently put there at the beginning for the purpose of negotiation and were kept there when in some particulars the negotiations broke down. May I say to the Prime Minister that while he says that he has met me half way, as far as half of the southern portion of the constituency is concerned, he may have met me in part half way geographically, but he has been very far from meeting me half way politically. After all, the political is the important consideration in studying the effects of any redistribution.

It will I think be recalled that my suggestion was that first of all there should be no additional territory added to the constituency of Prince Albert. The other point which I pressed most strongly was that the southern boundary of Prince Albert constituency as it is at present should be retained. The part lying immediately to the north of the southern boundary of the present constituency has been taken away in part for twelve miles to the north, in part for more than double that distance. This is the strong Liberal portion of the constituency, and it will affect the Liberal candidate, whoever he may be, most seriously. The government is adding to the eastern side of the constituency of Prince Albert certain territory from Melfort. It is true that under the revision the extent of this added territory will not be as large as was previously intended. It is also true that what is now being added will add a small Liberal majority. Based on the figures of 1930, it would be something like 50. This is being done instead of adding a Conservative majority of twice or three times as much as would have been the case under the bill as introduced. A portion of the additional territory which it was proposed to add and which gave a Conservative majority remains under the revise in the constituency of Melfort. As I have said, a portion giving a Liberal majority of 50 comes into Prince Albert. The effect with respect to what is being done in the southern portion of the constituency is however quite serious, in what it wipes out of the Liberal majority in the constituency itself. The figures for the 1930 election will bear me out. The Liberal majority in Prince Albert in the 1930 election was 1,192 whereas the redistribution as it is now made would give with the added 50 Liberal majority in what is being added from Melfort a Conservative majority of 136.

Mr. TURNBULL: I suggest that if my right hon. friend would check those figures again he will find that they are not exactly correct. According to the figures I have, it is the other way around.

Mr. BENNETT: It gives a Liberal majority.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am giving the figures as I have them. I have gone over them very carefully and checked them back and forth but I speak subject to correction if other figures can be shown. It may be that my hon. friend has other statistics but that is not as I figure it from the official records. I shall state the basis of my calculation. In 1930 the constituency of Prince Albert gave a Liberal majority of 1,192.

Mr. BENNETT: That is in the twenty-four mile territory?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking of Prince Albert constituency as a whole, as it was in 1930 and is at present. Taking the

1930 vote as a basis, the constituency as it will be after the boundaries now suggested supersede those of to-day, instead of giving a Liberal majority of 1,192, according to my figures will give a Conservative majority of 136.

Mr. BENNETT: We make it a Liberal majority of 60 in any event.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have not so figured it out. As I say, I figure it would give a Conservative majority of 136. That is one feature.

The other feature will be recognized as being even more important. The constituency of Prince Albert as it is at the present time is out of a total of 21 constituencies the third largest rural or rural-urban constituency in Saskatchewan. It now becomes the second smallest constituency in the province. If one includes the city constituencies, Prince Albert as it now stands is in fact the fifth largest constituency in the province of Saskatchewan. The populations of the constituencies are as follows:

Melfort	52,668
North Battleford	53,708
Regina	60,858
Saskatoon	60,638
Prince Albert	50,896

The population of Prince Albert constituency under this new redistribution will be only 39,874 which, as I say, brings it down to being the second smallest rural constituency in the province. May I say that this is so notwithstanding the fact that the city of **Prince Albert, a rapidly growing city, is** situated in the constituency. All along we have been arguing that where city constituencies are concerned the unit should be somewhat larger than the average. The population of the city of Prince Albert is in size over one-quarter of the population of the new Prince Albert constituency.

I shall now give figures to show how the proposed redistribution affects the population, and if Hansard will print them in tabulated form the result will be much clearer:

Prince Albert Constituency
Change by Redistribution as it Affects Population

Population of constituency	50,896
Taken away from Prince Albert by schedule as revised	12,594
	38,302
Added from Melfort	1,572
Population in constituency as redistributed	39,874

Average unit of constituency—44,186.
Present constituency—4,312 below unit.
Fair unit for Prince Albert—46,000 or 47,000.
Present constituency—6,000 or 7,000 below what unit should be.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

The population of the constituency as it stands now is 50,896. There is to be taken away by the present schedule a population of 12,594. That leaves the population of the part of the new constituency which is made up from what is taken from the old constituency as 38,302. But there has been added from Melfort to what remains of the old constituency of Prince Albert a population of 1,572, so that the population of the constituency as redistributed is 39,874. The average unit as we have been discussing it all along is 44,186 so that the new constituency of Prince Albert will be 4,312 below that unit. As I have pointed out, however, wherever a city is concerned the unit has been taken to be somewhat larger than the average. I would say that, having regard to the size of the city, a fair population for the new constituency of Prince Albert would be between 46,000 and 47,000. If that be correct, the present constituency will be between 6,000 and 7,000 below what its unit ought to be under what may well be regarded as a fair redistribution.

The Prime Minister has spoken about the line that is to form the southern boundary of the new constituency as it has been drafted. I believe there was some difference between the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) as to just what proposal was made during the course of negotiations with respect to the southern boundary, provided that other matters could be satisfactorily arranged. I gather that what the hon. member for Humboldt said was that the southern line as he had it in mind would have continued right across from the western boundary to the eastern boundary of Prince Albert; it would not, on being drawn from the western boundary, upon reaching the South Saskatchewan river, have run up north following the course of the South Saskatchewan river. It is true that a portion of Melfort that was on the map as brought in from the committee, and which would have given a Conservative majority has now been eliminated, but there has also been eliminated part east of the South Saskatchewan river, from the southern boundary to the river, a part of the old Prince Albert constituency which gave a very considerable Liberal majority. All that section that lies to the east of the South Saskatchewan river that remains in Prince Albert constituency as it now is, gave a pretty good Liberal majority and that is being taken out and put into one of the other constituencies.

Mr. BENNETT: Largely into Rosthern, is it not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is quite right; it is going into the new constituency of Rosthern. Let me say that if the unit that I had thought of as a fair one in Prince Albert, that is to say 46,000 or 47,000, had been the one considered; if the section that lies east of the western boundary of Prince Albert constituency on the south to the South Saskatchewan river had been left just as it is over to the South Saskatchewan river, I think, with the other changes made, the constituency might be regarded as having been fairly redistributed. But all that part has also been taken out of Prince Albert constituency and it is, so far as the fortunes of any Liberal candidate is concerned, the really important part of the constituency. The Prime Minister, in referring to this part, said that this part contains the town of Rosthern; that the new constituency is named Rosthern and therefore that Rosthern town and the country round about should be in the new constituency of Rosthern. But when the committee were negotiating in regard to the matter, the new constituency was not referred to as Rosthern, it appeared under the name of Hague. That was the name given to it and the one which appears in the schedules as reported. But now the new constituency is to be called Rosthern. I do not object to that name being given to any constituency; it is a fine name, but I certainly object, and object very strongly, to losing from Prince Albert the good people of Rosthern because I know of no finer lot of citizens or electors anywhere than one finds in that particular community and that part of the province.

Let me say just a word as to the effect of the redistribution on the political complexion of the riding. This will show more clearly than anything else what the effect of the changes are. Here again they will be most apparent in tabular form:

Prince Albert Constituency As Redistributed
Effect on Political Complexion of Riding
Added from Melfort, a Population of
1,572 Persons

Of that number in the election of 1930—	474 votes were cast	
Of which Conservative	199	
Of which Liberal	262	
Of which Farmer	13	
Majority of Liberal	63	over Conservative
	or 50	over both combined

There is added from Melfort a population of 1,572 persons. From that number in the election of 1930, 474 votes were cast and of them 199 were cast for the Conservative, 262 for the Liberal and 13 for a Farmer candidate. In other words, that portion which is being added from Melfort to Prince Albert gave a Liberal majority of 63 over the Conservative candidate or a Liberal majority of 50 over both candidates combined who were running in Melfort at that time. But let me now give the effect of the change as respects the old constituency of Prince Albert, that is the constituency as it is at present compared with what it will be when the redistribution goes into effect:

In Prince Albert	
Liberal	
1930 vote was	9,283
Conservative	
1930 vote was	8,091
Liberal majority, 1,192.	
What is left in of 1930 vote—	
Liberal	6,536
Conservative	6,735
Conservative majority, 199.	
What is taken away of 1930 vote—	
Liberal	2,747
Conservative	1,356
Or a Liberal majority of	1,391
is taken out of Prince Albert.	
Where total Liberal majority for Prince Albert constituency in 1930 was	1,192
Which becomes now Conservative	199
Subtracting Liberal majority from Melfort which is being added	63
Leaves Conservative majority	136

In 1930 the vote cast for the Liberal candidate totalled 9,283 and for the Conservative candidate 8,091, or in other words there was a Liberal majority of 1,192. If we take what is left of the old Prince Albert constituency, under the 1930 vote the figures would then be: Liberals, 6,536; Conservatives, 6,735, or a Conservative majority of 199. If from that Conservative majority of 199 we subtract the 63 which is the added Liberal majority from Melfort, this would give a Conservative majority of 136. In other words, the effect has been to change a Liberal majority of, as I have said, 1,192, into a Conservative majority of 136.

Mr. BENNETT: Has the right hon. gentleman counted the triangular piece I mentioned a few minutes ago that is now taken away from him?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thought I had—the piece in the southeast corner of Prince Albert constituency, yes, as I figure it. The other triangle does not enter into the picture.

There is now one remaining and all important point to which I wish to draw par-

ticular attention. Of the vote that is taken away from the constituency of Prince Albert to go into the new constituency of Rosthern, there will on the basis of the 1930 election be a total Liberal vote taken away of 2,747. The Conservative vote taken away that will be going into the new riding of Rosthern will be 1,356. In other words, a Liberal majority of 1,391 is taken out of Prince Albert in that part which is to go into the new constituency, whereas the total Liberal majority for the constituency of Prince Albert as a whole as given at the time of the last election was 1,192. It means this that, as matters now stand, on the basis of the 1930 election, a larger Liberal majority will go into the new constituency of Rosthern than that which represented my majority for the whole constituency of Prince Albert in 1930. Let me put it in this way: the total Liberal majority in 1930 was 1,192. The total Liberal majority that has gone into Rosthern and is taken away from Prince Albert amounts to 1,391. In other words on the vote of 1930 my majority would be found to-day in supporters who have been taken into the new constituency of Rosthern, rather than in those who remain in Prince Albert constituency as redistributed. I admit it is very difficult to work out these matters as both sides might wish to have them, and I accept the situation as it is. In pointing out, in the way in which I have, the position of Prince Albert, I am speaking as the representative of Prince Albert constituency in the interest of the electors. I hope I have been fair and impartial, and have spoken without feeling one way or the other. I repeat that I am obliged for the time and trouble that hon. members opposite have given in seeking to rearrange the constituency, and that in what I have said I have simply stated the position as it is.

May I conclude with just one word in reference to another constituency; it was the concluding word of what I said when we last discussed the constituencies of Saskatchewan. As a whole I did hope that the administration would see its way to keep the names of North Battleford and South Battleford as those of separate constituencies rather than change the name of North Battleford to Redberry. I notice to-day that among the amendments that were moved was one to change the name as it appears on the revised schedule to what it had been before, and that that amendment was accepted. I hope it will not be too late yet for the government to accept an amendment which would retain the old name of North Battleford instead of the name of Redberry which has not, as far as I see it, any real significance in relation to the history of Canada. Certainly I would hope that this might be adequately done by also bringing the town of North Battleford into the North Battleford constituency. It should be in the North Battleford constituency. But even if there is hesitation about that, what will be called the constituency of Redberry will nevertheless be a constituency that is allied so far as commercial, business and social interests are concerned, with North Battleford, not a constituency that will be particularly associated with Redberry, except that Redberry finds a place in it. I believe the changes I have proposed may be made merely by an adjustment as between the townships in North Battleford and South Battleford without affecting or altering in any way the boundaries of any other constituency. If the government would as a last act, one of grace, if you wish, make that change I feel that we would all go away with a pleasanter feeling.

Mr. GARDINER: I would like to follow up the remarks that have been made by the leader of the opposition in regard to the change being made in the constituency of Battleford, and I do so because I know that country well. I went into it in the year 1903, long before the railways were ever there and I traversed most of it. I was simply amazed when I found that the proposed redistribution map of Saskatchewan brought both Battlefords into one constituency.

Looking over the map of Saskatchewan one of the constituencies that struck me first as being rather peculiar was the Qu'Appelle constituency. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) has made the statement on more than one occasion that the reason for having a constituency of that shape was the natural boundary known as the Qu'Appelle valley. I know that part of the country well; I worked there as a hired man for some years before I went north, and I remember that you could cross the Qu'Appelle valley almost everywhere. The Qu'Appelle valley is no natural boundary in the way that the Saskatchewan river might be called such. I remember that in 1902 the town of Indian Head shipped more wheat than had been shipped from any other shipping point in the world. Where did it come from? The bulk of it came from north of the Qu'Appelle valley, and naturally because of the fact that you could cross the valley at almost any place you wished to cross it. Since then there has been a great deal of road construction,

and if my hon. friend from Regina wants any importance attached to his statement that Qu'Appelle constituency is shaped as it is because of the natural boundary of the Qu'Appelle valley, then I say that applying the same reasoning to the constituencies of North Battleford and South Battleford as they are at the present time, there is a greater reason why this map should be changed before this committee rises.

The other evening when the Prime Minister spoke he seemed to be disposed to make a change in the two Battleford constituencies. The present proposal is to have one constituency known as the Battlefords and another called Redberry. The Prime Minister said that there might be some difficulty in that it might be necessary to change the boundary between the Battlefords and the constituency of Kindersley. I think the Prime Minister has a map before him, and if he will look at it he will see that there is no need to change that line at all, that Kindersley can be left exactly as it is.

May I also call the attention of the committee to the fact that not only is the Saskatchewan river in so far as the two towns of Battleford are concerned a natural boundary, but if the Prime Minister will look at the south end of the Redberry constituency as now proposed, he will find that there is a piece of the Redberry constituency south of the North Saskatchewan river, and I am informed that in that piece of territory between the Rosetown constituency and the North Saskatchewan river there are some 4,000 people. There was only one crossing at that time so far as I know, and that is the bridge at the elbow. There may have been more put in within recent years, but the last time I was there, a few years ago, there was just one crossing. That forms the natural boundary between the south end of Redberry constituency and the north end. That part could very easily be put into the Battleford constituency because it is closer to South Battleford than to Redberry. The old Saskatoon-Battleford trail passed through that territory, and the people immediately south of the north Saskatchewan river are more interested in South Battleford than they are in Redberry. A change could very well be made there so as to restore the city of North Battleford to the old constituency of North Battleford.

There is another possibility. If the Prime Minister will look at the map before him he will see that he can take the townships in the range immediately north of North Battleford and going north for five or six townships make the change there very easily and substitute on the north side of the proposed Battlefords constituency a range of townships there which would probably equalize the population. I think that the people living in that area would appreciate that change very much. I do not speak of this matter with any heat or for any particular reason of my own, but merely because I happen to know that part of the country, and I think that as it stands at the present time the bill proposes a ridiculous situation which I am sure the government when it is acquainted with the facts will recognize.

Mr. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I spoke briefly once before on what is being foolishly done in connection with the redistribution of North Battleford and South Battleford, and perhaps I should say something this afternoon. The Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) stated to-day that man after man from Saskatchewan made the statement in the committee room when the general redistribution committee met that if the constituency of Melville were fixed up everything would be satisfactory.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say in the committee room. I said they had urged upon the government.

Mr. McINTOSH: I beg pardon, that they had urged that upon the government. All I know, and I want to be as fair as possible as I know the Prime Minister himself wants to be fair, is that two members from Saskatchewan made that statement, and no other member from Saskatchewan, so far as I know, made it. So far as I am concerned I asked that something be done to rectify the situation in Melville, but I concluded what I had to say by drawing the attention of the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) to the absolutely ridiculous position of the Battlefords. I said there was a general feeling that something should be done to rectify the blunder committed in the Battleford seats.

This afternoon I am asking for a proper redistribution of these two seats. I am not necessarily making an appeal for myself; I am not thinking of doing that. Nor am I making an appeal for the Liberal party or any other party. I am trying to make as plain as possible that which in my view ought to be done to redistribute fairly the population north and south of the North Saskatchewan river which separates the two Battlefords. It is a question of recognizing that the boundary line in existence is a marked type of boundary. The gully formed by the

river and the river itself at the Battlefords is easily two miles wide. That natural boundary line is perhaps as clear cut as any in western Canada. As a result of this, north of the North Saskatchewan river, a great community has grown up in the last twenty-four or twenty-five years, a community stretching from the city of North Battleford and the North Saskatchewan river northward over one hundred and fifty miles, westward to the Alberta boundary, and eastward to the same river a short distance from Saskatoon. It is a great developing community. And it is equalled by another great community which has developed south of the Saskatchewan river, a community including the old town of Battleford, the towns of Wilkie, Unity and Lloydminster. In the present redistribution measure practically one-quarter of the old North Battleford riding has been taken and thrown in with three-quarters of the old South Battleford riding. Notwithstanding the fact that North Battleford is a city and Battleford is a town, only one-quarter of the area north of the river has been added to three-quarters of the territory south of the river to make the new constituency known as the Battlefords.

May I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that in the campaign of 1930, which was based on the redistribution of 1924, the North Battleford federal riding gave a Liberal majority of approximately 1,100. In balancing up the votes cast in the 1930 election I find that under the new riding drawn up by the hon. member for Regina, instead of giving a Liberal majority of 1,100 votes the majority will be turned around to practically the same number of votes in the other direction. In other words, on the 1930 election date, there would be a majority of about 900 against a Liberal candidate. That is the result of the redistribution that has taken place. I ask the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) and any other hon. member whether or not that is a fair distribution. Further than that, I do not believe any such change has taken place in the constituency the Prime Minister represents, namely that of West Calgary. I am quite satified there has been no such change in the constituency represented by the hon. member for Regina.

Mr. TURNBULL: My hon. friend's figures are very much exaggerated.

Mr. McINTOSH: Which figures?

Mr. TURNBULL: About the change in voting strength of the new constituency of Battlefords.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. McINTOSH: These are figures that I have worked out. What figures have you?

Mr. TURNBULL: My figures are very different from those.

Mr. McINTOSH: I prepared my figures correctly from the last records. If the hon. member has anything different I should like to have them, but I believe he will find I am substantially correct. They were taken from the poll records for 1930, and I do not think there has been any mistake in adding them. North of the North Saskatchewan river, that great natural boundary—

Mr. VALLANCE: I suggest that the hon. member for Regina is counting the three-cornered fight in South Battleford, and adding the farmers and Grits jointly as against the Conservative vote.

Mr. TURNBULL: No, I have taken the figures only for Liberals and Conservatives. I left the third party out of my calculations.

Mr. McINTOSH: I am satisfied if the hon. member for Regina has done that he will find that his figures, not mine, are out of range or wrong.

I have stated that north of the North Saskatchewan river in the last twenty-four or twenty-five years a great settlement has grown up. North Battleford, as a young and ambitious city, is intimately associated or connected with that settlement, that is with all that expanding northern country. In fact for over a quarter of a century it has taken a leading and magnanimous part in its attempt to build up facilities of one kind and another for the development of this fine fertile belt of territory. Its distinctly unselfish aim was always to give this district an impetus to help it in years to come. The work of railroading this north land in the last twenty-five years has been a prodigious job. North Battleford has taken a prominent part in trying to provide this vast territory with adequate railway facilities, and its task is not yet completed and will not be for years.

The argument may be urged, "Well, although you are changing the constituency electorally, you are not destroying its associations." I say you are doing just about as much as could be done to destroy those associations, putting in a wedge as it were between the city and "The North". In my view there is no reason for taking North Battleford away from its surrounding territory and putting it into a new territory only part of which can be said to be connected with it. The building of highways alone has been another important matter that has had to be directed

and supported north of the North Saskatchewan river. A great work has been done in that connection. North Battleford has played an important part in the development of highways in every direction throughout that area. Then telephone, telegraph, postal and air services have had to be carefully considered. Throughout the years all these services have grown and grown into greater importance. I believe practically every elector in that part of the country will say that the leading part taken by the citizens of North Battleford in providing all these services has been most helpful, and without such help very much of this essential pioneering work might not have been done.

In addition to all these accomplishments North Battleford has been one of the pioneer centres in western Canada in the building up of a live stock organization. Years ago when wheat growing was claiming the attention of other awakening parts of western Canada the citizens of North Battleford took an active part in initiating a movement of placing live stock on the land, hither and thither throughout the country, with the result that to-day the effects of that movement can be seen in more ways than one. Facilities of one kind and another and municipalities have grown up, towns and villages have developed, rural districts have come into being. Further, all these districts, centres, municipalities and services are linked one way or another with the population of North Battleford.

To take North Battleford out of that area, out of these surroundings, out of its environment, and place it in a district by no means as closely connected or associated with it, is I think very unwise. If the government or the Prime Minister could do anything in the way of preventing a mistake of that kind, I feel satisfied the people of North Battleford and the surrounding country would respond to such an act of generosity which under the circumstances is nothing more than justice. I am not speaking politically at all; I am speaking for the city of North Battleford and the miles and miles of country beyond it. I realize I am on fundamental ground in saying that what is being done in this bill is not fair, and the sooner it is corrected the better.

Now I might go south of the river and show that around the towns of Battleford, Wilkie, Unity, and Lloydminster and other centres in that great south country similar developments have taken place. But these developments are south of the North Saskatchewan river, and they have been largely tributary to the towns I have mentioned. Much of the lower part of this territory is much more tributary to Saskatoon than to North Battleford. Into that southern area, some parts of which will be one hundred miles from the city of North Battleford, you are throwing North Battleford, and taking it out of its natural setting. This I am sure is a vital mistake. It can however be readily corrected without interfering politically with the map which my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Turnbull) has made. I would say that anything the government can do ought to be done and done at once. I realize that the government is in power. I realize that my own party is out of power. I am not complaining about that. What I am asking for is fair play for the city of North Battleford, the people back of it, in a word justice to all concerned. I am satisfied that if the government would give a little thought to the problem the adjustments desired are very easy to make, if there is a disposition to make them.

The electoral history of Saskatchewan, especially northwestern Saskatchewan, is to a large extent linked up with the Battlefords. That is one reason why I do not like to see the names North Battleford and South Battleford disappear from the electoral map of Canada. I think this would be a blunder. In 1887 the northwest territories were given four seats; the two Assiniboias, Alberta and Saskatchewan. In 1902 the representation was increased to six; Assiniboia East, Assiniboia West, Mackenzie, Humboldt, Qu'Appelle, and Saskatchewan. In 1907 we had ten constituencies; Assiniboia, Battleford, Mackenzie, Humboldt, Prince Albert, Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw, Qu'Appelle and Saltcoats. In 1914, following the census of 1911, when the hon. Prime Minister was a member of the redistribution committee in the government of Sir Robert Borden, the present Prime Minister himself established these two outstanding names. It was decided in 1914 there should be a South Battleford and a North Battleford. Ever since 1914 these names have been on the electoral map of Canada. In 1924 under Liberal rule there was a redistribution and these two names remained unaltered.

I have a map here showing the outline of the constituency of North Battleford as it was in 1914. To the north it is bounded by the Northwest Territories, to the west by the Alberta boundary, to the south by the North Saskatchewan river, and from a southerly point easterly by the adjoining constituency of Prince Albert. In 1924 when the redistribution took place under the Liberal government

the constituency was left practically intact, only the eastern boundary being moved westward a certain distance from its Prince Albert boundary. For instance Shellbrook was formerly in North Battleford, now it is in Prince Albert. And until this bill was put before the house the boundary line was practically the same as in 1914, 1917 and 1924. By this bill the riding of North Battleford is demolished to a certain extent, about one quarter, as I have said being taken out of it and thrown in with three quarters of South Battleford. In addition the names North Battleford and South Battleford disappear. The great area surrounding North Battleford is given the new name Redberry. I leave it to other hon. members speaking for Saskatchewan to say what more suggestive name if any ought to be adopted. Surely the government can take a matter of that kind into consideration and take some action.

In concluding may I say I am pleased to have had another opportunity of presenting this very controversial question to the committee. I do not want to be acrimonious, do not want to show any feeling in the matter, but I desire to say that what is being done in view of the history of these topographically interesting constituencies is astounding—amazing.

Finally I wish to move two amendments, which will bring the matter definitely before the committee. I would say that if the amendments are not satisfactory to the government we would accept any reasonable suggestion to rectify the matters to which I have drawn attention. The first amendment is, moved by myself and seconded by the hon. member for South Battleford (Mr. Vallance):

That townships 43-48 inclusive, north of the North Saskatchewan river, range 16 west of the 3rd meridian be taken from "The Battlefords" as at present constituted and transferred to Redberry as at present constituted.

The second amendment is:

That townships 39-41 inclusive, straight north to the North Saskatchewan river following in a southeasterly direction to township 39, ranges 11-15 inclusive west of the 3rd meridian be transferred from Redberry as at present constituted to "The Battlefords" as at present constituted.

These two suggestions were brought to the attention of the house by the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner). The amendment for the change in names if necessary can come later.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot move two amendments at the same time.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. McINTOSH: Well, I will move the first and the hon. member for South Battleford will move the second.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The two were mentioned together to show the relationship.

Mr. VALLANCE: Mr. Chairman, would you mind telling us what is the amendment now before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Regina has moved that the schedule with respect to the province of Saskatchewan be struck out and that the reprinted schedule be substituted therefor.

Mr. BENNETT: That should pass on division first.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The amendment of the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) will have to be a sub-amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: If the amendment of the hon. member for Regina is adopted the reprinted schedule will be carried, and then the amendment of the hon. member for North Battleford will be in order. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the amendment of the hon. member for Regina shall be adopted?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. VALLANCE: You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that these two amendments submitted by the hon. member for North Battleford are complementary; that is, if you take townships 44 to 48 inclusive out of the Battlefords as at present constituted, you must substitute something in lieu thereof. For the information of those who are not as familiar with the geography of that portion of Saskatchewan as those who represent it, I may say that there are two Battlefords. There is the old town of Battleford which, as the Prime Minister said on a previous occasion, once was the capital of the Northwest Territories; I think it is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, settlement in what is now known as the province of Saskatchewan.

The amendment now before the committee is not what I would have desired, but it is better than the suggestion contained in the present bill. I have always argued that the northwestern part of the province of Saskatchewan, north of the Saskatchewan river should be one constituency, and I think that is pretty well agreed upon by those who have given the matter any consideration. If you go back to the redistribution of 1924 you will notice that this principle was definitely

adhered to. In my opinion it is a great mistake to put the two Battlefords together; there is no community of interest. The city of Battleford is the distributing centre of all the country north of the river, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh). If you look at these two communities you will find that South Battleford contains four railway centres. There is the town of Wilkie on the Canadian Pacific main line between Saskatoon and Edmonton. If you go to the southern end of the constituency there is my home town of Kerrobert, which is another divisional point on the Canadian Pacific line between Moose Jaw and Lacombe. If you go to the northwestern corner of the constituency you find the town of Lloydminster, also a divisional point, and when you get down to the southwestern portion you find the town of Macklin, which is also on the Edmonton-Saskatoon line of the Canadian Pacific.

One only has to look at the various institutions in the two communities to see that there is no community of interest. In the old town of Battleford we have a collegiate and other institutions which are duplicated across the river, proving conclusively that there is no community of interest in those two municipalities. Even the provincial government realizes that fact; a land office has been established in each town so that those residing on the southern side of the Saskatchewan river need not cross that stream in order to file on their homesteads. They have even established a liquor store in each town, and I think these facts prove conclusively that there is practically no community of interest there. The old town of Battleford has been in existence for well over fifty years; people are living there who left Ontario more than fifty years ago. I well remember that in 1906, when I settled in that district, the settlement north of the river was very sparse indeed, and the only communication was by means of a ferry. So it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is a very sad day for the Battlefords when they are placed in the same federal riding.

The hon. member for North Battleford gave some statistics with regard to the vote in the last election. If you take that portion of the constituency of South Battleford which, under this bill, is placed in the constituency of Kindersley you will find, on the basis of the 1930 election, that whoever receives the nomination there will have a majority over both the Conservative and Farmer candidates, if there is a three cornered fight as there was in 1930, of 547. According to the figures as I have worked them out, in the last election the Conservative candidate received 1,689 votes; the Liberal candidate, who was myself, received 3,090 votes, while the Farmer candidate received 864 votes. The Farmer and Conservative candidates together received 2,553 votes, so the majority for the Liberal candidate was 547. But when you take that portion of the Kindersley constituency which, under this legislation, is placed in the new riding, you get a different picture. In the last election there was a straight fight in Kindersley between the Liberal and Progressive candidates. The Progressive candidate was the present hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael); he polled 4,648 votes while the Liberal candidate polled 3,502 votes, showing an adverse vote so far as the Liberal candidate was concerned of 1,146. If you carry the Liberal majority of 547 in that part of South Battleford into the constituency of Kindersley, you will see that the result will be an adverse vote of approximately 600 I do not want to say that the alterations as proposed in the bill have been made for political purposes. If the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull) proposes to reply, I should like him to answer a question which I asked the last time I spoke on this matter. South Battleford as at present constituted is the sixth largest constituency as far as population is concerned in the province of Saskatchewan. In 1921 the population was 35,070 and it has increased at the rate of one thousand per year, until we now have a population of 45,199. I should like to ask the hon. member for Regina and those who were responsible for drafting the new map why it was thought necessary to eliminate a constituency which had 45,199 population, the sixth largest population in the twenty-one seats in Saskatchewan. These are the questions that are being asked me. I am receiving daily communications from South Battleford although I will admit to the hon. member for Regina that those who are writing me are undoubtedly those who supported me in the last election. They feel very much annoyed at South Battleford being disrupted in this matter. As was pointed out by the hon. member for North Battleford, the Battlefords and perhaps Kindersley will not offer a good fighting ground for the government. I say quite frankly to the government that this proposed set up will jeopardize any chances they might have had of winning those two constituencies. We have twenty-one members now in this house. I have argued from the beginning, and submitted a map in support of my argument, that it would be quite simple to redistribute the

excess population to be found in the north among the three northern constituencies. It must be remembered that the number of members from Saskatchewan is not being changed. This would have avoided the disruption which has taken place and the, shall I say, acrimonious fight which has been going on during the time we have been attempting to put this through. I still feel that before forcing this bill through it would be possible for the government to keep the two Battlefords separate and not put them into one constituency. The Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) has stated that that would disrupt the present boundaries of Kindersley, but the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner) has pointed out two or three ways in which this could be done. There is also the amendment now before the chair. The government could take territory out of the Battlefords and place it in Redberry and take territory out of Redberry and put it into the Battlefords. That would be a very simple matter in my opinion and I appeal to the Prime Minister and to the hon. member from Regina to give this their serious consideration.

Mr. TOTZKE: Mr. Chairman, before the schedule for Saskatchewan is disposed of there are a few remarks I should like to make with regard to a number of constituencies in that schedule. I do not intend to argue the matter of the alteration of boundaries because I was assured pretty definitely the other day by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Bennett) that no alterations would be made. But there are some questions I should like to ask and some information I would like to obtain from the government before this schedule is passed.

I should like the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Turnbull), who was on the subcommittee for Regina, or someone on the other side of the house to explain to this committee why it was found necessary to alter the southern boundary of the constituency of Qu'Appelle in the manner in which it has been altered and why it was considered necessary to select six sections in the constituency of Qu'Appelle along the Qu'Appelle river and put them in the constituency of Melville. I should like to know why it was considered necessary to take the suburbs of the city of Regina consisting of North Regina and the northern annex and put them into the rural constituency now known as Lake Centre. I should like to know also why it was considered necessary to take off the western row of townships in the constituency of Moose Jaw as it now exists and put them in the constituency of Swift Current. In spite of the additions which have been made to the constituency of Moose Jaw its population is still below the unit while the population of Swift Current is above the unit. I should like to know why more of the rural portions around the city of Saskatoon have not been included in the constituency of Saskatoon City. Could the hon. member for Regina give me the population of the proposed new constituency of Rosthern?

Mr. TURNBULL: I can figure it out but it will be smaller than it should be because of the population taken away from it and put into Prince Albert. I have attempted to compensate for that to some extent by taking certain townships which were formerly in Humboldt and transferring them to Rosthern. We have endeavoured to make up the deficiency which was created at the last moment.

Mr. TOTZKE: I do not wish to make any particular objection to the constituency of Rosthern as it now stands. I think I have demonstrated pretty clearly throughout the course of this debate that I consider there was no necessity for making the alterations in constituencies which have been made. I do not propose to go over the whole ground again, but I do want to say a word about the northern constituencies and especially about the alterations which have been made in Prince Albert. I concur in what my leader has said, that the alterations have not been made in a fair way. As that constituency is now constituted it does not give a fair chance to my chief.

In connection with the Battlefords and Redberry, I think I made it clear the other day that there would be no difficulty in readjusting the populations in these two constituencies. They are side by side and it would simply be a matter of taking population from one constituency, adding it to the other and then taking from the other and adding it to the first. The situation has been explained very well indeed by the hon. members for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh), South Battleford (Mr. Vallance) and Acadia (Mr. Gardiner). The hon. member for Acadia lived a good many years in that particular section of the province; he knows the constituencies and the interests of the people living in that district. The Prime Minister intimated the other day that if it was at all possible he was ready to make the desired change and put North Battleford back into Redberry and call the constituency North Battleford. As has been explained, there is a certain area lying south of the North Saskatchewan river which was formerly in the district of Rosetown and which has been added to the district of Redberry. This could

very well be put into the constituency of the Battlefords. It lies south of the North Saskatchewan river and the area is contiguous to the old town of Battleford. The people in that area did their business there; their centre was the old town of Battleford. They very seldom got into North Battleford and as a matter of fact it would be more agreeable to the people living in that area to be in the Battlefords than in the Redberry district, the great portion of which lies north of the north branch of the Saskatchewan river. If the government did not think that were advisable, they could take a small portion of the range of the townships in which North Battleford is situated and add it to Redberry, and then get sufficient population in the next two ranges lying north of the proposed line of the Battlefords to make up the required number

I do not know that it is of any particular value to say anything more in connection with the schedule as proposed. As I said at the outset I was definitely told that no matter whether I stayed here two weeks or two months, there would be no alterations. I can see no benefit in continuing the fight after a threat of that kind. If I thought there were a chance of getting alterations of any kind, I would gladly stay here for two months and continue the fight. But I appeal to hon. members opposite, to the government, that in this particular instance of the Battlefords there is justification for a change and I think further consideration should be given in that regard.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Notwithstanding the somewhat pessimistic remarks of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) with regard to the possible result of our intercessions, I would like to point out to the Prime Minister and to the government that like the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Gardiner), I have some personal knowledge, although not of the same homesteading kind, of North Battleford and the surrounding country since 1905. It was then that the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were established. Following that for a number of years there were very good crops, but in 1907, 1908 and again in 1911 we had a terrific frost that put a crimp in practically all the crops of the old and southern areas of Saskatchewan. That was in the days of Red Fife; they had none of the early wheats established at that time, with the result that Red Fife seemed to be altogether too late and there grew up a strong desire and demand for more live stock. The Saskatchewan government responded to that demand in 1908 by passing a Live Stock Distributing Act and putting a considerable amount of money into the distribution of live stock. The good people of North Battleford, however, did not think we were engaging in that work sufficiently rapidly and generously to meet their requirements. There is a vast hinterland north of that country, without, at that time, any railroad extending up to Jackfish or Meadow Lake and they were crying out for more live stock as it was a great grass country. In order to meet the situation and to supplement the activities of the government of that day at Regina, the business men of North Battleford —and I would like the house to mark this because I have never before heard of a case like this anywhere in Canada, especially on the part of a small struggling town as it was at that time—initiated the idea of establishing a live stock distributing association—I think that was the official name—working in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture at Regina, the latter body doing most of the buying, while the business men of North Battleford supplied the money and did the distributing of live stock and collecting for themselves. A very considerable amount of live stock was distributed in that way by the business men, and, as I said before, I do not know of a city of that size in any other part of Canada or, indeed, on this continent which has taken such an active personal interest in the surrounding country from which it drew and upon which it depended for its business. It was, I think, an imperative and enterprising thing for them to do; it was pressed upon them by reason of the exigencies of the situation due to the early frosts and low wheat prices in those early years. The only similar organization I know of on a large scale in Canada is that recently initiated and organized by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Beatty; that was three years ago. The house will remember, when the recent bad crops first struck the southwestern part of Saskatchewan and other places, a number of business men headed by Mr. Beatty and others conceived the idea of doing in a large way exactly what North Battleford did away back in 1911, more than twenty years ago. The Canadian Pacific initiated this enterprise in a large way and it is now a going concern, not expanding very rapidly, because conditions, on account of lack of money, do not warrant it. But I want to point out that before the Canadian Pacific or any other of these big business concerns ever dreamed of such a proposition, North Battleford was on the map with its businessmen with their hands in their pockets supplementing the effort of the Saskatchewan government to do the same thing for that constituency running

away north, one that has since developed so remarkably. I have much pleasure in bearing testimony to that because it is an outstanding fact, one that is not generally known. Many of the early settlers have passed away and it is only those who were then engaged and are still so engaged in the Department of Agriculture and know something of the early settlement of North Battleford who are familiar with that great movement.

I understand from the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) that he himself put some money into that enterprise. I am not going to ask him how much he got out of it, for I know, as a rule, those who promote those progressive enterprises very frequently lose money because some bad debts are always incurred in distributing live stock to new settlers in a frontier district. I remember, when we started similar work in the Department of Agriculture in 1908, the government figured out how much the loss would be and I remember it was estimated it would be at least 10 per cent. The then premier, the Hon. Walter Scott, took the ground that it would be good work and a good investment even though the loss proved to be twice that amount because the people had to be given some good foundation stock with which to build up a safe diversified agriculture. The loss was nothing like 20 per cent; if my recollection is correct, it was slightly over 14 per cent, so I anticipate that the business men of North Battleford would probably lose about the same amount on their investment.

Shortly after that a cooperative creamery was established in North Battleford, its activities radiating away to the north and to the west. At that time it was one of the largest of those frontier creameries, although later it was exceeded by Lloydminster. That proved a veritable godsend to thousands of farmers in that vast country, not only because they were able, out of the cream cheques they got, to pay for the live stock, but because of the way in which it helped to sustain them in their daily groceries and other supply requirements on the farm.

I cannot implement that with anything further except to point out that this was an unusual undertaking. Now that they have assisted in building up as described, that hinterland with their own money, to debase and disappoint that thriving young city by changing the name of the constituency from its present historic name—"North Battleford" and "Old Battleford" are names which have endeared themselves to the people there—changing it to the relatively unknown name of Redberry, is surely almost adding insult to injury. I am not familiar with the story of the name of Redberry. I think it is associated in some way with the Hon. George Langley. That was the name of his provincial constituency. I believe there was some noted gentleman in England, Lord Redberry or some other prominent gentleman who bore that name and after whom the provincial riding was called. I thought there was a village of Redberry in Saskatchewan but I am informed that there is not. But there was a constituency of Redberry up until a year ago, but in these redistribution days constituencies sometimes disappear, and Redberry was one of the ones that disappeared just a year ago. Up to that time from away back in the early days of settlement there was a provincial constituency of Redberry which the Hon. George Langley represented for many years. He was followed by Mr. Cockburn, member of the legislative assembly, who now represents that old riding. Anyhow, it does seem a terrible thing to deprive a young and thriving and justly proud city like North Battleford of the name of that great area which it helped so much to develop in the way I have described and to call the constituency by the comparatively unknown name of Redberry. I am sure that the Prime Minister, who is a gentleman of parts and has travelled much, knows the instincts of the human breast towards old institutions and old names like the Battlefords, where the old town was the seat of the territorial government prior to 1883. Battleford was the seat of the northwest territorial government for several years before the government was moved to Regina. Besides being the seat of government during those early years and also the seat of operation during the rebellion of 1885, Battleford is one of the beauty spots of the Canadian west. I have no figures to show how they voted in connection with this election or that election. I know that we have two gentlemen here from the Battlefords as a result of the election of 1930, but that is not the point I am driving at. It is the debasement, the disappointment of a worthy city that I am thinking of, a city that has not deserved this kind of treatment. While as I say I have not dealt with figures or shown how the townships go, whether this way or that, I do not think that enters into it at all because the alternative dividing lines are only six miles apart. But that is not the question at all. The question is whether the city of North Battleford with nearly 6,000 people will be in the riding formerly called by the name of North Battleford, or will it be taken out of that constituency and put into a new seat thus losing both name and constituency.

I would draw the attention of the government to another thing, which perhaps may not seem to have very much to do with this question, but out in Saskatchewan now there are three provincial vacancies, one in Estevan, one in Happyland and one in the Battlefords. Only less than a week ago the provincial member for the Battlefords, Mr. S. W. Huston, died. Now if the city of North Battleford feels, as I am sure the people there will feel, that they are not being properly treated in this redistribution bill, I would ask what effect is that going to have on the provincial by-election? So far as I can see, unintentionally no doubt on the part of this government, they are going to make the third vacancy in Saskatchewan go against the Anderson government. That is what the result is likely to be.

Mr. TURNBULL: Why are you worrying?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am not worrying. I would rather see the cause of complaint removed on the part of North Battleford than see the Anderson government further embarrassed by leaving this redistribution map as it is. Governments come and governments go, as they always have and will, but for North Battleford to be deprived even in name of her hinterland with which she is naturally associated will be something she will feel for many and many a day. I leave it with the government. I have endeavoured to put the case plainly and earnestly, and I do feel very earnestly about it because it does seem to me to be a wrong that should be righted. Like my leader I leave it now entirely with the government to come to a conclusion based upon a sound and well-reasoned judgment in the matter.

Mr. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, as towns grow, the area of their influence grows, but their political size must decrease as the population grows. The area of North Battleford's commercial influence has grown large and the population has grown large at the same time, but to place North Battleford on one side or the other does not affect its commercial influence or the hinterland around it at all.

There are a great many things to be considered in a redistribution, and when you apply one of the yardsticks only you can get all sorts of incongruities. I defy my hon. friends to draw any map of Saskatchewan that I could not, by applying one yardstick at a time, criticize a great deal more effectively than they have criticized this particular map, There are present trends of population to be considered, and future trends, natural boundaries, accessibility, community of interest and probably many other matters which affect the situation. Undoubtedly the boundaries of North Battleford could have been drawn in different places by any person, and undoubtedly they could have been attacked wherever they had been drawn, but as they are drawn now you have a small, compact territory. If my hon. friend from Battleford complains that he is now in a Conservative constituency—I do not know whether he is or not—he is in very good company for a short time anyway, and he should not complain about that.. With regard to the size of Battleford as at present constituted, there are eight constituencies larger than it is.

With regard to the queries of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) as to the south boundary of Qu'Appelle and as to Weyburn constituency, again I ask, why worry? The members themselves are perfectly satisfied, so why complain?

With regard to the six sections removed from Qu'Appelle and placed in Melville, the people in those six sections can vote with very much more convenience in Melville than in Qu'Appelle, and the people who were formerly in Qu'Appelle can vote more conveniently where they are now. That is why these changes were made, and it is a very good and sufficient reason.

With regard to the suburbs of Regina I should have been glad to retain the whole constituency of Regina as it stood. I have personal and political friends in the part removed. The suburbs that have been taken off gave me a majority of 250 at the last election, so it is no personal reason that requires that they should be removed from the city. They will now have two members to look after them because they will always be more or less connected with Regina, and the member for Qu'Appelle will also look after their interests.

With regard to the western boundary of Moose Jaw it is precisely the line on one of the maps presented by the hon. member for Humboldt. Why then does he complain?

With regard to Saskatoon there is truly a reduction in the amount of the rural area, but having regard to the population of Rosthern, and having regard to the fact that Saskatoon has grown approximately fifty per cent in the last ten years and is the centre of a very large area of future growth, it was considered that the rural area attached to it was sufficiently large to be satisfactory to the people. If every city in the country was given the territory surrounding it and attached to it by commercial interests, we would have a

very different map from what we have now. The whole city of Vancouver is by commercial interests attached to British Columbia. No one suggests boundary lines should not be drawn across that area. The whole population of Ontario is attached commercially to Toronto, but no one suggests that the area of Toronto should be so enlarged. It has never been considered that the drawing of political lines across a territory detaches it commercially from the cities at the centre of that area. Railways will run across it, roads will run through it, and a person never thinks of political lines when he goes to do business. I say again that any map which could be drawn of any province could be criticized, but when you apply all considerations to the present map of the province of Saskatchewan, including Battlefords and Prince Albert, you have about as fair a map as could be drawn of that province.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I wonder if I may ask the hon. member for Regina if he can see any objection to making the change.

Mr. TURNBULL: Which change?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have used all our ability to show the advantages of this change, and I believe the government representatives have not shown any disadvantage. True enough, the Prime Minister urged the advantages of provincial boundaries being followed, but I hasten to assure him—and I think he knows it—that out west we do not follow municipal or provincial lines. We never think of them at all. Federal boundaries are quite distinct. The federal boundaries of the two Battlefords have been entirely distinct. They have been distinct entities ever since they were established. They never were together federally. I know the story of them very well. It is true that at one time there was one Battleford, but as soon as there were two they were kept separate and distinct; they were not merged. Now, after many years, after this policy was established in 1914 by Sir Robert Borden's government, and later confirmed by a Liberal government in the Redistribution Act of 1924, this new merger is made. Both previous redistributions to which I have referred agreed on the southern boundary being the Saskatchewan river, and at this time we are asking only that the same principle be observed, and that the same southern boundary if possible be preserved. Sometimes boundaries have to be disturbed, but in the present instance the point is that for the want of moving the east boundary line a mere matter of six miles, the two Battlefords, both the town and the city, are being put into one constituency. By leaving North Battleford in the territory with which it has natural communications, its proper position will be preserved. I have not heard any argument to refute that statement.

Mr. BENNETT: The difficulty in this case is the difficulty which has arisen in all these cases. I have never envied the position of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Totzke) in the committee. Had he not insisted upon putting forward an entire plan of redistribution, and had he contented himself with dealing with the situation unit by unit I think we might have been able to arrive at some more—shall I say—mutually satisfactory arrangement. Conceding that an adjustment is necessary—and that is conceded by all—it involves a change of boundaries. The question as to how those boundaries can best be changed without doing violence to existing conditions to an extent which would be unfair has been the very earnest effort, at least, of hon. members of the committee, who represented the government. It is unfortunate, but by reason of one constituency being maintained without any changes in its boundaries, it has had its repercussions throughout the entire province. The creation of the new constituency at Rosthern, as I pointed out a few moments ago, necessitated changes being made in the boundaries not only of constituencies nearby but also in constituencies that were overpopulated in order that the unit of population might be fairly observed.

At this time in the afternoon I shall not trespass upon the time of the committee to do more than to say this, that it was apparent that changes had to be made in the boundaries of Prince Albert; it was apparent that changes had to be made in the boundaries of the Battlefords; it was apparent that changes had to be made in the boundaries of Melfort, and it was apparent, also, that a new constituency had to be built by reason of the circumstances to which I have alluded, namely, population conditions. A new constituency was built up, and I have endeavoured to explain to this committee as fairly as I could the real, earnest desire to meet the views of the right hon. leader of the opposition and I think—I may be wrong in this—that what he said a moment ago is true, namely, that in dealing with figures it is always difficult, when you have polls which are split by reason of three-cornered contests, to determine exactly what the vote has been. Where there are three candidates it is almost impossible.

A few moments ago I said to an hon. member of this house what I believe to be true of western Canada more than of any other part of the dominion, namely, that it is a country where you cannot predicate a vote in the future upon what has happened in the past. It is always in a state of flux. I know nothing which is static in connection with the attitude of electors of western Canada. Communities which at one time have expressed themselves very firmly as being in favour of one political party at the next election vote very strongly the opposite way. Sometimes they vote for a third party. That has happened on more than one occasion. Under those circumstances I trust the committee realizes that having given this matter all the consideration and attention which could be given, and having arrived at definite conclusions we do not touch one constituency alone, but affect the situation in regard to other constituencies. I agree that if you took one isolated instance you might be able with some degree of fairness to say that this does not represent a fair and equitable redistribution of population. But when you consider one constituency in its relation to the others in the province, I think you will have to agree that the proposals which have been submitted are not unfair. In connection with Prince Albert it was admitted by the hon. member for Humboldt that changes had to be made. Once you admit that changes have to be made it is a question of weak, human, fallible judgment as to how they can be made so as to cause the least inconvenience and be fair to the population affected. That, we believe, has been the governing motive in connection with these matters. More largely in the west than anywhere else population has been the factor. Straight lines can be drawn much more readily than they can in the old settled communities where areas of land determine where the boundaries which have been worked out in centuries shall be made. It is difficult to say, with any degree of success, that you shall have a straight line from a line which is not straight.

All I can say is that the government has considered as fairly as it could the representations made to it. With respect to the Battlefords I can say only this. I live in the province of Alberta, and I saw the difficulty which arose between Edmonton and South Edmonton. I saw the rivalries on the two banks of the river. I have seen the same thing in the Battlefords, and I believe it is in the national interest federally, as it was provincially, that they be united. In that instance we followed the example of the provincial administration, which was not a Conservative administration, of uniting these two constituencies into one.

It will not be politically sound, they have said; we will not gain anything from it. The ex-Minister of Agriculture says we will suffer from it. But we are not thinking of that in this matter; we believe it is in the national interest that this should be. The province believed it was, the province acted on that belief, and did not act on it lightly. The province realized the force of the arguments made here, they were made then; and the province united them because these continuous jealousies such as between South Edmonton and Edmonton, between North Battleford and South Battleford, make it impossible to develop the spirit that there should be. The province accepted that view and united these two constituencies, and we have done the same.

One point made this afternoon as to which the government will be glad indeed to act on any reasonable suggestion that may be made, is in connection with the matter of names. If it is thought that the names the Battlefords and Redberry should be exchanged for other names we shall be glad to have any reasonable suggestions from the committee, and suggestions from the communities affected will be given consideration most of all. We cannot immortalize hon. gentlemen opposite by giving their names to constituencies. The right hon. leader of the opposition at least cannot complain, because one of his names finds expression in a constituency; he is one of the few members of the house of whom that can be said. Of course one of the most distinguished of Scotch names is McIntosh, but I hardly think we can substitute that for the Battlefords. Any reasonable suggestion on the part of the committee would be quite acceptable to the government. I know something of the history of Battleford, though not of course in the same degree that the hon. gentlemen do. In the very early days, thirty odd years ago, when Battleford was then an old community, it was my privilege to know two of the distinguished early settlers, one who administered justice, making Battleford the centre long before the member for South Battleford came into this country, and the other, one of the bravest men, I once heard a judge say, that he had ever come across. He was taken prisoner and sentenced to death, and when they asked him to recant he said: "You may shoot me, but always remember that the majesty of the law of this country will ultimately assert itself." I refer to the late

Thomas Mackay. I was indebted to him for much of the information I had on the early settlement of that country, particularly with respect to the Battleford area.

Any suggestions in regard to these two constituencies we shall be glad indeed to view with favour. I regret that for the reasons I have given we cannot dislocate the plan of redistribution that has been prepared with such infinite pains. It was thrown entirely out of gear by allowing judgment to be influenced by appeals to sympathy and sentiment, and members on this side find themselves now in a position where they cannot yield to the views that have been expressed by the hon. gentlemen this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the suggestion of retaining the name North Battleford for the constituency, if the town of that name could have been included I would have welcomed that proposal very cordially. But it seems to me it would be something of an anomaly for the constituency itself to be called North Battleford, when the town of North Battleford is not in that constituency. Leaving the town from which it gets its name out of the constituency would be, I should say, offering the shadow but withdrawing the substance. I question whether it would help matters much. I have all along advocated very strongly keeping the name North Battleford for historic and other reasons—

Mr. BENNETT: Battleford is the historic name, not North Battleford.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, these names all mark stages in our historical development. I wish the Prime Minister could have seen his way to granting not only the name of the constituency but associating with it the town of North Battleford. If that cannot be done, unless the hon. member himself has some feeling on the matter my view is that to call the constituency North Battleford without the town of North Battleford being in it, perhaps would be regarded by many as anomalous.

Mr. TURNBULL: Seeing that North Battleford is not in the constituency will the hon. gentleman suggest a name that would be satisfactory for that northern constituency? I took Redberry as being the most satisfactory to everyone as I supposed. If any one can suggest anything more satisfactory I am not particular about a name.

Mr. McINTOSH: There is the town of Battleford and the young city of North Battleford, but all the country north and west of North Battleford is acceptably known as the North Battleford country. I think that the idea in the mind of the leader of the opposition is that if that great piece of territory now being called Redberry should be known as the North Battleford district, or territory, it might be better. I do not object to the name "Redberry." What I strenuously object to is doing away with the old name, North Battleford. Might I ask if the suggestion made by the right hon. the Prime Minister could be left until after eight o'clock?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, let us get through.

Mr. TURNBULL: Would my hon. friend suggest that the southern area be called "The Battlefords" and the other "North Battleford"?

Mr. McINTOSH: "The Battlefords" would be the area into which you put the two Battlefords?

Mr. TURNBULL: Yes.

Mr. McINTOSH: My point is that all the country north and west of the city of North Battleford is known as the North Battleford area. I think the Prime Minister's suggestion would be better than nothing.

Mr. TURNBULL: I have no objection to calling them "The Battlefords" and "North Battleford."

Mr. BENNETT: I think the hon. member for North Battleford (Mr. McIntosh) the other day suggested that we should use the name "The Battlefords" rather than just Battleford. That country, when I went west, was called the Battleford country as a broad general term, rather than the North Battleford country, and I suppose it is yet; similarly with the Prince Albert country, and so on.

Mr. McINTOSH: It would be then.

Mr. BENNETT: If it would better satisfy the members from that area we might call the seat North Battleford, even though as the right hon. gentleman has said the city of North Battleford is not in it. It would mean an entire change of population to the extent of 7,000 to change the boundaries, that is the real difficulty. Call the south seat just "Battleford," or "The Battlefords."

Mr. McINTOSH: "The Battlefords" would be better.

Mr. BENNETT: There is no reason why that should not be done. The difficulty is because of the location of the city out of it. I have been making an endeavour to get

away from the jealousy between rival communities, such as Edmonton and South Edmonton. I happened to be in the legislature at the time we changed the name South Edmonton to Strathcona. An amendment was moved in a spirit of frivolity that we should call it Macaulay because the member for that constituency was named Macaulay, and that motion was defeated by only one vote. I remember the enjoyment, more or less irresponsible, that a lot of members at that time got out of that situation. If it will please the members from the constituencies concerned I am content that the seat to the north be called "North Battleford," and that the seat to the south be called "The Battlefords." I shall be glad to move that, if it is thought desirable by those living in the locality.

Mr. McINTOSH: I think that would be satisfactory.

Mr. VALLANCE: Does it seem reasonable to call one "The Battlefords" and the other "North Battleford?" Why use the plural?

Mr. BENNETT: Well, that is what I asked.

Mr. VALLANCE: Of course I can see the trouble that may result if we maintain the name of North Battleford for the northern district. I do not see how you can call it North Battleford if you do not put the city in it, unless you name the one constituency Battleford and the other North Battleford.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): There is an amendment before the committee moved by the hon. member for North Battleford, that townships 44 to 48 inclusive, range 16, west of the third meridian, be taken from the Battlefords as at present constituted and transferred to Redberry as at present constituted.

Mr. TOTZKE: If you would allow me, Mr. Chairman, there should be included also that portion of township 43 lying north of the North Saskatchewan river.

Amendment lost on division.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gobeil): There is another amendment moved by the hon. member for North Battleford.

Amendment lost on division.

Mr. McINTOSH: I would suggest to the Prime Minister the name North Battleford for the northern constituency, and Battlefords —not Battleford—for the new constituency. It seems to be the feeling that these names would be better.

Mr. BENNETT: I would therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that on page 54, constituency No. 12, the word "Redberry" be stricken out and the words "North Battleford" substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT: Perhaps under the circumstances it will be preferable to have the word "Battlefords" remain, for the reason I have just given. There are two towns, North Battleford and Battleford, and it may be thought that we have named the constituency after the old town of Battleford, and that the newer town has not been considered. Perhaps if we adhere to the name of Battlefords it will serve the purpose better.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule agreed to on division, as amended.

Section 3 agreed to on division.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. BENNETT moved the third reading of the bill.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say only a word at this stage of the proceedings. Once more I want to register my protest against this measure which smashes old traditional county lines in the province of Quebec and violently destroys the federation of the province. I denounce this manipulation of the electoral map of the province of Quebec. That is all I wish to say to-day, but I shall carry this battle throughout the length and breadth of my province.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are at the end of the session, the end of the week and the end of the day. If any discussion were to take place now it is obvious that hon. members would have to remain here until next week. In the circumstances the government having said it intends by its majority to carry the bill as it is, being desirous of accommodating everyone in so far as we are able, we have decided not to discuss this bill further on the third reading, though in order to make our position clear, we wish to vote against the third reading. In doing so may I say that we are very, very strongly opposed to this redistribution bill.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. Bennett) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson (Toronto-High Park),
Belec,
Bennett,
Bourgeois,
Bowen,
Bury,
Chaplin,
Dupré,
Duranleau,
Esling,
Fortin,
Gagnon,
Ganong,
Gobeil,
Gordon,
Hay,
Kennedy (Winnipeg South Centre),
LaVergne,
Loucks,
Macdougall,
MacLaren,
MacNicol,
McGregor,
Manion,
Moore (Chateauguay-Huntingdon),
Murphy,
Myers,
Quinn,
Ryckman,
Sauvé,
Shaver,
Simpson (Simcoe North),
Simpson (Algoma West),
Spankie,
Stanley,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stewart (Lethbridge),
Stirling,
Swanston,
Tétreault,
Thompson (Lanark),
Weir (Melfort),
White (Mount Royal),
Wright.—45.

NAYS

Messrs:

Boulanger,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Deslauriers,
Fafard,
Ferland,
Fiset, Sir Eugène,
Gardiner,
King, Mackenzie,
McIntosh,
McKenzie (Assiniboia),
Malcolm,
Motherwell,
Séguin,
Stewart (Edmonton West).—15.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Messrs:

Anderson (Halton),
Arsenault,
Arthurs
Baker,
Baribeau,
Barber,
Barrette,
Beaubier,
Bell (Hamilton),
Bell (St. Antoine),
Bell (St. John-Albert),
Beynon,
Black (Halifax),
Bowman,
Boyes,
Burns,
Cahan,
Cantley,
Casselman,
Charters,
Cotnam,
Cowan (Port Arthur),
Cowan (Long Lake),
Davies,
Factor,
Fournier,
Mitchell,
Bertrand,
Beaubien,
Totzke,
Rhéaume,
Ahearn,
Mercier (St. Henri),
Raymond,
Dubois,
Euler,
Dubuc,
Hanson (Skeena),
Coote,
Butcher,
Rinfret,
Cardin,
Howard,
Blair,
Hurtubise,
Ilsley,
Irvine,
Lucas,
Dickie,
Dorion,
Duguay,
Edwards,
Embury,
Ernst,
Fraser (Cariboo),
Garland (Carleton),
Geary,
Gott,
Guthrie,
Hackett,
Hanson (York-Sunbury),
Harris,
Johnstone,
Jones,
Laflèche,
Larue,
Laurin,
Lawson,
Lennox,
MacDonald (Cape Breton South),
McMillan
McDade,
McGibbon,
McLure,
Maloney,
Matthews,
Morand,
Mullins
Nicholson,
Peck,
Perley (Qu'Appelle),
Perley, Sir George,
Pettit,
Plunkett,
Porteous,
Price,
Rhodes,
Robinson,
Rogers,
Ross,
Rowe,
Ryerson,
Senn,
Short,
Smith (Victoria-Carleton),
Smith (Cumberland),
Smoke,
Spence,
Spotton,
Sproule,
Stinson,
Stitt (Nelson),
Stitt (Selkirk),
Sullivan,
Thompson (Simcoe),
Tummon,
Turnbull,
White (London),
Willis,
Wilson,
Reid,
Verville,
Dumaine,
Elliott,
Bothwell,
Spencer,
Neill,
Goulet,
Mercier (Laurier-Outremont),
Rutherford,
Lapointe,
Perras,
Veniot,
Jacobs,
Donnelly,
McLean,
Girouard,
Thauvette,
Fontaine,
Gray,
Pouliot,
Urquhart,
McKenzie (Vancouver),
Dupuis,
Power,
MacInnis,
Young,
Moore (Ontario),
Parent,
Howden,
Bradette,
Luchkovich,
Munn,
Marcil,
Bouchard,
Speakman,
Macphail, Miss,
Hanbury,
Ralston,
Desrochers,
Heaps,
Roberge,
Lacroix,
Taylor,
Sanderson,
Heenan,
Denis,
Duff,
Cayley,
Fraser (Northumberland),
Hepburn,
Golding,
Hall,
Weir (Macdonald),
Kennedy (Peace River),
Brasset,
Jean,
St-Père,
McPhee,
Gershaw,
Brown,
Vallance.

Mr. POWER: I was paired with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon). Had I voted I would have voted against the third reading.

Mr. AHEARN: I was paired with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Beaubier). Had I voted, I would have voted against the third reading.

Mr. McLURE: I was paired with the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. MacInnis). Had I voted, I would have voted for the third reading.

Mr. SANDERSON: I was paired with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. TOTZKE: I was paired with the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Barber). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. VALLANCE: I was paired with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was paired with the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. MALONEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Young). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. POULIOT: I was paired with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Lennox). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BOTHWELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. Embury). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. SHORT: I was paired with the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Heenan). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. PERLEY: (Qu'Appelle): I was paired with the hon. member for North Vancouver (Mr. Munn). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. CARDIN: I was paired with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Cantley). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. LARUE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Thauvette). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. DENIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (N.B.) (Mr. Smith). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ST-PERE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Hastings South (Mr. Tummon). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ROBERGE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. FONTAINE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Laurin). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. FOURNIER (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (N.B.) (Mr. Arsenault). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. VERVILLE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. Dorion). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUMAINE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Lake St. John (Mr. Duguay). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUPUIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (N.B.) (Mr. McDade). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. DUBOIS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. John-Albert (Mr. Bell). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BRASSET (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for St. Ann (Mr. Sullivan). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. RHEAUME (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Berthier-Maskinonge (Mr. Barrette). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. HURTUBISE (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Cotnam). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. JEAN (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PERRAS (Translation): I was paired with the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Hackett). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. BENNETT: I think the whips will arrange to place the pair lists upon Hansard.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes, that will be done.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time.

Mr. BENNETT: I move that the bill now pass and that the title be as on the order paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, this motion is not debatable, but we could call for a division. If we do not do so, at this time it is for the same reason that we did not continue the debate on the third reading. The government has said from the start that it intended to carry the bill by its majority. We now know what that majority is and there is no occasion in order to ascertain it anew to divide the house again. Otherwise we would do so, because we wish on this measure to fight to the finish.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that would be in accordance with what was done in 1903 when a similar situation arose in reverse. The Conservative party was then fighting against the redistribution bill of that day and it was declared that the same division should be recorded in the journals and it was carried on the same division.

Motion agreed to on the same division.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

FREE CONFERENCE WITH SENATE—REPORT OF MANAGERS—FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS

Hon. MAURICE DUPRE (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the managers for the House of Commons who attended at a free conference with the Senate on Bill No. 71, to amend the criminal code, as follows:

Your managers beg to report that they duly held the free conference with the managers appointed by the Senate with respect to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (71), intituled: "An Act to amend the Criminal Code," and the managers on behalf of the Senate have agreed to recommend that the Senate do not insist upon their first amendment to which the Commons have disagreed but that it accepts the following proposed amendment in lieu thereof:—

"(3) In any prosecution under subsection two of this section, where the circumstances are such as, in the opinion of the court, to render it likely that the child might be in danger of being or becoming immoral, its morals injuriously affected or its home rendered an unfit place for it to be in, it shall, upon proof that the person accused did, in the home of such child, participate in adultery, in sexual immorality, in habitual drunkenness, or in any other form of vice, be an irrebuttable presumption, that the child was in fact in danger of being or becoming immoral and its morals injuriously affected and that its home had in fact been rendered an unfit place for it to be in."

I now request that Bill No. 71 be considered in pursuance of the conference held with the Senate respecting certain amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER: The house will now consider the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 71, to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. DUPRE: I move, seconded by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) that subsection 3 of section 3 be deleted and there be substituted therefor the amendment which I have just read.

Mr. LAVERGNE: If I may say a word at the end of the session, I am glad the Senate and the ex-Minister of Justice have come to the opinion I expressed in the house the other day and for which I was severely criticized.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They send good managers there.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DUPRE moved:

That the second and third amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, be now read a second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

ILLEGAL WARFARE CLAIMS

MOTION TO PRINT INTERIM REPORT IN FRENCH

Hon. C. H. CAHAN (Secretary of State): With the concurrence of the house, in order to correct an oversight, I would move:

That 200 copies of the interim report to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, dated January 13, 1932, made by Errol M. McDougall, Esquire, a commissioner appointed to investigate and report upon illegal warfare claims and reparations payable in respect thereof, laid on the table of the house on February 6, 1932, be printed forthwith in the French language and that standing order 64 in relation thereto be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

MOTION TO PRINT REPORT OF EVIDENCE AND PROCEEDINGS IN FRENCH

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister) moved:

That 500 copies in the French language of the proceedings held and evidence taken, before the select standing committee on agriculture and colonization which were distributed from

day to day during the sittings of the said committee, be printed forthwith and standing order 64 be suspended in relation thereto.

The translation of these proceedings was begun, but there is nothing on the orders of the house to authorize their being printed and distributed.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following message:

Ottawa, May 27, 1933.

Sir,—

I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate chamber on Saturday, May 27, at 8 p.m. for the purpose of proroguing the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. Lascelles,

Secretary to the Governor General.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I avail myself of this opportunity, before the house rises at six o'clock to meet again at eight, to express my appreciation and that of the government of the attitude taken by the official opposition during this last day in expediting the business of the house and enabling us to prorogue this evening. To bring the members back on Monday would have been very inconvenient and unfair to them, and I should like the opposition to be assured that we appreciate the spirit in which they have dealt with the difficult problems confronting them this afternoon, enabling us to reach prorogation this evening.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): I appreciate what the Prime Minister has just said. I am sure if we had consulted our feelings in the matter, we would have kept up this debate for at least another week. We preferred to accommodate, as he has done on occasions, the feelings of the house generally.

May I before we adjourn make a request of the Prime Minister? If parliament is to reassemble before the year is out, would he be kind enough to give as long a notice in advance of that circumstance as may be possible?

Mr. BENNETT: It will be within your memory, Mr. Speaker, that last year I assured the right hon. gentleman that if the house met in the fall I would give as much notice as possible. We intimated that the house would meet after the Ottawa conference, but the date we were not able to determine until later. If as a consequence of what may take place during the next few months it is necessary to reconvene parliament this year, I shall make it known by every means in my power just as soon as I myself am aware of the necessity of parliament being summoned.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE BY SENATE IN COMMONS AMENDMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received a message from the Senate informing this house that the Senate hath concurred in the amendment made by the Commons to its first original amendment to Bill No. 71, an act to amend the criminal code, without any amendment.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

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

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

In the Senate chamber, His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

BILLS ASSENTED TO

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.
An Act to amend the Criminal Code.
An Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.

To these bills the royal assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Excellency:

The Commons of Canada have voted supplies required to enable the government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following bill:—

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1934.

To which bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this bill the Clerk of the Senate, by command of His Excellency the Governor General did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these bills.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the fourth session of the seventeenth parliament of the Dominion of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

In bringing to a close the fourth session of the seventeenth parliament, I congratulate you upon the extent to which you have realized the hopes set forth in my address on the re-assembling of parliament in October last.

It is deeply gratifying that the benefits of the Imperial Economic Conference agreements now known throughout the world as the "Ottawa Agreements," to which legislative sanction was given in the early part of the session, are already reflected in a profitable and steadily increasing volume of empire trade.

The measures which my government has taken to maintain the integrity of national finance are already showing gratifying results. The credit of Canada throughout the world has been strengthened.

The last decennial census, upon which redistribution of the representation of the people in the House of Commons under the British North America Act is based, disclosed that Canada has now, like many other countries, a majority of its population residing in urban communities. Notwithstanding this added difficulty, a fair and equitable redistribution of the electoral divisions of the country has been accomplished.

The charters of Canadian banks have been extended for one year, in order that parliament before undertaking the decennial revision of the Bank Act, may be informed of the conclusions of the World Monetary and Economic Conference and may have before it the findings of a royal commission which my government will shortly appoint, to consider Canadian banking and monetary problems.

The intricate and difficult problems of railway transportation in Canada have been dealt with by legislation embodying the essential recommendations of the royal commission on Canadian railways and transportation. This legislation based upon the principle of maintaining the integrity of our two transcontinental railway systems, aims to secure efficient and economic service and to provide means for ensuring cooperation between the two railways.

The agreement with the Republic of France, regulating customs tariffs, together with the convention governing the rights of nationals, commerce and shipping, which you have ratified will, it is confidently believed, promote trade between and confer mutual benefits upon the two countries.

The amendments to the Pensions Act which you have passed will enable the country more fairly and equitably and with less cumbersome and expensive machinery to discharge its obligations to those who served in the Great War.

Among other important measures passed were an act to amend the Canada Grain Act, an act to authorize the governor in council to agree to extend by proclamation the duration of the Canada-New Zealand trade agreement, an act to amend the Canada shipping Act, and acts respecting penitentiaries, His Majesty's visiting forces, the criminal code, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and Unemployment and Farm Relief.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provisions you have made for the public service.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The courage with which the Canadian people have endured the burdens imposed upon them in these troubled times is witness to their great faith in the future of their country. It is, however, realized that cooperation amongst the peoples of the world is essential to recovery from the unprecedented conditions which have for so long prevailed in all countries.

In relieving you from attendance upon your parliamentary duties, I pray that Divine Providence may guide and bless you.

This concluded the fourth session of the seventeenth parliament.

END OF VOLUME V.